


## PROCEEDINGS

(Sitting nenbers: Hugh Russell, Thonas Anni nger, H Theodore Cohen, Panel a Winters, Steven Winter.)

HUG RUSSELL: Good evening. This is the neeting of the Canbridge Pl anning Board. The first itemon our agenda is the revi ew of the Board of Zoni ng Appeal cases.

LI ZA PADEN So the first case that might be of interest is on Notre Dane Avenue whi ch is the Benj amin Banneker Charter. And what they' re proposing to do is install banners on the front of thei $r$ building so that they have sone identity for the buil di ng itself. And so you have an institutional church buil ding whi ch is now being used for the charter school, and the probl emis in a residential di strict where they are, anything nore than one sign on the lot is over the al I owance. And it's onl y allowed to be 10 square feet. They' re not illumnated. I
really thi nk it's a BZA case.
HUGH RUSSELL: Do we have any
pi ct ures that you can show us?
LI ZA PADEN So the banners will
say: Sci ence, Technol ogy, Engi neeri ng and Mathenætics. One of these banners will be in each of the posts on the building itself. So this is an example of the banners, and then the locati on of the banners will be on the buil ding near the doorway entrances and at the corners of the buil di ng. And then they have photographs of the exi sting building in thei $r$ package. They don't have photo si mof what the banners nould I ook like on thei r buil ding though.

PAMELA WNTERS: May I say
something? I don't have a probl emwith banners, and particul arly on a school situation, that's just ny personal opi ni on. So I don't know if anybody el se has any other little conments.

HUGH RUSSELL: So I' massuning across the street there are some tho-fanily houses?

LI ZA PADEN Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: Because that's what it's like up there.

LI ZA PADEN Ri ght. So, on Notre Dane, the street name escapes ne, and Mddl esex are all in that area. And for the nost part they're all tho-family houses that ring the church property.

HUGH RUSSELL: Can you tel I ne on thi s map which one is the buil ding that they' re in?

LI ZA PADEN It's not thi s one. Ri ndge Avenue.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.
Oh, I ' m conpl et el y turned around.
LI ZA PADEN Yes. So this is the school. Were aml? This is the Benj amin Banneker School buil ding here. So thi s is

Sar gent Street, Notre Dane, and M ddl esex. They' re in this buil ding and this buil ding.

So the banners nould be here at the courtyard and across the front of the buil ding -- well, it's a side of the building. It's parallel to Ri ndge Avenue, but they' re not goi ng to be actually on the street.

HUGH RUSSELL: Oh.
So, how do we feel about I eaving thi s up to the Board of Zoning Appeal ?

STEVEN WNTER: I thi nk that's where it should be -- will citizens have an opportunity to appear and speak?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
LI ZA PADEN Ch, yes, it's a public hearing at the BZA.

THOMAS ANN NGER: It's fine with me.
I rarely see banners I don't like. Al nost never, so I thi nk it's fine. I hould al nost be willing to say something like that, but I thi $n k$ this is better left to the Board of

| 1 | Zoni ng Appeal . |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Is this not on? |
| 3 | LI ZA PADEN It's on, but I think |
| 4 | you have to be a little closer. |
| 5 | Okay -- |
| 6 | HUGH RUSSELL: Maybe we can say |
| 7 | something like that the use of banners to |
| 8 | identify cultural and educational |
| 9 | institutions is becoming nore conmon in the |
| 10 | city, and we think this is not a bad idea. |
| 11 | PAMELA WNTERS: That sounds good. |
| 12 | STEVEN WNIER: It's appropriate to |
| 13 | the city with a rich acadenic fabric. |
| 14 | HUGH RUSSELL: Ckay, that's very |
| 15 | good. |
| 16 | LI ZA PADEN Rich, acadenic fabric. |
| 17 | THOMAS ANN NGER: And we don't have |
| 18 | to use it for the negative to express our |
| 19 | approval |
| 20 | LI ZA PADEN Ckay. |
| 21 | HUGH RUSSELL: Right. |

LI ZA PADEN The other case I wanted to point out to you is 45 Granville Road whi ch is 10371, and usual Iy the Pl anni ng Board obj ects to cases where you have front yard parki ng.

PAMELA WNTERS: Yes.
LI ZA PADEN I have -- this
particular case is a corner lot. So what has happened is there's an exi sting parking space, and sonebody not payi ng attention al tered the I andscaping and the garden so now the parking space is cl oser to the street and they got caught out by Inspectional Servi ces. So their preference is to ask for a Variance to allow the car to sit on what previ ously was the dri veway of a corner lot instead of ri pping up all of the I andscapi ng and the entrance that they have reconstructed at that corner of the house. I just wanted to draw that to your attention, because usually the Pl anni ng Board conments on front yard
set backs.
HUGH RUSSELL: So this is a little conf using. It's actually like a--

PAMELA WNTERS: Ri ght.
HUGH RUSSELL: -- a bl ow up. The house is here --

LI ZA PADEN Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: -- the street is here, and there l guess, and those green thi ngs are shrubbery I thi nk.

LI ZA PADEN So this is the lot. Here's Vassal Lane. Here's Granville. The parking space used to go further into the yard here, and this is what they' ve reconf i gured.

HUGH RUSSELL: The gar age on the abutting property.

LI ZA PADEN The next-door nei ghbor. And so what's happened is now they' ve put a fence here and I andscaped this area and I andscaped in this area. So on this pl an it
nould be like this. This is all I andscaped with a fence, and thi s is now the parking space. So that's what the vi ol ation is. And so that's what they' re asking for fromthe Board of Zoning Appeal as a Vari ance. PAMELA WNTERS: So they don't want the parking space to be adj acent to thi s gar age?

LI ZA PADEN: No, they want it here because that's what they I andscaped and they changed this entry here. So they'd like the parking space to be in thi s area here.

PAMELA WNTERS: And what is it here?

LI ZA PADEN Part of the yard and the dri venay to get to thei $r$ garage.

STEVEN WNTER: Is hardshi $p$ a part of what's consi dered?

LI ZA PADEN: They' II have to prove that at the --

STEVEN W NTER: Have they
denonstrated the har dshi p?
LI ZA PADEN $V \notin$ don' $t$ have the hear ing.

H THEODORE COFN: In the past they
occasi onally parked in that front area?
LI ZA PADEN Maybe they did. Naybe they di $\mathrm{dn}^{\prime} \mathrm{t}$.

H THEODORE COHEN: Maybe they di d. Naybe they di dn't. All right.

HUGH RUSSELL: Ri ght. Maybe the next-door nei ghbor parks in thei $r$ dri veway.

H THEODORE COEEN: Maybe.
LI ZA PADEN So. . . .
HUGH RUSSELL: The thing is when you have corner lots, you have a lot fewer opt i ons.

PAMELA WNTERS: Ri ght.
HUGH RUSSELL: And in thi s case I don't -- there seemto be pl uses and minuses and theref ore I think leaving it to the Zoni ng Board is the right way to do because
they will sort out what's important and what isn't inportant.

PAMELA WNTERS: Ri ght, I agree.
LIZA PADEN So does the Board want to look at any other cases?

HUG RUSSELL: Wivndows, I i ve nasic at Spi rit Bar. I certainly don't want to look at that. Lincoln Institute needs to install a wheel chair lift. I thi nk that is not a big issue. l'msure that the Historic Commissi on will probably be on their case to make sure it's done very ni cel y .

LIZA PADEN You got it.
HUGH RUSSELL: It's a beautiful buil Iding.

LIZA PADEN It's gorgeous. Inside and out.

HUGH RUSSELL: It's a gorgeous buil ding, right. And they do a nonderful j ob keeping it up. So I don't see anything nore. Okay.

as public hearing on the MTPUD5, and conti nuati on of Pl anni ng Board case No. 273, 54R Cedar Street.

J anuary 22nd there will be a public hearing on nedi cal narijuana interim regul ations.

February 5th we'll be at the Seni or Center for Town Gown reports. And then in terns of other upcoming thi ngs we have, we have got a publ ic hearing March 19th, 130 Canbri dgePark Drive, and a public hearing April 16th is likel y to be as well for the MK School Speci al Pernit. But ne will al so have three neetings in February, the 12th and 19th.

In terns of other neus that the Board næy be interested, seei ng that 75-125 Bi nney Street, a building that the Board approved for desi gn revi ew a while ago, has now been tenanted with Ariad. In addition in terns of a previ ew of coming attractions for what I
noul d i nagi ne noul d be pretty robust engaging with the community in the wake of the $C 2$
process. The quest parcel s have been sol d as wel I to a group of Normandy Capital as nel I as Al ex Twining who is here as well toni ght. And I hould inagi ne that it will be a little while, but I would not be surprised if they're not maki ng thei $r$ way bef ore you at some poi nt this cal endar year.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you very mach.

And we' re right on schedul e. So the next itemon our agenda is a public hearing on the Forest C ty Petition to extend the Cantbridgeport Revitalization Devel opment District fromGreen Street to Mass. Avenue. And it looks like Roger nould Iike to key thi s up.

ROEER BOOTH: Yes, Hugh. I just want ed to remind the Board that you' ve seen thi s site a couple of times over the last
year or so, and there's been quite a bit of back and forth with the commenity and Gity Council and it made nany changes to the sort of basic structuring that they' re thi nking about for the site. I nould point out that toni ght is really a rezoning di scussi on, and shoul d the Zoni ng be adopted by the City Council, they'll be back with this project for a project revi ew soon ther eafter I thi nk. So, I thi nk there are a nunber of changes that have been made, and I' msure the proponent will be going through those in thei $r$ presentation.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thanks, Roger.
ATTORNEY J AMES RAFFERTY: Good
eveni ng, M. Chai rnan, nenbers of the board.
For the record ny name is J anes Rafferty. I' man attorney with the offices at 130 Bi shop Al I en Drive in Cantridge. And I' m appearing thi s evening on behal f of Forest City the Petiti oner on this rezoni ng
petition.
Pi cking up with what M. Boothe had to say, I just wanted to al ert the Board or fill in some of the procedural hi story as to how the Petition is in its current form

The Petition differs in a few
si gni ficant ways than the prior Petition, and all of those changes were the results of anendments that were nade through the Ordi nance Committee process. The prior Petition, the one that preceded thi s one, was noved -- has on the City Council agenda in August and bef ore, bef ore the expi ration date the Council had a speci al neeting to consi der the Petition. In the end they concl uded that they were not prepared to adopt the Petition, but prior to that there had been a series of Ordi nance Committee neetings. And the Ordinance Committee in its final report offered three or four substanti ve anendnents to the Petition whi ch they later -- it was
that amended Petition that got noved to a second readi ng. So what we have re-filed is the Petition as anended by the Ordi nance Conminttee. In the areas that have changed in the Petition, M. Cal kins will walk you through the details of them but they really were a few specific di nensi onal areas the Petition originally proposed, hei ght at 115. The Ordi nance Conmittee nade an anendment that it go to 95 feet with a requi rements certain portions of the building be at 65 feet.

The Ordi nance Conminttee al so inposed an obl igation that the ground floor retail that had been contenpl ated and tal ked about through the process be requi red, and there are sone I anguage in the Petition that is I anguage provi ded to us fromthe Ordi nance Committee around the ground floor retail and how efforts should be extended to nake sure that that succeeds.

## (WilliamTi bbs Seated.)

The other el enent of the Petition that's before you, which is not al ways the case with Zoning Petitions when you see them, is there was a Letter of Conmitnent that has becone a popul ar nechani smin rezoning. If you recall the Al exandria rezoning, the Broad rezoni ng, the Leslie rezoni ng, the Nbvartis rezoni ng, all of those rezoni ngs incl uded by reference in the Ianguage, a Letter of Cormintnent, and that Letter of Commitnent typically outlines a series of conmanity benefits that are negotiated by the

Councillors and the Petitioner. In this case because the Letter of Conmitment had al ready been concl uded, and it's referred to in the Zoni ng, you have in this Petition actually the Letter of Conmitnent. And the Letter of Conmitnent covers a range of topics, i ncl udi ng sone I anguage around af for dable housing that was the subj ect of mach
di scussi on. And frankly, at the end of the process, the Ordi nance Committee process, there was still sone uncertainty on the part of Council, at least that was the vi ew expressed at the hearing, and there was nore time needed to work on the affordable housing I anguage in the Letter of Conmitment. So that di scussi on continues. I thi nk it's fair to say that there's an understanding of what the i ssues are. There are sone nechani cal issues, if you will, around how rent formol as are establ i shed and the fact that the current housing affordable housing in the Uni versity Park project cane onl ine prior to the adoption of 11.200 so it doesn' t exactly line up with the way 11.200 oper ates. And there is ongoing examination as to how that might, how the gap bet ween the current oper ati on and the exi sting affordable housing regul ations nork, how that might be nar roned. So just by way of letting you know that the Petition,
while it is our Petition, is a Petition in its current formthat reflects a great deal of effort by the Ordi nance Committee and those amendments were i nf orned by very I engthy publ ic debate and di scussi on at the Ordi nance Conmittee and in another for uns.

So we' re happy toni ght to share with you the Petition, and in particul ar the changes that I've just out lined. So Mr. Cal ki ns i s here fromForest C ty to do that.

HUGH RUSSELL: So thi s is an unusual opport unity where usually the City Council gets to look at our recommendations, now we get to turn the tables.

ATTORNEY J AMES RAFFERTY: That's one way of looki ng at it, M. Chai rnmn. I agree.

WLLI AM TI BBS: Not with the same results.

HUGH RUSSELL: They still remai n the I eading authority, yes.

PEIER CALK NS: V@l I, thank you. My
nane is Peter Cal kins. I' mwith Forest City. l'mpleased to be back with you again to tal $k$ about 300 Mass. Ave. M. Rafferty sort of went through nost of the history and the background. I will point out that there's one other change that has happened nore recently since we were I ast bef ore you, you'll note that this is now called -- we' ve titled this the Forest Cty MII enni um Pharnaceutical s Petition. When we were I ast here with you we were in conversations with Mllenni umbut we weren't at that point at li berty able to di scl ose those in publ ic. And those di scussi ons have now consunmated thensel ves around sone agreenents that are in process of being finalized. Mllenni umhas secured all of the internal approvals that it needed to be able to go public. And so this is very noch now a joint Petition between Forest City and MIIenni umwho will be taking the entirety of the building other than the

15, 000 feet or so thereabouts of retail that's on the ground floor on 401 Nass. Ave. And you will hear I think fromseveral fol ks from M I I enni umtoni ght as well.

HUGH RUSSELL: So is this like the rest of Uni versity Park where there's a tenant, you own the building, and MT retai ns ownershi p of the I and?

PETER CALK NS: Yes, MT -- the I and is currently partly controlled by Forest Gity and partly by MT. Ve will put that into a sort of a common ownership structure that MT will ultimately have control of. Forest Gity is the devel oper on the building. MT is actually an equity investor because of thei $r$ I and position as well, and MIIenni umwill be a I ong-termtenant which is similar to, you know many of the other structures.

HUGH RUSSELL: Ri ght.
PETER CALKNS: So this is a, you
know this is a slide that you nould have
seen bef ore and in similar forns, and it's worth I thi nk just touchi ng base once again on just a little bit of the history because Uni versity Park goes back a long way. Thi s Zoni ng Petition has really tho primary components; one is to expand the definition of the boundaries of the CRDD District. The bl ack line on this pl an is the existing CRDD District, and the dotted Iine shous the portion that we' re expanding CRRDD cover ed by Article 15 to incorporate. And then the ot her sort of si gni ficant pi ece is to nodify the pernintted GA, the FAR, to enable devel opment to happen on that site. And of course there are a nunber of corollary nodifications as well that ne'll get to, but those are the two primary drivers.

Thi s pl an shows Uni versity Park as it was built out. The buildings that are in orange are the resi dential buil di ngs. The ones that are in light bl ue are the
commercial ; the office and Iife sci ence and the hotel as well and the retail. And then the ones, the three that are dark bl ue are the three parking garages. And then of course the whol e network of green space and open space that interconnects themal.

You will recall that Uni versity Park was ori gi nally entitled after mach di scussi on, 25 or 27 years ago, for 400 units of residential and 1.9 million square feet of conmercial. The Zoni ng enabl ed us to build nore resi dential if we so chose, eating into the conmercial. And we did follow that path. So in fact we either built or through the Honeowners Rehab pi ece over here sponsored and hel $p$ support the devel opnent of 674 units whi ch brought the anount of conmercial area that we had down so that we onl y built $1,573,00$. So we' ve built 274 units or pretty cl ose to 70 percent nore residential than we had ori gi nally conmitted to build al ready.

And the commerci al came down conmensuratel $y$.
Once we add the square feet that we' re tal king about in this Petition, the Petition now limints the square feet within CRDD for conmercial uses to 1.8, 1,820, 000 square feet. WKich is still bel ow the 1.9 million square feet that we started with. So that's the sort of big picture for where Uni versity Park and CRDD will stand presunning that this Petition makes its way through the process.

I do want to sort of touch base a little bit on the conparis between what you saw last time and what we have before you now M. Rafferty touched on some of this as well. The last Petition we actually filed in March and we were before you in J une to di scuss. The GFA nunbers, the $1,820,000$, the 246, 000 square feet that that nould enable as a maxi numcap to be built on the Nass. Ave. Site. And the effective increase of $j u s t$ over 100, 000 feet, those nunbers haven't
changed frombef ore.
Wセ have, as Jimnentioned, brought the hei ght with the strong encouragenent of the Ordi nance Committee down from 115 to 95 feet. That hei ght was set because the hei ght of the Necco building is at 97 feet, and the sense has that that was an appropri ate sort of cap for what ought to be happening al ong there. And so we were happy to compl y with that.

There were in our last Petition no particul ar additional built formconstraints built into the Zoni ng. And, agai n , and after sone consul tation with the Ordi nance Committee, we' ve agreed on a requi renent that at I east tho-thirds of the buil ding has to i ncl ude a cornus line that's at 65 feet or I ess al ong the Mass. Ave. frontage with a set back and a step up, you know, all oned behi nd that. And that so only a third of the buil ding could actually reach that 95-foot hei ght at the Mass. Ave. street wall. And
that's I anguage that is built into the Zoning Petition. So it -- that's really focussed on trying to dri ve what I thi nk is ever ybody's goal to make sure that this is an articul at ed building, that it looks and feel s like naybe molliple buil dings, that it doesn' t have the I arge sort of bl ocky feel that sone Kendal I Square buil di ngs might have in, on the Nass. Ave. envi ronnent which is a different kind of pl ace.

Fromthe retail perspective there were no specific Zoni ng requi renents set forth in our I ast Petition. We certainly had tal ked about the fact that we intended to do retail al ong the front, al ong Mass. Ave., but that wasn't cast in stone in the Zoning in any way. The Petition now incl udes a requi rement that at least 75 percent of the frontage al ong Nass. Ave. noist be retail or conparable thi ngs, you know, of public uses. And we' ve al so incl uded a conmint nent that we' re goi ng
to put together a retail narketing plan that we will revi ew periodi cally with the fol ks at CDD. It's focussed on our notual goal, the goal that we have, the Council has, that everyone in the conmunity has, to nake sure that we' re attracting a di verse group of local and i ndependent retailers and so we're committed to working to achi eve that.

Froma residential perspective the I ast position -- Petition did incl ude some additional square feet for resi dential on the site next to the fire station. That fell anay as community opposition to the loss of the open space cane up. That proj ect nould have had sonething Ii ke 120 to 130 units. It nould have had pretty cl ose to 20 affordable uni ts through the incl usi onary program, and so we have conmitted that we will in any case still find a way at some point in the next few years to provi de an additional 20 units of affordable housing somewhere in the Gty
of Canbri idge. If we don't get there, there are financial penalties that are built into the process. But our goal is to try to provi de that. So that's an additional housing requi rement that we've made, as wel I as extendi $n g$ the affordability for the units that are within Uni versity Park.

You' ve seen this slide bef ore, but just to remind everybody, this is what the site I ooks like now About Iike what it I ooked like tuo years ago when I took these pi ctures. The vi ew on the I eft is looking towards the Novartis/ Necco buil di ng towards MT. The vi ew on the right is looking up towards the 350 Mass. Ave. buil ding here. Highl ights pretty ni cel y the tho bill boards that I thi nk ever ybody bel i eves aren' t necessarily appropriate uses on Mass. Ave., and we' re looking forward to being able to take down.

The plan, we are here for a Zoni ng
proposal, but, you know behi nd the Zoni ng proposal obvi ously is an intent to build a buil di ng, and we know that that's what everybody ultimately cares about is what is goi $n g$ to be happeni ng on the site. So we do want to gi ve you a sense of what our planni ng thi nki ng is. You can see here agai $n$ the focus on the retail al ong Mass. Ave. We' ve really, you know got a very snall, very fairly mini malistic entry into the building lobby. The I obby is sort of internalized into the building rather than putting it al ong the whol e frontages. Thi $s$ happened in sone other buil dings in the city. And we' ve devoted practically the entirety of the frontage in the site to the retail.

There are two, if you will, front doors to the buil ding. This is the case of many of the buil di ngs in Uni versity Park that are through- bl ock ki nds of buil di ngs. One here on Mass. Ave., one back here on Green Street.

As we have before, there is sort of a significant open space that's built in back here that provi des sone relief to the sort of congestion. This is a -- Green Street's a fairly tight street, and so between 350 Nass. Ave. and the hotel buil ding and the garage and this buil ding, we felt it was inportant to have sone open space here. It al so creates a place for peopl e who have been to Star Market and are waiting to get picked up or waiting for a cab fromthe hotel or what ever it might be, to have a place to sit down and rest and, you know partake of sone open space.

Ve' re al so seeki ng very mach to activate the retail al ong Nass. Ave. And thi $s$ is sonething that is a new nove from when we were last in. And, again, it's still a conceptual idea, but it's sonething that we' re conmintted to achi evi ng whi ch is to nake sure that we can enliven the retail space
here with sone sort of an open ai $r$, tables, seating. $V \notin$ haven't desi gned it yet, but at a concept ual l evel, something that sort of opens up this end of Bl anche Street as nel I as thi s end of Bl anche Street. Ve know that Bl anche is a connector. It's a connect or that a l ot of people nould like to see enhanced. Ve do bel i eve that this is the best spot to put the I oading of service for this buil ding, al though I know ne' re going to have sone conversations later this week with some of the fol ks at Traffic and Parking and CDD about that. But because of the I oading docks that are across the street and because it keeps these uses away fromthe congestion of the cars that are entering and I eaving the gar age here and al so the resi dential use that does exi st at the noment right here, it's our bel $i$ ef that this is the best location for the I oading. But that's obvi ously not a Zoni ng question per se, that's when we'll be back to
talk with you about at a future point in time.

Parking, as bef ore, is in the 55
Franklin garage. Ve're not intending to build any new parking spaces. There were questions that were rai sed I ast time we were bef ore you and the Ordi nance Committee about peopl e who had wal ked through the garages and sai d how do you, how do you -- I don't see that many avail able spaces in these garages. We do have a nunber. W\& have one current tenant in the Uni versity Park Vertex who has nore spaces than they would ot herwi se be entitled to use because they needed themand we had them And so we' ve gi ven them extra spaces. Obvi ousl y Vertex is going to take both its peopl es and the cars and nove to the Seaport District. And so when they I eave and the timing is jives pretty well with the construction of this building, that will open up a l ot of capacity in the garage. So
that's where that capacity cones from
And then bi cycle storage, even though we' re not building parking spaces, we are buil ding bi cycle spaces. V\&' re going to comply with al l the bi ke requi rements whi ch techni cally are tied to parking spaces. So he wanted to make sure that ever yone under stood because we weren't buil ding parking doesn't nean -- di dn't nean we wer en't al so goi ng to build bi ke spaces. So he'll be doing all of that.

This is an el evation that $j$ ust rei $n f$ orces, here's the 95-f oot line that we agreed to with the Ordi nance Committee. Here's the 97-f oot tall Necco buil ding. You can see here the 65-f oot el ement, and there's a section at the building entry that sits down and even a little back. So that you do get al ong the street wall of 300 Mass. Ave. sort of a I onger, I ower horizontal el enent and a taller, narrower el ement. And we will
play that up with the difference in naterials as well to really give this building a sense that it's moll tiple things al ong the way.

We have just a few sort of, you know, qui ck vi ens. Agai $n$, we' re at Zoni ng so there' s no architecture here per se. But thi $s$ agai $n$ gi ves you a sense of the taller building, taller el enent that happens here and the I onger and I ower el enent that happens here, different ki nds of naterial s bet ween the two. You can see the step backs, you know sort of stepping up and around to the back up there. And then the sane ki nd of perspective fromthe other di rection. Agai $n$, the longer, lower el enent that noul d be retail all al ong the first wall here and then sonet hi ng el se that's happening at that pi ece.

We al so have just a couple of quick conceptual, you know, sketch vi ens of the ground plane, the street life scape that we
want to have happen. This is in the I onger, I ower section of the buil ding looking down towards Novartis and MT. This is the MT Miseumbuil di ng over here just for context. And, agai n , we haven' t really fully desi gned, but looking at ways to really enl i ven the retail al ong here, and then as well looking down Bl anche Street towards Star Market really maki ng a sort of vi brant space here that can enliven the retail use, probably a food service use that happens in this particular space. And, agai $n$, you can see that's across the street fromthe VMFitness center which is located here on the corner and al though we do antici pate havi ng I oadi ng docks in here, we' re al so goi ng to work hard to make sure that we upgrade the si dewal ks and the pedestrian -- a pedestrian's touch and feel so that it is a vast improvenent over what's there now

We have I think nost of you know Jesse

Baerkahn of Gty Retail who has done a lot of nork with a lot of the retail around both Central Square and Kendall Square over the years. Jesse's part of our teamand he's here toni ght and I'd Iike to ask hi mto take a couple of minutes to speak to what he's trying to hel $p$ us do with the retail and how he thi nks we' re positioned to try to accompl i sh that.

So, Jesse.
J ESSE BAERKAHN: Good eveni ng. N ce to be bef ore all of you agai $n$. And it's B-a-e-r-k-a-h-n.

So I will touch briefly on sone of what Peter just touched on as it rel ates to the retail, and then l will get into that last question whi ch I think is how are we going to I ease to the fol ks that I thi nk that the city and all the fol ks that are invol ved in this process over the last year, and certai nl y we bel i eve shoul d be here. So, the first really
obvi ous thing with this plan, which is quite exciting, is al nost all the frontage on Mass. Ave. is dedi cated to retail, and I thi nk Mass. Ave. deserves that. And the poi nt that Peter made about the entrance is a very si gni ficant one, whi ch is that we' re not seei $n g$ ki nd of a grandi ose, bi g trophy type I obby here. The ent ryway rel at i ve to the retail is quite understated. And, you know, the val ue that exi sts where the street hits the buil ding is transl ated in this buil ding with retail that will be for lease. So that's certai nly l think is something that's very exciting about this plan.

You know, I nould al so say, and Peter touched on it briefly, the slight change to the corner and the addition of thi s-- the slight change to thi s top, left corner of the buil di ng I thi nk is very si gni ficant. Creating a space where the retail can bl end out ward and the street can bl end i nward i nto
the buil ding, I thi nk is really a great use for that corner. And when I look around Cantbri dge and I thi nk about where do you have out door dining or the potential for outdoor di ni ng, out door space connect ed to the ground fl oor building. There are actually very few pl aces where this is done well. And I think this corner on Mass. Ave. is a spot that quite frankly I'mreally excited to work on and I think this will be a great, great corner for Mass. Ave. and for Central.

And then jumping qui ckl y now to the how we do it. One of the nost significant things about this design and one of the challenges actual ly that we' ve all spoke about, I spoke with COD quite a bit about, is if you're l ooki ng to create spaces for small, local owner-oper at ed busi nesses what are those spaces I ooking like today when retail has changed consi derably? And thi s space here presents a lot of opportunity because I think
there is the ability to easily demise it and create all sorts of different configurations, whi ch quite frankly the retail that we' ve all di scussed putting in here, and that I thi nk is thri ving is quite small format. So to have that flexibility on the right si de of the buil ding, and you can i magi ne ki nd of a restaurant on the left and some snal ler format retail on the right, is quite exciting this will never be lifestyle, you know kind of nall type retail. This will be contextual urban retail. Mbstly service and some amenity. And in the nei ghbor hood you' ve got a great bi ke shop, you' ve got yoga, you've got a stati onery store, and a hai rdresser across the street. And so there is ki nd of the begi nning of a retail district starting to happen here, and a quite robust exciting retail di strict al ready exi sts down the street.

So the plan is to build upon that in a
pretty dranatic and aggressi ve way.
And then I thi nk, I thi nk where I end it nould be if -- I have no doubt the val ues for the retail gi ven the various stakehol ders and ki nd of going out to the smal I local owner-operators are in the right place. I thi $n k$ the last pi ece of the puzzle here is if you have the space, how do you get those fol ks in? How do you structure the deal s to do that? I thi nk a similar way to what ny group has done in Kendall Square, the real ity, the reason Kendall Square has expl oded froma retail perspective is the I andl ords have been real istic and aggressi ve in structuring economic terns that work for the I ocal busi nesses. They' re the same approach we use here. So not to -- and I'Il reiterate that, you know the val ues are there, the space is there, I thi nk the last pi ece whi ch I'mreally excited to get into and Forest City quite frankly has been
committed to fromthe noment I first spoke to themis structure and economics that all ous these local s to cone into this building. So I have no doubt that we will he be tal king nore about the retail, and I think the actual I easi ng and the nerchandi sing and the narketing will happen after this petition. But as a first step, you know, very excited about the prospects for this, it's a great spot on Mass. Ave.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
PEIER CALK NS: Thanks, J esse. I just have one slide left. You know, one of the, one of the questions that hel d up this project over the course of the last year in various venues has how does this compl y with $Q$ and the nork that the C2 Advi sory Committee was doing. And so I want to just touch base very briefly on that issue.

Thi s page shous a nunber of different ki nds of issues that the $C$ Committee
di scussed internally, put in thei r reports, di scussed with you when they spoke with you back at the very begi nni ng of Decenber. And, you know, you can see that in this col unm just to cut to the bottomline there's a yes i $n$ every si ngl e col unm. So, you know, buil ding hei ght, the C-A Conmittee was recommending that in the Osborne Triangle whi ch they' ve defi ned to incl ude thi s bl ock, a naxi nom hei ght of 100 feet noul d be appropri ate and 95 feet. Obvi ousl y we' re compl i ant with that. They were very
pro-acti ve in wanting to have variety and hei ght and massi ng and build formin di verse l ocal independent ground floor uses with, you know, resi dential di versity. And al though ne don't have any resi dential in this project, we are conmitting to support additional resi dential in a couple of different hays within the city. There's a specific ref er ence in thei $r$ report to the open space
and Green and Bl anche Street which I thi nk is there because it's been in our pl an for a while, but you know, we are rei nf orcing that with the plan that we showed you toni ght. We' re trying to improve the publ ic real m al ong the Mass. Ave. si de as nell with that cutout on the building and the retail vi brancy at the corner.

Wen we were I ast before you we were committing to a LEED Silver with sort of an internal goal of getting to Gold, but not a publ ic conmitment to do that. The $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{A}$ Conminttee sai d that they felt that buil dings of consequence and si gni fi cance shoul d be desi gned and built to a Gold LEED standard and we' re happy to nake that commitment. So we' re compl i ant with that goal. And then obvi ousl y the goal of reducing requi renents for new parking and that's been the case for us for a long time.

So, we thi nk that, you know, the
petition that we have before you, as Jim mentioned, is the product of a lot of conversations with a lot of different people, certainly the Ordi nance Conmittee and the Council broadly, but al so a nunber of nenbers of the conmunity, and is strongly informed by and, you know, I think, you know hel p this group to think about, in practical terns, sone of the thi ngs that they were thi nki ng about with what the $Q$ conmunity pl anni ng process was all about. And so we're pretty excited about potentially being able to nove forward with this.

As I noted in the begi nning, we are now partnered with MIIenni um And I'dIike to introduce Mark Hernon who will cl ose our presentation by telling you why this is such an i mportant project for Mllenni ums perspect i ve.

MARK HERNON: My nane is Mark Hernon. I'mVice President of Operations at

Mllenni um, the data oncol ogy conpany. That's He-r-n-o-n.

Just wanted to take a minute to talk about the conpany and the people that are going to occupy thi s space at 300 Nass. Ave. MIIenni umis a Cantridge conpany. Ve were founded in Kendall Square 20 years ago, 1993. And we' ve been in the city ever since. So we're part of the conmunity, and we think Cantoridge is part of our identity and our culture. Forest $G t y$ has been our I andl ord si nce 1999. They' ve been a real partner in buil di ng our company. We think it's great when we see other gl obal phar maceutical compani es cone into Cantbri dge and expanding their presence here. C early they see sone of the same advantages we do in terns of the institution, the econony, the people which is fantastic. But it's more than that for us, it's our hone, it's where we' ve al ways been.

We have 1600 peopl e on our canpus at

Uni versity Park. Mbre than 1100 of themare residents of the city. Those 1600 people are working everyday to di scover and devel op new medi ci nes to treat cancer. And they' re passi onate about it. They' re passi onate about fighting cancer. They' re al so passi onate to gi ving back to the conmunity. So back in Noventer The Boston G obe naned Mllenni umt he nuntber one place to work anong I arge enpl oyers. Whi ch we' re tremendousl y proud of. I want to read you a quote that cane froma G obe wite-up. They sai d: MII enni um was recogni zed for its conmanity support, specifically its philanthropy under its MIIenni um Makes a Difference Program MIIenni um Nakes a Difference is our untbrella programfor giving back to the conmanity. So we donate noney, but nore importantly our peopl e vol unt eer time, and they do that with the active support of our CEO and our nmnagenent teamto a nunber of different
causes. So not surprisingly we partner with a lot of cancer-rel ated organi zations like the Leukenina and Lymphonm Soci ety and the Multiple nyel ona Research Foundation. Ve al so support Iocal conmunity organi zations I i ke the Cantori dge Seni or Center, The East End House, the Nargaret Fuller Nei ghborhood House. V由 pronote wal $k$ and ride to work days. We encourage our enpl oyees to avoi $d$ dri ving al one to work. In fact we recei ved a pi nnacle award fromthe Nass. Departnent of Transportation for excellence in conmater operations.
$V$ V' $^{\prime}$ ve been active in the Cantoridge science festi val since its inception in 2007. And about 20 of our enpl oyees are stem antbassador vol unteers. They work with si xth graders through Mass. Bi o-Ed Digits Program Beyond that we' re having a really exciting di al ogue with the Nayor's office about how we can further contribute to Stemeducation in
the Canbridge Publ ic Schools. That's a cause that's near and dear to the hearts of a lot of fol ks at MII enni umwho are I argel y sci entists thensel ves. There's lots nore but hopef ully that gi ves you an idea of who we are and for our presence in the conmanity.

In 2008 M II enni um was acqui red by Takeda. Takeda is the Iargest pharnaceutical company in Japan. It's a 230 -year-ol d company whi ch is amazi ng when you thi nk about it. And often when you thi nk about corporate takeovers you thi nk about downsizing and restructuring and all those sorts of things. Our experi ence has been the pol ar opposite of that. Takeda has continued to invest heavily in MII enni umand in Cantori dge. We' ve hired over 400 peopl e si nce we were acquired in 2008. We expect that grouth to continue. And in order for that to happen, we need nore space. As we gain nore space, it's
critically inportant to us that we retain a
conti guous campus. Our busi ness relies on people from di fferent di sci pl ines working cl osel y together everyday. So we can't split our people apart in moltiple locations. We found oursel ves in that situation once in our hi story. V\& had about a dozen locations around the Gity of Cantridge, and the busi ness just di dn't work the way it needs to. So we really need do need to be co-l ocated in a single location. That's our nunber one priority. It's very cramped on our canpus today. But for the short term that's okay. Ve're willing tolive with those cronded condi tions in order to avoid novi ng sone of our peopl e to sonepl ace el se. But in the long termthis proposed building at 300 Nass. Ave. gi ves us the space we need to conti nue to grow right next-door to our current hone. So I hope you'll consi der that as this process noves forward.

Thank you very mach.

HUGH RUSSELL: Just a question out of curi osity.

MARK HERNON: Sure.
HUGH RUSSELL: Where are you I ocat ed at Uni versity Park? Are you facing the green?

MARK HERNON: Yes, we are. Do you want to pull that up, Peter?

HUGH RUSSELL: At 45 and 75 ?
MARK HERNON: So 35 Landsdowne and 40 Landsdowne are our core buil di ngs. So we are the sol e tenant in those tho buil di ngs. We have additional space in a nunber of ot her buil di ngs around the campus; 75, 45, 64, and al so 350 Mass. Ave. Most of that is space that we' ve taken over the last four years with a lot of cooperation fromForest City as our grouth has expanded. So we' ve been able to bolt on bits and pi eces here and there, but that's not going to sustain us long term HUGH RUSSELL: So in 20 years it
will be called MII enni umPark.
PEIER CALK NS: Ve actual ly like the fact that several conpani es like to call Uni versity Park the MII enni umcanpus or whoever it is canpus. It works well that way.

HUGH RUSSELL: Qkay, thank you.
MARK HERNON: Thank you.
PEIER CALK NS: So that does cl ose our presentation. We'd be happy to answer any additional questions that you might have either now or, you know after you entertain corment.

H THEODRE COEN: Could I just follow up on a question? So after assuming this gets adopted and the building is built, will everything be in that one building in 300 ?

PEIER CALK NS: I'msorry, coul d you say the questi on agai $n$ ?

H THEODORE COEN Assuming the

Zoni ng gets adopted and the buil ding is built, will MII enni umbe excl usi vel y in 300? PETER CALK NS: It will be in 35 Landsdowne in its entirety. In 40 Landsdowne in its entirety. In 300 Nass. Ave. in its entirety say for the retail space. And, you know it may or nay not at that point in time be hol ding on to, you know the of fice space they have in thi s buil ding or the space they have here or other places. But they will occupy all of the life sci ence and office space in those three buil di ngs whi ch you can see is, you know, i mportant to the proxi mity pi ece that Mark tal ked about.

HUGH RUSSELL: Ton?
THOMAS ANN NGER: Peter, I noti ced that the GA that you are adding to the total proj ect, what is it, 800 and sone odd is the sane as you had bef ore, not just for thi s project, I mean for all of the origi nal CRDD. And yet you' ve lost over 20 feet in hei ght.

How cone there is -- what was the i mpact of that I oss of hei ght to your GFA?

PETER CALK NS: $W \notin '$ ve put -- I mean the buil ding as desi gned nay not use every I ast square feet of that GFA. Ve're obvi ousl y still norking on that. You know, one of the things that we' re tal king about with MIIenni umis the potential of roof decks and green roofs, and there's a GFA i mpact to that that we haven' t even started to cal cul ate yet. We' ve recovered a si gni ficant piece of what was that top floor, whi ch has a snaller floor because as the buil ding got taller, it got smaller, by reorgani zi ng the nassing on some of the I ower floors.

THOMAS ANN NGER: I see.
PETER CALK NS: V\& di dn't recover every last square foot, but we di dn't change the overall nunbers because, you know, they' re still working on the building.

## HUG RUSSELL: Ckay.

THOMAS ANN NGER: Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Are there other questions or shall we proceed to public conment?

Okay, there's probably a si gn-up list. And you don't have to sign up. So I just thought I'd make -- I see there are nany people here, and I thought I nould gi ve just a little -- they're not very many people si gned up on this list, I don't know -- how that works out, but the point of a hearing is to get all the ideas, all the concepts, all the issues out on the table. And so that's what we' re looki ng to hear is every different point of view It's not so nach about us trying to count how many people want this and how nany people want that. That's nore of the j ob of the City Council. So if you want to be recorded as supporting of sonething, you can just say I'msupporting a particular
set of vi eus without having to say themall agai $n$, and that will hel $p$ us get through our agenda toni ght.

So, the first name is Steve Gansler.
Yes, ny faithful time keeper here will l et you know when three ninutes have passed and we'll ask people to onl y speak for three minutes. And begin by gi ving your nane and spelling it if there's any possi bility of naki ng an error.

STEVE GANSLER: Good eveni ng,
Mr. Chai rnan, nenters of the committee, ny nane is Steve Gansler. That's Ga-n-s-I-e-r and I'mhere to speak as a resident and both enpl oyee of Cantoridge. I' mthe seni or vice presi dent of Hunan Resources for MIIenni um Phar maceuti cal s. Have worked for the company for seven years, but l'mreally here toni ght as a resident. My wife and I and our youngest daughter live at 100 Landsdowne Street, so I have perhaps the shortest
commate to work of anybody here and I' mvery, very appreci ative of that. And as you night i nagi ne, I' mhere to support the petition by Uni versity Park.

As I sai d, he' ve lived here for five years now enj oy I i ving in Cantori dge very, very mach. My wife actually norks in Cantori dge for Genzyne Corporation, and has been here for nore than 10 years as an enpl oyee. We enj oy all the amenities that the city offers, incl uding the ability to find sone nonderful restaurants and shopping, and are very mach looking forward to havi ng expanded opportunity to do that with the, with this proposed space at 300 Mass. Avenue. Just in cl osing, and I promise I won't use all of ny three ninutes, it's al so heartening for ne to see many of ny coll eagues here, fellow resi dents of Cantbridge. And so at this point I think I'II stop and gi ve themt he opport unity to speak
and very mach appreci ate the opportunity to be heard toni ght.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Next is Ken Beardsl ey.
And after Ken will be Steve Kai ser's turn.

KEN BEARDSLEY: Good eveni ng,
M. Chai rnan, nentoers of the board. My nane is Ken Beardsley. That's spelled B-e-a-r-d-s-I-e-y. M/ wife Li nda and I are registered voters and resi dents at 129 Franklin Street. So as you can see, we are right in the midst so to speak of the proposed Zoni ng change. I'mal so associ ated with MII enni um Pharnaceuti cal $s$ as a contract ed enpl oyee. V' ve li ved in Cantri idge, as I said, for five years and we really enj oy the conmanity. We enj oy all the anenities as Steve ny predecessor here i ndi cat ed.

I urge you to support and recommend to the City Council passage of this proposal. There are many benefits as $I$ can see as a resi dent that nould be good for the conmenity. The retail space as proposed nould be a terrific upgrade for that section of the Mass. Avenue. The open space park as indi cated in the schematic nould al so be a great asset and an upgrade. The other asset and upgrade as I see, is the potential for additional tax revenue for the city. As you know, there are difficult times facing all cities and towns with regard to the generati on of tax revenue to support servi ces and prograns for the entire conmunity, not just the geographic area. So with that l'II close, but agai n I urge you to recommend.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.
STEVE KA SER: For the record, ny name i s Steve Kai ser, K-a-i-s-e-r. I I ive at

191 Hamil ton Street. I note that the prior Zoni ng submissi on to this Board was not supported by the Board I ast year. Why? Because the Central Square study mas still ongoing. The City Council failed to support the petition for the same reason. Last year the Yanow Petition was offered by citizens and has wi thdr awn for a si milar reason. The current -- the proposed Zoni ng area under di scussi on by the Central Square study process incl udes the Forest Gity site. So there's ei ther dupl i cation here or conflict.

The Pl anning Board shoul d rej ect this second Forest City Petition as prenat ure, just as the first one was for the same reasons that identified last year.

Now anti ci pating a thi rd submissi on for this project we should identify the following missing pi eces in this application: There should be a traffic and parking study. I have a letter with ne which l will submit and
that expl ai ns why. And I would note on the I ast table slide which was shown by M. Cal ki ns where traffic did not appear. Nany groups in Cantri idge, incl udi ng MT in the past, have supported more housi ng as a general policy for this area. The appropriate sol ution is to zone 300 Nass. Avenue specifically for housing.

The tuo MT owned park parcels near the fire station, they should be rezoned as open space and that would preserve them They're shown on the master plan that you saw today as open space and this nould preserve them

As I stated in ny letter, I oppose plans for the buil ding -- for assi gni ng 20 affordable housing units sonewhere, sonewhere in the city. A better arrangenent is to accept Section 3E of Forest Gity's Decenber commitnent letter. And that is to put \$4 million contribution into the Affordable Housing Trust Fund. It's very specific.

It's a better alternative. It doesn't have I oophol es.

The expiring use housing benefits now I imited by Section 15.32 .2 should be changed from, quote, at least 30 years to at nost 75 years. And that takes care of the i ssue of expi ring use.

Now for quite a while l've expressed ny concern about up zoni ng as bei ng in conflict with Article 7 of the Decl aration of Rights of the State Constitution. Article 7 says: Governnent action cannot del iver profits to special private interests. Up zoni ng like this, Zoni ng Petition is, increases property val ues so there is the illegal profit. I agree that enforcenent of Article 7 nould change the way the city does busi ness. Last year JimRafferty sai $d$ he was preparing a treatise on this topic, taking a different position frommine. Unf ortunatel y no treatise has been forthcoming.
l plan to submit ny own treatise to the hearing of the Ordi nance Committee on J anuary 17 h , and I request that the Board extend the witten comment period for this hearing, however it cones out toni ght, at least 10 days, until July 18th (sic) so that I can submit ny Article 7 report to the Board and M. Rafferty can submit anything he wi shes and anybody el se can subnit anything they wish on the matter.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Next speaker is Dani el Glbert. After M. GI bert, Virgi ni a Rodri guez.

DAN EL G LBERT: Good eveni ng, I' m
Dan GIbert and I have I i ved on Troubridge Street for 18 years, resi dent of Cantbridge. I'ma professor at Harvard Uni versity. One of the courses 1 teach is the sci ence of living systens. You don't need a prof essor fromHarvard Uni versity to tell you that we
are in the middle of the of a revol ution, the life sci ences revol ution. Cantridge is one of the hotspots for that, and MII enni um Pharmaceuti cal s, al ong with other conpani es are what makes it a hotspot. We have to do everything we can to keep conpani es like thi s in our city. Just like you don't need a professor to tell you that there's a life sci ence revol uti on goi ng on, you don' $t$ need an architect to tell you that's what's bei ng proposed is just a whol elot better than what we' ve got. If you sent these tho pictures to any thousand randonhy sel ected citizens of Cantori dge and ask them do they like what's there or do they like what's proposed? I thi nk you nould have a thousand sober votes for this proposal.

A Pl anning Conminssion's job is to hel p protect -- hel p protect our city's history, but it's al so here to hel p nake new hi story. I thi nk that's what MIIenni umis going to
do. And I think in a hundred years peopl e are goi $n g$ to look back at 300 Mass. Ave. and say this is the place where cancer was cured, and they're going to congrat ul ate you for supporting thi s proposal.

Thanks.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Virginia -- I think l'll ask you to pronounce that. Transl ate your witing.

VI RG N A RODRN GEZ SANCFEZ My nane is Virgi ni a Rodri guez Sanchez. So dear, M. Russell and nenters of the Planning Board, ny nane is Virginia and I live at 12 Decatur Street. I amjust a couple of blocks fromthe MII enni umcanpus. I have Iived in Cantori dge nost of ny life. I attended ny entire primary school ing in Cantori dge attendi ng and graduating fromFitzgeral d El enentary in 1987 and from CRLS in 1991. Being rai sed in Cantori dge have nany privileges, many that I did not recognize
until l started rai sing ny own family. I noved out of Canbri dge when rent control was abol i shed and experi enced I ife in ot her commonities in other parts of the state. Culturally I was uni npressed and acadenical ly for ny children I has under i mpressed. I knew I had to sonehow nove ny fanily back home. I was able to achi eve this by securing an affordabl e rental through Just-A-Start. Wthin seven nont hs of noving back, my own little miracle happened when I won the I ottery for affordable ouner shi p through the Canbri dge Commeni ty Devel opment.

My family has bl essed to end up in the nei ghborhood we still resi de in, just tho bl ocks fromny enpl oyer, MII enni um

Phar naceuti cal s. I have four chil dren who are all attending Cantbridge public school s. I renenber Uni versity Park bef ore it was devel oped. It was drab, it has rundown, it was -- it was in pretty bad shape. It has an
area you just passed through. Wen I tel l this to ny children, they can't bel i eve it. The area ne know as a fanmly is quite the opposite. Li ke nany other families in ny nei ghbor hood we frequent Uni versity Park in the eveni ngs and on the weekends. My chil dren are intri gued by the rock scul ptures in the courtyards. My daughter's convi nced it's St onehenge. They I ove when they see the family of rabbits whi ch happens many times day and ni ght. And in the summer they want to sit at the mist fountain and cool of $f$. They read the pl aques and follow the witing in the si dewal $k$, and they conment how pretty and clean it is where nommy works. Where I nork is a reflection of Cantbridge to me. MIlenni umis a sal ad bow of cultures, races bel i ef s, and background all working together respectfully just as we live together in the many nei ghbors around Cantbridge in a mix of cultures, races, bel i ef s, and background.

Just as I could not fathomrai sing ny chil dren in another commanity, I could not fat hom working at a pl ace where the same basic princi ples were not practiced. The nei ghborhood and city noul d greatly benefit froman uplift of 300 Nass. Ave. Additional retailers and restaurants nould add jobs and vitality to Mass. Avenue. Forest City's commitnent to affordable housing would al low peopl e like ne to continue to plant roots in the commanity. I as a Canbri dge resi dent vi ew thi s redevel opnent as an opportunity to enl i ven Cantri i dge.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Next speaker it Terrence Smith.
TERRENCE SM TH That is a tough act to follow My name is Terrence Snith. T-e-r-r-e-n-c-e S-mi-t-h. Good eveni ng, honor abl e nenters of the Pl anning Board. My nane i s Terrence Smith and I amthe di rector
of government affairs at the Cantridge Chanber of Conmerce at 859 Nassachusetts Avenue and a resident of 21 Nanassas Avenue. The Chanber strongly supports the petition subnitted by Forest $\mathrm{Gty} / \mathrm{MT}$ to anend the Zoni ng Ordi nance by extendi ng the

Cantori dgeportway Revi tal i zati on Devel opment District from Green Street to Mass. Avenue in the area adj acent to Bl anche Street. A positive reconmendation fromthe Pl anni ng Board nould be a first step in the long overdue redevel opnent of a blighted area. Thi s site is the worst block on Massachusetts Avenue, and this Zoni ng change will allow for new devel opnent. This will connect

Uni versity Park better to Central Square, Kendal I Square, and MT and allow for devel opnent of needed Iaboratory office and retail space while renoving several del ipi dated buildings and two bill boards. Two recent planni ng studi es, the Central

Square PI anni ng St udy and the Red Ri bbon report have i dentified a need and strong support for redevel opnent that improves street scape, adds retail, and provi des opportunities for grouth for innovative Cantbri dge busi nesses. The proposed Zoni ng will provi de the regul at ory framenork necessary for redevel opment that will address these needs. These studi es and ot hers have i dentified of the need for retails space to bring life to our maj or streets and squares. The proposed Zoning will allowfor retail devel opment that will add to the local retail mix, benefitting and serving busi nesses al ong Massachusetts Avenue and Central Square. And the I aborat ory and office space will bring new custoners to exi sting and future retailers. Wile it is not the primary concern of thi s body, I al so note that the proposed redevel opment will al I ow MII enni um to conti nue to grow in Cantbridge. Over the
past 20 years MII enni umhas becone not only a nodel of innovation in its industry but al so a strong partner in our conmanity.

Adopting the Zoning change woul d lead to the creation and preservation of nore than 1,000 Cantbri dge jobs.

Putting on another hat I'mtreasurer of the Cantori dge Green Street. V由 have been a partner with MIIenni umfor a nunter of years on the wal $\mathrm{k} / \mathrm{ri}$ de days and we' re happy to work with themand they' ve been happy to nork with us. On behal f of the Chantber, its Board, and our 1500 nenbers, I strongly reconmend you adopt the petition -- you reconmend adoption of the petition and thanks for the opportunity to speak this eveni ng.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.
Next speaker is Heather Hoffman. And does (Nane) want to speak next?

HEATHER HOFFMAN: Hello, ny nane is Heather Hoffman. I live at 213 Hurley Street
at the other end of what is beconing bi otech all ey. And I was, I was very pl eased to hear that MII enni umenpl oyees support gi vi ng MIIenni umthis additional space, not to nention the Cantoridge Chantber of Conmerce. But I want to talk about quality of life. I'ma really heavy sl eeper. I can sleep through practically anything, and this norning I was awakened by the noi se of the bi otech by ny house. We were I ooking -- ny husband and I looked on the map before I cane over here, it's nore than 300 yards away. It's -- or 300 feet, excuse me. And it's a one-story building. And I was awakened in ny bedroom which is on the back of ny house, so that's opposite that on the second floor. That's what it's like. The city doesn't have an enf or ceabl e noi se ordi nance. What you' re doi $n g$ is spreadi $n g$ thi $s$ throughout the entire city. This kind of noi se destroys the quality of life. It makes it so that you
can't thi nk, you can't sleep, you can't enj oy your hone. Until we cone up with a way to deal with this and to enf or ce the way we deal with it, because I can assure you that in the parts of Kendall Square where the noi se is part of the Zoni ng Ordi nance, I nspecti onal Servi ces isn't enforcing it. Conpl ai nts have been made, they' ve done not hi ng. I denex proved that the city's regul ar noi se ordi nance is not enf or ceable. So thi nk about the qual ity of life that you're bringing into yet anot her nei ghbor hood.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. Lee Farris.

And after Lee, Kathy Vatki ns.
LEE FARR S: H, I adi es and gentlemen, ny name is Lee Farris and that's spelled L-e-e F-a-r-r-i-s. And I resi de at 269 Norfol $k$ Street in Canbri dge and have resi ded in Cantbri dge si nce 1979. And I' ma
hon巴owner at that Iocation. Wilel should al so mention that I ama nentber of the Cantori dge Resi dence Aliance, but that ny comments toni ght are ny own. I -- despite the fact that this petition is in sone ways i nproved from when it first cane bef ore the Pl anni ng Board, particularly with regard to the hei ght, I still prefer the exi sting Zoni ng. To ne this building is still too tall, and it's still too dense. And hearing how MIIenni umis in two full buildings and scattered anongst, I lost track, but I thi nk it sounded like three or four nore other buil di ngs. And hearing how Vertex will be l eaving for the seaport, made ne wonder why it's not possi ble to acconmodate Vertex within the exi sting Zoning and still keep themwithin the campus. And so that's a question that I think it nould be interesting for the Pl anni ng Board fol ks to rai se with Forest Gity and MII enni um
 I al so think that the conmint nents that Forest Gity has made about the affordable housing are mach too small to be north the -that's the 20 units, are nach too snall to be adequate compensation to the commenity for the ki nds of thi ngs that Heather Hoffnan was tal king about. And the preservation of the exi sting affordable housing, in ny view, at Kennedy Bi scuit Loft and 100 Landsdowne shoul d si mpl y happen because that shoul d have been part of the ori gi nal agreenent and that's the right thing to do by those fol ks. That should not be part of any tradeoff or qui d pro quo as a result of this Zoning Petition. I hould prefer to see housing on Mass. Ave. rather than bi otech, and agai n for sone of the reasons that Heather descri bed. I nould like to see Forest $G i t y$ conmit in witing or the city to initiate a Zoni ng Petition to preserve the park near the fire station. Ri ght now this petition doesn't
address that and so that parcel of I and is still vul nerable. And --

PAMELA WNTERS: If you could wind up your conments, pl ease.

LEE FARRI S: Okay.
PAMELA WNTERS: Thank you.
LEE FARRI S: Okay. I guess, I think that we really need to ask a lot of questions of Forest Gity and not sort of say this is a done deal si nply because they' re conning back agai $n$.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.
Next speaker is Kathy Watkins.
KATHY WATK NS: H. My name is
Kat hy Watki ns and I'ma I ong-term Cantori dge resident and I live at 129 Franklin Street, apartnent 315. So I'mjust speaking about the Forest C ty Zoni ng Petition. In general I' magai nst giving Zoning rights to specific devel opers especi ally when the conmanity
fought so hard 25 years ago and rel inqui shed up Zoni ng rights at that tine. In this case the conti nued affordability of many units of affordable housing al ready in pl ace at Uni versity Park is at stake and that changes the situation. I'ma resi dent of one of those affordable units at Kennedy Bi scuit Loft. I'mal so a board nenber and I al so serve on the Aliance of Cantridge Tenants. We represent I ow incone tenants in Cantbridge. If the affordable housing piece of this deal can be worked out to the satisfaction of the affordable housi ng housing commanity, I hould be in favor of up zoning. However, I want to nake it cl ear that this is not the case right now, and I believe Mr. Rafferty alluded to that. There are sone details, i mportant ones, that need to be worked out. The CEOC, Cantri idge and Sonerville Legal Servi ces and Act have been invol ved in the negotiations over the past nonths, but the nost important
aspects of affordability have not been put into place in the new proposal. They are as fol I ous:

Forest $G$ ty shoul d agree to apply the i ncl usi onary zoni ng or di nance draft formol a, 30 percent of incone for rents and utilities with exceptions for tenants with subsi di es and those paynents anong themto the exi sting 168 affordable apartnents at Uni versity Park. Thi $s$ nould ensure that the 77 affordable units at Kennedy Bi scuit Lofts and 100 Landsdowne are actual ly affordable to low i ncone tenants. I'maware of about 10 househol ds in these buil di ngs that are currently unsubsi di zed. That is, they don't bring with thema Section 8. And that neans that they can pay -- they -- they can pay rents that are way unaffordable to them Their incone limits might neet, but they, they have to pay often a lot of noney. I don' $t$ know how nany househol ds are payi ng on
affordable rents at this point, but it's a bi $g$ concern to have af $f$ ordable units that aren't affordable basically for alot of peopl e. And the other thing is that Forest Gity should commit to provi de 20 new affordable units above and beyond any other affordable units required by sone separate Zoni ng provision or otherwi se. So in other nords, if they build another buil di ng that has 200 units and they're requi red to build, I don't know say 30 under the incl usi onary zoni $n g$, then right now Forest $G$ ty is saying that would al ready neet these 20 units, when in fact the incl usi onary zoni ng woul d nean they nould al ready have to build that. So they woul dn't be gi vi ng anything above and beyond, you know unl ess they didn't build the housing.

The resi dents of the these affordable housing units at Uni versity Park have not been properly inforned of what is going on,
onl y reassured that everything is okay for now Ve' ve been working hard to get the I anguage cl ear and nake these apartnents aff ordable and in line with the incl usi onary zoni ng rules that Cantbri dge uses. So I'm aski ng you, please, do not reconmend the sub zoni ng until the details have been worked out. It's very cruci al, and we' ve been norking really hard. I nould hate to see thi s hastily go through before we get the details worked out that are really inportant. Thank you.

PAMELA WNTERS: Thank you.
HUG RUSSELL: Richard Gol dberg.
And after Richard, Brian Frye (phonetic).
RI O-ARD GOLDBERG Good eveni ng. My name i s Ri chard Gol dberg. I resi de at 170 Harvard Street. I'mal so on the I eadership of the Area 4 Nei ghborhood Coalition and they are a group that has been bef ore you bef ore.

I guess I'd like to ask to start with
what exactly has changed si nce the summer? I don't see a great deal of change, so nost of the comments l'mmaking are conments that I've made previ ously. I actually have sone respect for the work that MII enni umdoes, but I do see thi s not just as an up zoni ng petition, but as potentially spot zoning where we' re bei ng asked as a city to up zone a specific plot of land for a specific client whi ch is not exactly smart zoni ng. So lots of questions remai $n$. They were all asked previ ously. First of all, has Forest City really gi ven up building on the green space adj acent to the plaza in Laf ayette Square or is that option still in play? Ve nould like the answer to that before Forest C ty is gi ven a trenendous bonus. Were exactly is the promised housing that was supposed to be on that pl ot whi ch sonehow di sappeared and the di scussi on has sonehow shifted to the 168 uni ts that Forest City al ready controls
i nspi ring housing. It seens that Forest Gity actually ones additional housing even if they don't build on the park that no one in our conmonity wants themto do. I guess there are a lot of questions that were before this Board this sunmer, and I don't see that those questions have really been answered. Every time Forest Gity has cone back, they' ve cone back with a better proposal. Let's gi ve them a chance to cone back with a better proposal agai n .

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
After Brian Frye will be James Willianson.

BRI AN FRYE: Good eveni ng. My nane is Brian Frye. I'ma resident in 91 Si dney Street. And I'ma busi ness owner in

Cantri idge actually, too, so just joi ned the Chantoer of Conmerce of Cantridge so næybe l'Il see you on next hednesday norning at the
newconers' neeting. I just want to voi ce ny support for this petition for 300 Mass. Avenue. I think it's a great opportunity for the City of Canbridge. Part of the reason I noved to Cantbri dge i mmedi at el y after college was because, you know, it's just an i nnovati ve city and probably one I hould consi der one of the nost innovative cities in Anerica. I nean seeing, you know the Mass. Ave. revitalization right bef ore us is Fl our, Central Bottle, all the new retail and restaurants and everything sprout up everywhere, has really mæde Central Square and j ust the City of Cantbri dge in gener al mach nore attractive to ne, and made it feel a l ot nore like hone. So, I strongly support this petition. The current block is compl et el y del i pi dated. I don't know, it doesn't look Iike nany of you would be patrons of Al Asia on a Friday ni ght, but if it's rai ni ng in there, the roof leaks. So I
nean, it's just a compl ete eyesore. Bl anche St reet is what I mould call scarey to wal $k$ down. As far as the noi se issues, I mean, I sympathi ze but I sleep, you know at ni ght with ny wi ndows open during the surmer. I don't have a problemon 91 Si dney Street. You know Cantoridge isn't Lincoln, Massachusetts, it's a growing city. You know, we can expect there's going to be trucks goi ng down the street, and there's goi ng to be noi se. It's not the suburbs, you know So with that, thank you. HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. $J$ anes. J AMES WLLI AMSON J anes Willianson, 1000 J ackson Pl ace. The basic probl emwith devel oper-dri ven planning is that the entire pol icy debate revol ves around the devel oper's proposal s, not around a plan that is based on what is best for the nei ghborhood and city. Conmunity organi zations are di verted away
frompursuing plans that will meet thei $r$ needs and instead toward negotiating over a devel oper's plan. They can end up minicking the real estate industry and becone I ocal power brokers instead of conmunity advocates. Conmunity neetings and the press focus on potential impacts and appropriate concessions by the devel oper, but few people project a different sort of process in which plans can start with the problens, needs, and proposal s of people who live and work in communities.

Shoul d not conmunities cone up with thei $r$ own plans through an open Denocratic process and then let devel opers compete for the right to i npl enent them? That is a section froma section by the di rector of community planni ng at Hunter College, a gentleman by the nane of TomAngotti whose book New York For Sal e was published by MT Press in 2008. And that's froma section on Forest City Rat ner and the battle over Atlantic Yards in Brooklyn. And

I have copi es of the entire section for the nenbers of the Planning Board.

Were is the pl an the Denocratic, commonity-based, thoughtful, coherent plan for Central Square into whi ch this is integrated, this proposal. As far as far I can tell, what's wrong with the current Zoni ng? The current Zoning is just fine. In fact, it's overly gener ous in ny opi ni on. The current Zoni ng would allow for a building taller than the 65-f oot building, whi ch as far as I'mconcer ned, would be appropri ate for this area this cl ose to Central Square. 65 feet nould be fine. The current Zoning allous 80 feet. Mllions and nillions of dol I ars here gi ven to Necco for a hi storic preservation credit. Now this new buil ding as proposed is going to bl ock off pi eces of what they got publ ic noney to preserve hi stori cally. Has anybody thought about that? Housing could go on this site where it
-- where it actually bel ongs. It doesn't have to be offered as a swap to -- for sonet hi ng el se. And by the way, if you read car ef ully, the swap coul d be a swap for narket rate units, and those could be repl aced with affordable units for a no net gai $n$ of units. It noul $d$ be a gai $n$ for affordable use.

A lab/ office use is not appropriate here. Enough of this. Is every single bi otech company goi ng to cone up with a cure for cancer? Every one of themcan clai $m$ credit for the future care for cancer. As far as I'mconcerned, this might as well be a cancer grow ing in our conmunity. Mbre and nore of these massi ve buil di ngs in vi ol ation of any sense of conmunity, any sense of proportion, any sense of the historic retail core, the integrity of the historical retail core of Central Square which is what they're all profiting from There are many things
norky -- there's a lot of norky language in the house --

PAMELA WNTERS: Jan巴s, your tine is up.

J AMES WLLI AMSON Thank you.
I have a couple of itens to incl ude by way of background. And I just want to cl ose by sayi ng that Santa C aus arrived in Decentor shortly after this petition was re-filed in the formof Peter Cal ki ns who wrote $\$ 100$ checks to Ken Reeves and Lel and Cheung and I'mgoing to be submitting that as part of the record.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Next speaker is Susan Hagel. And after Susan, El ai ne Derosa.

ATTORNEY SUSAN HAGEL: Good eveni ng.
My nane is Susan Hagel, Ha-g-e-I. And I'ma housing attorney at Cantridge and Sonerville Legal Servi ces for al nost 30 years. And I
have norked on affordable housing issues for I ow i ncone tenants in Canhridge for nost of that time. I'mhere in that capacity and al so on behal $f$ of affected tenants in Uni versity Park. And I wanted to di rect the Pl anning Board's attention tho serious concerns froman affordabl e housing perspective. They have -- were briefly out I i ned al ready by Kat hy Vatkins, and I di d submit witten testimony, and had spoken earlier to Forest $G t y$. So in the interest of tinel'll very briefly outline them

One has to do with the 168 units of so- called affordable housing in Uni versity Park right now Ri ght now there are no Zoni ng restrictions on what defines affordable. It si mply says they need to be nade avai lable to people at certai n i ncone brackets, but they could be available to peopl e payi ng 80 percent of thei $r$ i ncome. There are right now sone financing
restrictions on the property, but when that financing expi res or it gets prepaid or whatever, there is si mply no restrictions on the rents for those properties, that this was way back bef ore the incl usi onary zoni ng, and so it just seens to be a glitch. People al ways tal ked about it about as affordable housing, but when you read the current Zoni ng Ordi nance, it doesn't offer that protection. What Forest G ty is pl anning to do is not to really change that as to the rents for the 168 units, that they plan to keep what's currently in place. And I nould just urge that it be made clear that it incl udes the rents as well as the other provisions of the increased Zoning. In their commitnent Ietter they do talk and they say that they pl an to admini ster these 168 units using the sane requi renents, policies, and procedures that are used by the incl usi onary zoni ng. But upon further di scussi on it turns out that
does not incl ude the rent formolla. That it i ncl udes ot her pi eces such as reports to the city all of whi ch is good, but I nould urge you to be very car ef ul in reading this and hopef ully those details could still be norked out.

The other point I wanted to qui ckl y make has to do with the 20 new units that Forest City is proposing. And if you read thei $r$ conmitnent letter it keeps tal king about new units, new units, and new units. But if you read it carefully, they coul d neet that requi rement by ot her, if they' re al ready requi red to do the 20 units, that will count. So agai n, as Kathy Vat ki ns poi nted out, the 20 units, for it to be meani ngful, it has to be something above and beyond that they' re al ready requi red to do, whet her it be by Zoni ng or some other requi rements. So I
woul d just urge that the Pl anning Board thi nk carefully about recommending passage of thi s
until those issues as to the affordable housing pi ece at I east get worked out.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Next El ai ne Derosa.
ELA NE DEROSA: I live at 4 Pl easant Pl ace in Cantbridge. I' mthe di rect or of CEOC I can't be any nore articul ate than Kathy Vatki ns and Susan Hagel was, and so I support those conments in line with your you don' t have to stand up here and say everything. The onl y one poi nt I woul d add is that we keep hearing that MII enni um wants to have its home here, and MT is doing all of this so that Mllenni umcan have a hone. V\&ll, the people in the affordable housing it's their hones as well. And ne' ve been norking wi th them, and I know they' re trying to deal with the issues around the housing that Susan and Kathy articul ated very well, but I noul d ask themto thi nk about the hoops
that they jump through to create enough space for MII enni umto nake Cantori dge thei $r$ hone and probably could nake a si milar effort, that the affordable housing could be resol ved so that the people who live here can conti nue to make themas thei $r$ hones.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Does anyone el se wi sh to speak? Yes, sir.

J ULI AN CASSA: H, ny nane i s Juli an Cassa. I I ive at Windsor Street. I amal so on the Area 4 Coal ition Board. Toni ght I just want to speak briefly about some of the fine print that was not sort of di scussed that is rel evant to the Pl anning Board.

One, a concern of the nei ghbor hood has been that we have not had nouch of a di scussi on with Forest City about sone of the thi ngs that we' d like. Going back in the summer they cane out and nade a -- they made
a presentation and it incl uded 15, 000 square feet of retail on the first floor whi ch that has been noved down to 13 and I thi nk 10, 000 square feet. So there's been a lot of little details that have been presented. There has not been a lot of di scussion. As you should know that the Area 4 Coalition has been trying to -- has been open to a di al ogue or havi ng any di scussi on what soever.

Cat egorically speaking the conmunity is not happy with the building on several grounds. For one, nost people nould like to see housing. There is a bonus in the Zoning for housing as you know I have zero probl ens with Takeda Corporation. I thi nk bi otech is wonderful. I think it's great that it's here in Cantbridge. The questions and the fine print arise al ong the lines of what actually is the little nuances? I support people wanting to see bi otech. I'd like to see this bui I di ng devel oped into sonet hi ng. The
i ssues al so contai ned are -- there's no incentives for the conmunity. There's nothing for retail that's necessarily guaranteed to be affordable. Forest City will tell you and Takeda will tell you that there shoul d be no expectation of Iocal people being enpl oyed at this facility. Another techni cal issue goes al ong terns of sewer, el ectric, and transportation. There will be about a thousand people perspective to cone in and out of that buil ding everyday of whi ch they do not have to build parki ng. I don't understand how they got out of that. That does not seemconmonsensical, forget if it's legal that there's no parking there.

Tho, we just had -- we' re havi ng severe weat her issues. Ve had an enornous ti dal wave hit New York. If something Ii ke that was to happen in Cantori dge, noney shoul d be set aside for devel opment like this to be sure infrastructure, be it sener, be it
parking, real tangible thi ngs that the Pl anni ng Board has to thi nk about that have not been incl uded. And there's no reason to bel i eve when you' re asking for up zoni ng that nould be in the $\$ 5$ to $\$ 10 \mathrm{milli}$ on a range for an addi tional just the up zoning portion there's a si gnificant anount of noney to be made. I think it's in the city's best i interest so see sone of that noney cone not just fromthe $\$ 1$ million that they offered to go to infrastructure, but I al so thi nk sone of the additional noney or sone of the other benefits that should be gi ven to the conmunity should be there. There are currently at present very little local conmanity benefits. And so just I wanted to end by saying the Pl anni ng Board has to understand that thi ngs like parking, transportation, sewer, the pol es with wires above coul d be put underground. Nany maj or cities do that. We -- Cantoridge has sone
i ssues over the next 50 years to do, and when you put I arge devel opnent up, this is a wonderful time to do that and a nonderful tine to sort of bridge the gap of nodernizing the city while at the at the same time bri nging sonething good that's obvi ously a del i pi dated bl ock.

So I just wanted to cl ose by that and just say that we are absol utel $y$ as a commonity happy to tal $k$ to Forest City and have some negotiation -- nmybe negotiation is not the right word. Let's tal k about sone commanity benefits and it should be on the record that there are right now very little. NANCY SEYMOUR: My nane is Nancy Seynour. I live at 175 Francis Street. I'm here in the spi rit that you said to support statenents by Lee Farris, El ai ne Derosa, the Sonerville Canbri dge Legal Servi ces I anyer, Kat hy Wشt ki ns, Ri chard Gol dberg, J anes Willianson, and did I miss anybody el se that

I wanted to nention? No. That's why I'm here.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
NANCY SEYMOR: And I al so want to
say -- no, that's all I wanted to say.
PAMELA WNTERS: Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Does anyone el se wish to speak? Actual ly behi nd you, Mark had his hand up earlier and then Charlie.

MARK BOYES-WATSON: Thank you. Mark Boyes- Watson at 222 Eerie Street. I realized on the way up here toni ght that I now have passed the threshol $d$ of being nore than hal $f$ ny IIfe in Cantrid dge. So, and I've al ways I i ved in Cantori dge and I've watched

Cantori igeport sl ow y energe, I think, into a I ovel y place to live and it was al ways a I ovel y place to live, but I thi nk that there's this idea that buil di ngs are bad for a city, but I don't see that. I don't see the evi dence of that in Cantoridge. So, this
-- I actual ly di d not del i ber at el y speak on thi s petition because one of ny -- I was one of the nenbers of the Central Square Advi sory Conmittee, and it cane at a very awkward time for that conmittee as I thi nk the Board has real ized. But now the conmittee has sort of gotten its thoughts together and shared them, and I thi nk that now it's clear with sone of the thi ngs. And for ne it cones down to ki nd of an interesting noment in time this questi on of how naich to del ay and how mach to debate? But the -- because the norld, I nean clearly nould benefit fromadvancing the cures for cancer. And the U.S. cl early needs engi nes of economic grouth. And the state needs Cantbri dge to continue to be one of its I eading cities. And the city needs devel opment to conti nue to provi de the nonderful servi ces that we provide in thi s city. So on all these scal es we have huge benefits of approaches I i ke this. Actual ly
obl igation really. So, though I really-- I am-- al so conpl et el y concur and we' re goi ng to go back to -- I wasn't goi ng to speak, but I see the committee moist be exhausted because nobody here but ne, so excuse $n 巴$ one second. So the thing is, though, what about Central Square? What about the impacts on Central Square? And the fact is that I agree that up zoni $n g$ in a conpl ete vacuumis really a bad i dea. And I think that there's been a really four year process to try to start to fill that vacuumwith desires for what the city wants fromthrough acknow edgenent that it could happen, it could even be good for the city, and then to harness the strengths of the economic grouth. And so when the slide goes up that says, you know in what ways is thi $s$ now new Zoni ng petition re-filed consi stent with C , and I would generally, I can't speak for the committee, but I would generally agree that it is consi stent. It
starts to work on sone of these issues, connecting MT to Central providing open space, controlling buil di ng nassi ng, i ncreasing vitality through retail, it's consi stent al ong the streets, and meeting obl i gations and for the nost stringent reading of this affordable housing, these are all the nai $n$ primary stated goals of the $C$ Committee. So I know that's got a long way to go politically and it's there, but l just want ed to regi ster my strong support for the petition.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. Charlie.

CHARLES TEAGE: Thank you. Hi, l'm
Charles Teague, 23 Edmounds Street. I was a Iittle di sappoi nted that some of the -there' s sone goi ng back within the slides, the -- we had -- they' ve renoved the hei ght the pent houses. They carefully shoned al I the hei ghts on one of the slides, and they' ve
carefully renoved it. And this is one of the -- one of ny many issues with biolabs. If this was an office building or a residential thing and they wanted to make it a little bigger, we woul dn't be here toni ght but it's a biolab. And so it's the hei ght, they used to show was 128 feet or 34 -foot hi gh mechani cal penthouse arrangement. So I've wal ked through, I've phot ographed a lot of the penthouses in Kendall Square, and it's remarkably noi sy there. And this really goes back to what I bel i eve Zoni ng -- one of the fundanental things is that you take, you take all the nuclear poner plants and you take the dunp and you put it at one end next to the town that you don't like, and you put the residential over at the other end. And this is pushing the biolabs further in. It's within 700 feet of Nentown Court, you know, but -- and we' re supposed to be better than that. Ve' re not supposed to, you know push
it towards the low incone areas.
And then they want to make it bi gger. And so, so anyways, I don't see it as a bio I ab, you know If they could use office space, that nould be great. But l'mhere actually to ask a couple of specific questions. So there's the $\$ 4 \mathrm{milli}$ on, the \$200, 000 for aff ordable units. I'd I i ke the Pl anni ng Board to have staff find out how nach it cost HR just to start to build affordable unit, they build themall the tine. 2005 went to a Just-A Start presentation, they sai d 350, 000 wi th that I and cost at that time. And then I would like to see if we could get a witten response fromthe resi dents of the Iiving -the MTIiving groups that sort of surround the area that's across the street and right next-door and see what they thi nk of the proposal. Then on the -- there's been mach tal k about the I and I eases. My understanding
is I and leases all expi re at different tines.
I don't know whether that's true or not. I hope you could find that out. And how nany
-- and there's a mix of low incone and medi um i ncone. If you could actually break that down by I and I eases and get that down in witing, that hould be very inf ornati ve to us. And then the tal $k$ of the parking and the Vertex I eaving and the spaces, coul d we get in witing the cal cul ations, because that's in the Zoni ng. You need so many spaces for so many ki nds of thi ngs. So that's all -that all documentation should be easily gener ated. And so if you could ask staff to get that for us, that noul d be great. I appreci ate it. Thanks a lot.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you. Yes, Na' am BARBARA TAGGART: H. My name is Bar bara Taggart, T-a-g-g-a-r-t. I've I ived in Cantoridge si nce 1970. Owned a busi ness
that I ran until tho years ago. And I feel like we' re not representing what's happeni ng to the conmunity, and I don't feel that the conmunity has -- thei r issues have been addressed. And that the Cantori dge -- thi s Central Square Advi sory Committee had I thi nk 11 peopl e that were not Canbri dge resi dents on that and there was representatives of Forest Gity and Iand owners on that conmittee and our voi ces weren't heard. Sol'd like to say that with the new housing that cones in, the new acconmodation for people noving into the city, it seens like, and I looked in ny nei ghbor hood. There's a buil di ng there on Frankl in Street. And now that's $\$ 900,000$ condos. There's a buil di ng going up on Pacific Street, \$900, 000 condos. I don't know anybody that used to Iive in Cantoridge, ol d tiners, that coul d even contenpl ate what that neans in terns of monthly payments and nortgage paynents. Ve're being squeezed by
the people that cone in, they can buy these condos, they can pay 2600 for a two-bedroom apart ment, and so we' re getting pushed and pushed and pushed. Where we used to have rent control that gave us sone I everage agai nst the uni versity peopl $e$, he now have nothing. And no one's even nentioned that MT could build sone nore housing for their graduate students. That hasn't even cone up so that they' re not pushi ng up agai nst us. I feel those issues haven't even been nenti oned.

HUG RUSSELL: ©kay, thank you.
Does anyone el se wi sh to speak?
( No Response.)
HUGH RUSSELL: I don't see any hands.

Ckay, so the Board will go into a phase where we'll be di scussi ng anong oursel ves. We næy ask questions if they cone up.

Okay. I guess people who have sat here
for a while want to take a short break. So we'll take a break and cone back at ni ne ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{cl}$ ock and del i berate on this.
(A short recess was taken.)
HUGH RUSSELL: Ckay. Ve have reassentled and we'll start to di scuss the matter before us. I guess I'djust like to run through what's in the Zoning and what's in the Letter of Conmitnent. I think that our response is different about that. And I went through -- we sort of highlighted what's the inportant thing for the Zoning. There's -- so, there's a paragraph about the retail uses on Nass. Avenue as was described by Peter. There's a total floor area adj ustment which results in additional floor area, but -- wel I, you heard that di scussion. And the hei ght Iimits are changed from-- as was di scussed. Project revi ew for the projects noul d follow Chapter 19 rather than the process that was occurring while we were

I ooking at Uni versity Park. And interesting there's a reference in there saying that the criteria incl ude the Central Square action plan, the Central Square devel opnent gui del ines, and by any additional rel evant Zoni ng or Pl anni ng subsequently undertaken by the city, i.e. Central Square. So that's part of what we will be looking at as we're revi ewing a proposal.

The bi cycle parking requi renents are called out. That's the old bicycle requi renents as opposed to the ones that are on our agenda for toni ght, but, you know, it's one of those thi ngs that we probably can negotiate at the appropriate time. So that's what's in the Zoni ng.

In the Letter of Conmitnent there is a contri bution of about a million bucks which I understand is goi ng to the affordable housing trust. Nb ?

STEVEN WNTER: Is that correct?

HUGH RUSSELL: I saw somet hi ng
sayi ng that. Is that true or not?
ATTORNEY J AMES RAFFERTY: There are a couple-- the million dollars goes to a conmanity benefits fund based on a formal a. The incentive zoning fee applicable to the current zoni ng, and that would go to the housi $n g$ trust.

HUGH RUSSELL: Ckay.
ATTORNEY J AMES RAFFERTY: And it's a comparabl e nunder.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right.
And then all of the two affordable housing thi ngs are in the Letter of Conmitnent. The expi ring use, the units at Uni versity Park, and the 20 new affordable units that can be provi ded under a variety of nechani sns.

So, you know, looking at it that way, it's not that compl i cated. Yes, there are 15 pages of paper. And the I awyers have, you
know been at it to make sure that it's extremel y cl ear and car ef ul and worked out, and I'msure the -- it's been revi ened by the departnent for that same reason but it's basi cally a pretty si mple proposal.

So let ne gi ve you my opi ni on on this just as a ki ckoff. I think the affordable housing deal is very important, and I thi nk we should tell the Council that we bel i eve that this is a very important thing and that they should get the absol utel $y$ best deal they can get. And then without telling themwhat we thi nk that deal is, because I don't think we have the expertise to know what that deal is. And in terns of the other, the monetary paynents, that's sonething that the Council is working on. I don't thi nk we really have any role in that.

STEVEN WNTER: M. Chai r, are you speaking of the nillion seventy-ei ght?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
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STEVEN WNTER: And then is there then sonething called a Community Benefits Fund with a whole witten piece of what it is and how the noney will be di sbursed?

HUGH RUSSELL: I've not seen it. I don't know whet her there is or not.

ATTORNEY J AMES RAFFERTY: I don't bel i eve it exists in that form but this nould be the fourth si gni fi cant fi nanci al contribution to a commeni ty devel opnent fund. And it occurred in the Broad. It occurred at Novartis. It's occurring here, and it occurred at Al exandria. And I don't know the accounting nechani sns, but the City Council does have, through its governnent operations committee is looking at how to do that and how it should be accessed, but it's i dentified and separatel y tagged, but I thi nk it's very mach a subj ect of ongoing di scussi on at the Council as to how it gets di sbursed or di stributed. What cane about at
the tine of Novartis was that Council's desi re to establ ish sone type of a square foot age for moll a to have consi stency. So in thi s case where there's 107, 000 addi ti onal square feet being sought in the rezoning, they applied that nunber and that's what this cones from

STEVEN WNTER: Thank you, I under st and.

H THEODORE COHEN: Excuse ne, jim,
I'ma little conf used. Now there's the million, seventy-ei ght.

ATTORNEY J AMES RAFFERTY: Ri ght.
H THEODORE COFN: Is there another
milli on you were tal king?
ATTORNEY J AMES RAFFERTY: Ri ght.
There's the current Zoni ng has a requi rement in certai $n$ Zoni ng Districts for incentive Zoni ng payments for whi ch are payments agai $n$ based upon a formol a on the size of the buil di ng. So that nunber these days is --

PETER CALK NS: About \$4.56. 4. 44.
ATTORNEY J AMES RAFFERTY: 4.44. So that's a separate formol a than the conmonity benefit, and that 4.44 gets applied to the whol e building, not si mply the 107 increase. So that's where that nunber cones from And that's --

H THEODORE COFEN Let me stop you there. And now is it clear si nce I think thi s the proposed Zoni ng says sonewhere that if there's a conflict between the new Zoni ng and other things in the Ordi nance, this hould control? Is it clear that this other incentive paynent is separate fromand in addition to anything that's arising under thi s Zoni ng Anendnent?

ATTORNEY J AMES RAFFERTY: Yes. In fact, in the, I think in the second petition it affirmatively states the obligation to do that and nakes reference to the incentive Zoni ng to avoi d any clai mthat -- because
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there were provi si ons in -- and there are provi si ons existing in Article 15 that have that I anguage with results to conflict, but there's an affirnative restatement of the i ncentive Zoni ng requi renents and that's, that's identified in the Letter of Conmintnent as nell.

HUGH RUSSELL: So, on the ki nd of question of the Zoni ng changes, yes, I thi nk there should be retail al ong Nass. Avenue. I don't think any of us di sagree.

I thi nk the hei ght scheme that they' ve norked out is very responsi ve to the Nass. Avenue frontage and, you know, I thi nk sone of the design pieces, which really aren't exactly bef ore us, there's sone good noves there, particularly the idea of essentially shorteni ng Bl anche Street, by putting open spaces in both ends. And the -- in terns of the floor area ratio, the total anount of devel opnent, I thi nk it's important to
recognize that like why was there a linit 25 years ago? And I thi nk it has around i mpacts. What ever næde the i mpacts, there has an el aborate traffic pl an a street construction pl an whi ch now has been fully i npl enented that tried to deal with what happens to the vehi cl es and the cars, and based on 25-year-ol dideas this linit cane up. Now we have a I thi nk a cl earer i dea of how -- an i dea now of how nany cars are gener ated by how nany jobs are quite different. So that a conmercial build out of 1. 8 milli on square feet nould actually have si gni fi cantly lower impacts than were contenpl at ed 25 years ago. Yes, the housi ng has a traffic conponent, but it's not very si gni ficant and it tends to be somewhat counterflow And as ne heard fromat I east three speakers they wal $k$ to work because they I i ve in Uni versity Park and they work in Uni versity Park. And I don't thi nk those are
the onl $y$ three peopl e that do that.
STEVEN WNTER: 35 percent of the peopl e who live and work in Cantoridge wal k to nork.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
So, and that explains why there' s no added parking. Because when they built the parking garages, that was a long time ago. Whs that 15 years ago when the Iast parking garage was built? It was about halfway through the process. And so they essentially built nore than they needed as it turns out. So they have the ability -- and the parking garages were based on 1900 square feet of conmerci al devel opnent, because that's where they were headed. And so the i dea that they can support it 1.8 million square feet --

THOMAS ANN NGER: 1.9 million.
HUGH RUSSELL: 1.9 million, you know is very logical. So in a way what we' re seei $n g$ in the sort of the Zoning
package is revi siting assumptions that were mæde 25 years ago and saying there's a way to devel op thi s bl ock that's consi stent with the thi nking and consi stent with current policy. And then I -- to me that it's for a local company that, you know has a thousand jobs or is it 1600? I've forgotten.

UN DENTI FI ED MALE: 1600.
HUGH RUSSELL: And then we' II have anot her group. And who knows how nach nore support will flow fromJ apan to Central Square. They sai d thensel ves that the task has not been easily acconpl i shed.

PAMELA WNTERS: Right.
HUGH RUSSELL: So we' ve looked at the Br oad expansi on and sai d the Br oad is a good thi ng, and we changed, we nade some shifts so that the Broad could expand. W\& I ooked at a Bi ogen at l east twi ce very early in the Pl anni ng Board hi story. There was a 121- A agreenent that hel ped Bi ogen on thei $r$
initial buildings. Recently the A exandria proposal. We didn't know at the time it was for Bi ogen, but Iow and behol d Bi ogen has benefitted fromthat.

So, there's a history and a tradition of supporting people who are here. You know, ne, I ast year -- tho years ago, I don't know, I guess in 2011, whatever that is years ago, we hel ped --

ATTORNEY J AMES RAFFERTY: Novartis. HUGH RUSSELL: -- Novartis, yes.

Thank you.
So, hel ping M I I enni umseens to ne to be a no brai ner, you know because all of the other ducks are in the line.

So I hould reconmend that we forward this favorably to the Council. And I guess the question is are there things about it that we want themto reconsi der or not? And I don't have them but Bill's smarter than I am

Bill.
WLLI AM TI BBS: You had your hand up first.

STEVEN WNTER: No, pl ease, go ahead.

WLLI AM TI BBS: I actual Iy agree with everything you sai d except -- no, seriously. One, we' re not in the devel opment busi ness, so hel pi ng the conpany -- we are a Pl anni ng Board so we should tal $k$ about pl anni ng. But I do agree with -- I nean, । don't think in principle have a real problem with what they're doing. The first time around I said that we were in a process, and I wanted to see what that process was. So I just thi nk in a nutshel I I thi nk that we need to at least do our due diligence and at least try to as a board, whi ch we have not done yet, at least look at the Central Square Advi sory reconmendations and minimal lalk about how this fits intoit. And since we
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haven't really done that yet, I thi nk that's just a dual process kind of thing for ne. So I -- and that's ny sense. I don't see any big rush. You næy have a big rush, but I don't see a big rush. At least mini mally have a neeting where asking staff to, you know put together sone conpari sons, to make sure -- there are a fewitens that have -was addressed by the publ ic whi ch has -whi ch I'mnot clear on, whi ch is how -- how does the $Q$ reconmendations reconmend housing and where it's placed? I'mnot a strong proponent that the housing should be in this particular location, but I don't want to just randonhy -- I'd like to have -- in ny mind l'd like to have sone context and thought to ki nd of make that.

It ki nd of -- it's funny, this goes back to al nost one of the first thi ngs you said in your presentation, which is initially you're asking for an enl argement of the CRDD

District. Because one of ny first reactions to thi $s$ when I first sawit, was why don't we just minimally deal with a whole block or are we going to do the Central Square rezoning a block at a time? Or are ne going to nake sone broad -- or have an understandi ng of sone broad thi ngs we want to acconpl i sh? It gets back to what M. Willianson said earlier, which is idealistically -- and I don't thi nk we should necessarily do this. But idealistically we should have a plan for Central Square and we should know what the Zoni ng is and then devel opers and proponents would cone forth and tell us what it is. The timng of such is not an ideal for that, but I think mini mally l'd like to understand the context that this stuff is in. So if -- so ny first thing was minimally should we look at the whole block or should we look at it? But then you sai d this real -- your real -what you're requesting is for an enl argement
of the Zone that al ready exi sts. And in that respect l'mnore confiortable with the proposal and the thi ngs that they' re sayi ng because it is not necessarily Zoning this one bl ock, but it's enl arging of a fai rly large parcel that we' ve al ready had whi ch we' ve had some hi story and stuff like that. And so that I don't, as I sai d, I don't have a probl emwith it in concept, but l just think as a Board, you know, l've been ki nd of compl ai ning al I al ong that the Central Square process, even though it's been going on for a I ong time, it's ki nd of -- we' re sl owing getting to us. So I thi nk minimally ue can use this as a catal yst at least for thi s section of Central Square to just basi cally say let's look at what they're doing, I et's I ook at some of the thi ngs. And I thi nk we' ve ki nd of done that, but we just haven' t done that as a Board. And I don't like doing it in the context of proposal s. I'dilike to
at least look at the proposal s in that context. So I nould Iike to at I east spend at least another meeting where we can, where we can actually sit and do that. We can talk about sone things. And of the thi ngs that we haven't -- that this addresses, but that l'm interested in about how we' re thi nking about it overall in Central Square is housing and where it's placed. Parking is an issue, I agree with you that I thi nk that they have -I have the feeling I guess or you' re saying that you actual ly have adequate parking because we have nore parking in the devel opnent that you need if you incl uded into that devel opnent. Ve -- one of the thi ngs that I was very inpressed with when I sat on the Board this -- the first buil di ngs in Uni versity Park, one of the first buil di ngs that were done when I was on the Board, and I was very impressed, was that we started to, on a yearly basis, do
cal cul ations and collect data on parking and stuff like that. So mini mally as a Board we should at least have the staff tell us that data as opposed to going on our feel, which I noul d agree with you I kind of agree with. So for ne it's more of a process issue than it is -- there are several things. There's some questions I have about the hei ghts of nechani cal penthouses are very interesting. Just a -- l'll give you an example of this, if we' re goi ng to say we' re goi ng to keep it for 65 feet, I would like to see the 65 feet as a definitelimit with no nechanical stuff on that pi ece just to nake sure that -because the nechani cal penthouses on the phar naceutical, on the bio-- they' re just getting bi gger and bi gger and bi gger and bi gger. So I'd like to have a better understandi ng of what the real hei ght woul d be, and I thi nk the CO Conminttee reconmendati ons we have the opportunity to
talk about that kind of thing in that context so we might have tolook at it a little bit nore focussed here. So just housing where it is, parking even though I don't necessarily feel that it's a big issue, the affordable housing incenti ves and how we' re doing that, and it's just something l'mjust interested i $n$ knowing about. So anyway, I just woul dn' t -- I' munconfiortable just naking a deci si on on this toni ght even though I'm-- I don't have a lot of negative feelings about it, but there are sone thi ngs that I had -- for i nstance, the Zoni ng says that there will be retail on at least tho-thirds of the front. The proposal you presented has nore than that. So that's ni ce, but the Zoni ng says tho-thirds, so I just want to næke sure. I found it interesting that the recommendation was 100 feet, but you're lower than that. Vell, I guess the Ordi nance Committee deci ded to suggest that it be lower than that. And
we' re not an Ordi nance Conminttee. So as naich as, as mach as -- I guess l'mbouncing around a little, but the whole conmitment and the Letters of Conmintnent and the ki nd of things that the Ordi nance Committee and the Council does with the devel oper or a project I thi nk is kind of different. You kind of inplied that, let's deal with the Zoning stuff. And the stuff that's in the Letter of Conmitment is not really our territory. So the fact that the Ordi nance Conmittee on Al exandria or any other project night have negotiated something is not an issue that l'mnore concer ned about what we' re looking at in terns of base zoni ng or what we' re doing there.

So to sunmarize, as fromas an extensi on of the existing of the exi sting CRDD area, I' m mach nore confiortable with this than if it were just a randomsite that a devel oper were coming to, and I thi nk that
the changes fromthe proposal bef ore it I think are all positive that I've seen, but I thi $n k$ that just for ny own sense even if we -- if it's just one nore neeting, I like to do due diligence to just to begin to tal $k$ about how the things that this proposal is tal king about is addressed by the Advi sory Conmittee reconmendations minimally even though we have gotten to making a fornal reconmendati on so that we have a context by whi ch to say that at least by our understanding that this would definitel y fall within sonething we' re confortable with. So that's where I'mat.

HUG RUSSELL: Steve. STEVEN WNTER: Thank you, M. Chai r.

The -- I feel like this is looking good and al nost ready to go. And, Bill, I al ways respect your sense of caution that we not nove ahead qui ckly, so I' mwith you on that
if that remæi ns strong with you. Okay?
I thi nk that the housing issue is very compl ex, and I have a feel ing -- I can't get ny head around all of it, but l thi nk nost of the parts are there sonehow but they' re just -- the ki nds of things that will be required and the ki nds of compl enent ary or di nances that are happeni $n g$ and locking in are very, very compl i cated to get your head ar ound. So I thi nk that the housing pi ece is a little I ess difficult than some might thi nk. The onl y i ssue I have with the housing is that I thi nk if it's off site, it needs to be transit-ori ented devel opment. It can't be housing that's off in some far corner of the city.

And I al so would I i ke to have some of that housing expertise and Commity Devel opnent Departnent to be able to look at thi s and come back to the Board and say well, this is what that really looks like, or this
is not the problemthat it looks like it is.
I nould like to get sone of that techni cal assi st ance.

And I thi nk that, you know we did -Mark Boyes- Watson di d say that he felt that this reflected the Central Square Advi sory Committee work very, very hell. And he's a respected voi ce, he' s a respected citizen so I Iisten to that. But I, you know if ne need to do -- if we need nore of that, then we need nore of that.

And I just, I al so thi nk that there are, there was countl ess peopl e who made the connection to the Red Ri bbon Commissi on as wel I to say this reflects -- I has on the Red Ri bbon Conmissi on. These are e-nails we recei ved fromresi dents. I was on the Red Ri bbon Conmíssion. Thi s reflects it in these ways. So I feel that's been spel led out, we can see that.

And I just feel like there's a lot of
very strong things with the retail commitnent, the conmitnent to the housing. I thi $n k$ there are thi ngs that are hi di ng, whi ch is one of themis the link that this company has made to the Cantbri dge publ ic school system The Stemprograns are, you know, statew de are not what they look -- they' re not what they' re supposed to be. It's a very weak system It shoul dn't be. But this is a really great link and, you know this is a, to ne that excites ne nore than a lot of the ot her things in here. The fact that we can get expertise fromthese enpl oyees reaching into the school s to encourage youngsters to go into these ki nds of careers, that's noney in the bank. You know, that's really trenendous stuff. So, l'mfeeling like there's so many good thi ngs here that I, you know, l'mfeeling very positive. l' mfeel ing I i ke this is all looking very good, and I nould be willing to nove ahead.

## HUGH RUSSELL: Tom

THOMAS ANN NGER: I guess I want to pick up where Steve Ieft off. This is a project that has al ready had an enornous anount of process. If you renentber not that long ago, it seens as if this project had reached a low point, and an idea out of whi ch it was not going to cone. I thought it was really at one point contann nated by so mach talk that there was really no hope for it, and I thought that was unf ort unate. Instead we find a project that has recei ved sone very careful attention by the Ordi nance Conmittee, the result of whi ch we have before us toni ght, and we had a presentation that I found convi nci ng, very convi nci ng, even inpressi ve, and I thi nk it would be a big mistake on our part to try to invol ve oursel ves in certain aspects of it.

Virtually all of themare the kind that ne typi cally do not get invol ved with such as
the financi al conmitments, the housing aspects to it. These are things that we typi cally do not do and are not at our best at. The Zoni ng I thi nk is easy. It al igns wel l with what we know cane out of the conmittee of Central Square and suits the buil ding and has been a mach negotiated natter. The hei ght has cone down. I thi nk that has a sensitive spot. Whether that's right or not, I'mnot even sure, but I think peopl e are satisfied with it. It's recei ved enough process. It fits the line. I think Hugh is right that I thi nk one can agree that it probably is appropriate. I might have gone with a little bit nore hei ght nyself, but l'm-- peopl e seemto be happy with this. I thi nk enough has been said with such an i mpressi ve proposal and such an i mpressi ve and i mportant bi otech company here in

Cantoridge that we care so mach about and that cares about us, I think it nould be a big
mistake to do anything other than to send a favor abl e recommendation toni ght to the Council.

HUGH RUSSELL: Pam
PAMELA WNTERS: Tom, I agree with what you sai d, and I just had one questi on that Bill brought up about the penthouse hei ghts. Thi s is going to be coming bef ore us agai $n$ in terns of design revi ew is it not, Hugh?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
PAMELA WNTERS: So is that the time that we can bring up that issue I noul d assune?

HUGH RUSSELL: Ve certai nl y can. Ve can al so at this time set sone constraints on it. I nean, the illustrations that have been presented to us show that the penthouse is set back from Mass. Avenue and that the -there is it is, you know? You can see the penthouse. It's hi di ng froma pedestrian's
point of view It's hi ding behi nd the ot her pi eces on Mass. Avenue. And so that's great. That's what we want.

PAMELA WNTERS: Okay. Al right.
HUGH RUSSELL: So we could try to wite that into the Zoning, but if they're al ready there, I'mnot, you know I nean, we do have a hi story with Forest City that goes back 25 years and they' ve built up credi bility.

W LLI AM TI BBS: I was goi ng to say pl ease don't go there rel ative to the penthouse sites because it's the Forest $\mathrm{C} t \mathrm{t}$ project which I see out of ny wi ndow where the penthouse hei ghts -- whi ch I under stand were perfectly legal and everything were, but that's the nature of these buil di ngs.

HUGH RUSSELL: Ri ght. That's what I'msaying is that if Forest City says they' re goi ng to do somet hi ng, I can -- I don' t thi nk that oh, no, they' re just sayi ng
that, they' re goi ng to do somet hi ng el se.
PAMELA WNTERS: Okay, thanks.
HUGH RUSSELL: Sure. Ted.
H THEODORE COFEN: VElI, I concur with nost everything that's been said. I want to start, however, with acknow edging that certai nl y I argued nonths ago that it was the wrong time to take this up al though I recollect sayi ng that it might indeed be the right building in the right pl ace but it was at the wrong time. I think we' ve cone a long way si nce then. Ve' ve had report fromthe Central Square Committee. Ve've heard from the Mr. Boyes-Vatson who, you know I'mnot sayi $n g$ he' s speaki $n g$ for the committee, he was cl early speaking for hi nself I think, and we saw the presentation about how it does comply. I think for Bill's I thi nk wariness, and I concur with it, is that we haven't really as a Board revi ened and, you know, accepted in any manner the Central Square
reconmendations. For example -- well, there are tho issues one could consi der. One is, you know, should this just be housing in this I ocation or can it be something el se? That I don't thi nk me' ve had a definitive point on. I don't object to this building there. I don't object it to being bi otech. You know, I've argued, you know, with people in the past that Mass. Ave. should be all the finest housing fromthe river to, you know, Al ewife with all retail on the bottom Now clearly that's not what it's been historically, and I don't think that's what it's going to be, but I think that's a point of view that one could adopt. So whet her thi s should be housing I thi $n k$ i s sonething næybe we shoul d consi der a little bit nore, but l don't know that it has to be. Other things in the Central Square revi ew, report, and what's been adopted here is I spent a lot of time today wal king up and down Mass. Avenue in thi s area, and none of
the other buildings there have setbacks, and you know, I understand the i dea of articul ating the buil di ngs and having different nassing, but I don't know that -and obvi ously the owner of the property and the devel oper can desi gn it the way they want to within the gui del ines of Zoni ng, but I don't know that it seens necessary to enshrine in the Zoni ng for Central Square that there will be setbacks at a certain point. But that's sonething I thi nk naybe we can discuss and staff can tell us and Central Square Conmittee can tell us why they cane on that formal a.

So I thi nk we have cone a I ong way from the surmer, and I'm, you know, pretty mach convinced in ny mind that this is in conpliance with the Central Square revi ew and the Central Square Revi ew Conmittee's report, but I certainly don't di sagree with Bill's concept that maybe we ought to have one nore
meeting where we act ually tal $k$ about the Central Square report and how this fits into it.

I agree that the affordable housing is not within our purview, and that is really something for the Ordi nance Conminttee and the City Council to negotiate, and I hope they can get the best they can. Al though it does strike ne, my personal opi ni on, that if these 20 units of housing should not be net by 20 units in another project, another housing project, that Forest City might do that nould otherwi se require it to have 20 units of affordable housing in it. It seens to me that these 20 units shoul $d$ be something in addi ti on to that, but I agai $n$, would leave that to the Ordi nance Conmittee and to the Gity Council to work on.

You know, I'mnot troubl ed by the project. I like the project. I think it's, you know, I agree MII enni um, you know, is a
great asset to the city, and l will take full credit for curing cancer once they reach that poi nt once we' ve approved thi s buil di ng. But, you know, I could vote on it this eveni ng, but on the other hand, I could see a I ot of reasons for going one further hearing and hearing nore fromstaff about conpliance with the Central Square, and I certai nl y noul dn't object to hearing nore about hei ght I imitations and penthouses and what the real hei ght minght actual ly be.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, Steve.
STEVEN WNTER: M. Chai $r$, there seens to be concurrence that this is a good proj ect and that it shoul d nove forward. Is it feasi ble for us to push it forward and ask the Council to make -- to do that due dili gence of comparing this nork to the del i verables of the Red Ri bbon Conminssi on and the Central Square -- I don't know the nane right now but could we then in fact ask --
could we nove this forward and ask themto do that? l'm-- you know I don't like to do nore meetings than we have to do.

HUGH RUSSELL: There's another
process we' ve used sonetimes that in a way accomplishes both goal s, which is we ask the staff to draft a reconmendation that incl udes that anal ysis and the other natters --

PAMELA WNTERS: Ri ght.
HUGH RUSSELL: -- and so that when we next di scuss it, we have sonething that's ki nd of ready to go out rather than just have another di scussi on and have another process of, you know, writing up the deci si on. So the way you take the period of witing a deci si on whi ch, you know is not instantaneous. We have, you know for exanple, a neeting schedul ed in tho weeks that might have sone time on it and, you know naybe we can revi ew the deci si on in tno meeks? Wbul d that work?

W LLI AM TI BBS: I thi nk that noul d nork for me because I want to separate the proposal bef ore us and just what we do and how we do it. I nean, and that's so -- and to your -- I thi nk we shoul d not ask the Gity Council to do that. That's not -- that's what we're here for. V\&'re here to make that compari -- I would note tho things I wote. Wen Mark Boyes-Vatson sai d that the conmittee has gotten its thoughts together on that, and I just said What about us? And it gets back to what Ted was just sayi ng. And I actually wrote, and it sounds a little harsh, but and I saidit's the staff's burden to compare thi s to the exi sting burden and the proposal and the reconmendations and just put thi s in some context. And I've been on the board many, nany, many years and it is not unusual for us to del iberate at a meeting after a public hearing. It's just not unusual. As a matter of fact, l personally
feel that it's nore unusual for us to have a public hearing and make a deci si on in one ni ght unl ess it's so matter of fact. And agai n, I'mactually favorably opposed to thi s with understandi ng some of the context. From ny perspective, Hugh, I thi nk your reconmendation is a good one. That gets staff invol ved. Ki nd of good, we'll talk about it. If we have other issues to talk about, we can do that. And then that keeps it novi ng. I agree havi ng another neeting just to tal $k$ about is probably not, but if ne can do it in a way that noves thi ngs forward, I agree. But I want to be -- I want to, as a Board Menter, I just want to say that I feel very, very strongly that both K2 and $C 2$ are very, very i mportant. And I thi nk we' ve spent a little bit nore time tal king about K2 than $C$. But I want to $j$ ust make sure that ne as a Board just do your due diligence and talk about these thi ngs. And the fact that
we have committees that spent a lot of time on it to gi ve us recommendations, that's al l wel I and good but we as a Board just need to tal $k$ about it. And this is a great catal yst for having that conversation. And I think when we' re neeting to do that isn't a bad i dea.

PAMELA WNTERS: Vell, I guess the question is -- oh, I'msorry. I guess the question is howlong is it going to take the staff?

BRI AN MRPHY: It woul dn' t be time at all. I nean, you know, we didn't want to step on the presentation, but Irams happy to sort of wal $k$ through if you want to right now where things are with terns of the $C$ conmittee. Si míl arly Chris Carter is here to answer any housing questions if there are any. But, if si mply rather, you know, do that now we can do that now If you rather do it where we take that and put that into a
deci si on, not a problemto do that as nell.
HUGH RUSSELL: But you can
accompl i sh this qui ckl y?
BRI AN MRPHY: Yes.
PAMELA WNTERS: Good, excel I ent.
Thank you.

## HUGH RUSSELL: Tom

THOMAS ANN NGER: I 've sai d, and I hould onl y be repeating nyself. I feel like we do sone of our best work when we' re not too intrusi ve into processes that have been going on for a long time and that others are in full control of. I think this is one of those situations where if we feel that, as we all do, that this is a good project and that the rest of it seens like nake nork to ne, it doesn't feel like real substantive. I don't thi nk anything is going to be added to it by anything that we can possi bly say any more. And just to use this as a learning experi ence for what the peopl e in Kendal I Square on the
committee cane up with is, l think, unnecessary to put it mildly. I hould do this toni ght and be done withit. I actually see no advant age to havi ng a report that just says what we saw up on the screen and that we neet what they' ve al ready sai d. So we do that with the Historical Commission. Ve do that with the Zoni ng Board. And here we nould do that respectfully with the Ordi nance Conmittee whi ch has taken this to heart and has done a good job withit. And I nould refer it back to themand saying good job. Thank you for working it through and bringing this back from where I think it was, whi ch has al nost lost. And now it's found agai $n$ and I thi nk we shoul d nove for ward.

HUGH RUSSELL: I guess on the once was l ost, now was found thene, that havi ng us I ook, you know, revi ew that what was one page with a bunch of yeses on it, having that flushed out and having us really say yes,
we' ve looked at that and we agree with that, this is why we agree with it, here's how it works. I thi nk that strengt hens the reconmendation. Does the Council need it or not? I don't presune to know, but I think it's a better report if we' ve done that honework.

STEVEN WNTER: It is nore
def ensi ble, certai $\mathrm{nl} y$.
PAMELA WNTERS: And we will have done our j ob.

HUGH RUSSELL: Ri ght. I nean I --
you know, I nean l-- l'msort of torn because I thi nk that -- I thi nk I know how it's going to cone out. And so if he know how it's going to cone out, then naybe ne just say let's vote to approve it and tel l the staff to wite it up in the report. But -- so, you know if it's a matter of del aying a coupl e of neeks, I don't bel i eve the Counci I can nove that qui ckly, so I don't
think it's going to affect the overall time scale of the action in front of the Council, and I thi nk it might be prudent to do it.

H THEODORE COEN: I certai nly thi nk it would be prudent do to it. And I, I don' t thi nk --you know, the Ordi nance Conmittee does what it does, but we have to do what we have to do. And I thi nk bei ng confiortable that it does i ndeed conpl y with what the Central Square Committee has been doing and what's staff can tel us how it compares to exi sting Zoni ng and to answer some of the questions we have, even if we know how we thi nk it's goi ng to cone out, l nould be naich nore confiortable hearing it fromstaff and being able to revi ewit one I ast time.

HUGH RUSSELL: So can that be on our agenda on the 22nd?

BRI AN MRPHY: Sure.
And then just a qui ck question. If l'm
asked -- the first Ordi nance hearing, or I don't knowif it's the only Ordi nance hearing on this or not, will be the 17th. If asked to characterize where the Board is, how nould you like ne to do so?

HUG RUSSELL: I noul d like to say that the Board -- every nenber of the Board expressed support for the general principles and for -- probably it goes beyond that.

WLLI AM TI BBS: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: The princi pl es. But support for the proposal. And we only are del ayi ng so that we can do this I ast pi ece of work that needs to be done.

STEVEN WNTER: We feel that due diligence is a very important part of our process.

HUG RUSSELL: Right. Particul arly when we' ve got -- the I ast time we revi ewed thi s we said we weren't going to support it because we di dn't do it. I think now we' re
ki nd of obl i gated to do it.
ATTORNEY J AMES RAFFERTY:
Mr. Chai rnan, excuse ne. Wbuldit be accurate -- ny understanding of del iberation the Board has di rected the staff to draft a favorable reconmendation?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, yes, that's correct.

ATTORNEY J AMES RAFFERTY: Wbul d that be a fair assessment --

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
ATTORNEY J AMES RAFFERTY: -- subj ect to anal ysi s?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
How do you al ways just find out what I intended to say? Jimis one of the best listeners in the city.

Okay, so then I thi nk we can concl ude toni ght's work on this and go on to the exciting real mof Bi cycle Zoning.
(A short recess was taken.)

HUGH RUSSELL: Ckay, if we could have people in the room conti nue thei $r$ conversati ons outside so we can get on with Bi cycl e Zoni ng.

Thank you.
J EFF RCBERTS: Ckay, thank you Menters of the Board. Jeff Roberts, Conmuni ty Devel opment. I'mhappy to be here resunning the di scussi on on Bicycle Parking Zoning. And coming in the door is Stephanie Groll and the PTDM conpliance officer Adam Shul man who is in the Traffic and Parking Depart nent. And al ong with them Cara Sei derman who I assuned coul dn' $t$ be here. She' ll be joi ni ng us shortly. She' s envi ronnental presentation and ki nd of the bi ke guru of the city. The four of us have been worki ng pretty cl osel y together on the project.

Just to remind people briefly of how we got to where we are so far. Ve have been
working on this for sonetine. Back in Nay of I ast year -- oh, there's Cara. Back in May of I ast year, we net with the Planning Board. We gave an overvi ew of what we' ve been working on in terns of the city's goal s for bi cycle parking, what we have been seei ng in terns of trends in bicycle parking across the city, as well as sone issues that have cone up with regard to provi di ng adequate space and design and quantity of parking, bi cycle parking spaces. So we revi ewed that.

In August we sent a preliminary version of Zoni ng I anguage whi ch was revi ewed and di scussed with the Board, and the Board brought up several -- had a lot of conments and we di scussed a lot of issues whi ch we' re goi ng to bring up and tal $k$ about in a little bit nore detail today. I don't plan to go through the Ianguage again in a lot of detail, but I'mhappy to answer questions and tal $k$ about sone of the things that have
changed si nce that versi on.
So we did update that versi on from August. We sent back in October a versi on of that I anguage. Hopefully you still have that. I can try to find copi es if we need additional copi es.

So today the goal is to answer sone of those questions. Our hope is that we can ask the Planning Board on our behal $f$ as the Pl anni ng Board, as it's been the tendency to do, to petition the Gty Council formally to consi der adoption of these Zoni ng changes. That would then initiate a process of public hearings where it would go to the Gity

Council and then it hould cone back to the Pl anni ng Board as well as the Ordi nance Corminttee. There nould be opportunities for the public to sort of viewit and conment. And then there nould al so be opportunities for changes at that point. So it woul dn' $t$ be the end of a process. It's sort of the
re-begi nni ng and there still nould be opportunities to answer questions and address any concerns.

Just to briefly, there are sort of tho thi ngs I wanted to hit on just to remind everyone with a purpose of these -- this new Zoni ng is intended to be. One part is maki ng it very cl ear to devel opers what the standards are for bi cycle parking in the city. Nowl've been tal king with people and realizing that one of the -- one of the i ssues, you know, we thi nk about this and a I ot of the ways that we thi nk about, you know auto parking. But I realize when you tel l peopl e-- when you say, you know, we want to requi re parking or just say a parking I ot, peopl e really have a good sense of what that is. Wen you thi nk about an auto parking lot. But when you thi nk about bi cycl e parking, we found that, you know, fromexperience, you know, lots of people
have different i deas of what that means. And we really need to nake that clear in Cantori dge what we thi nk those standards ought to be. And those are based on our experi ence here. They' re based on experi ence that professi onal s have had across the country. Many of these standards are basi cally nat i onw de standards that are appl ied everywhere and that we can and we thi nk there's val ue in having that level of consi stency as wel I.

Wat's shown on the screen is a page fromthe bi cycle parking gui de, whi ch is somet hi ng we' ve been using si nce I thi nk 2008 whi ch has hel ped dramatically in improving the qual ity of the bi cycle parking that we' ve seen around the city. And for the benefit of devel opers, for the benefit of the peopl e here in the city who do the code enf or cenent, we felt it was inportant that we had a set of Zoni ng requi renents that nat ched those
standards that we' ve al ready been, that we' ve al ready been usi ng.

And then the second part of it is really looking at the quantity of bi cycle parking and maki ng sure that what's provi ded in new devel opnent projects neets the city's goal s. And those goal s incl ude basi cally havi $n g$ storage for every -- or for that nat ches bi cycle owner shi $p$ across the city. So for resi dential projects naking sure that there is enough bi cycl e parking to at l east better accommodate the ownershi p that we' re seei ng, whi ch is very hi gh. Which is in many cases exceeds one bi cycl e per owned per househol d. And then naking sure we' re accommodating 10 percent of all trips whi ch is both the city's goal and what we' ve been seei ng in terns of trends. This is a pie chart froma custoner intercept survey whi ch has just done in Porter Square back in Septenber whi ch shous that it's at that level
al ready of 10 percent of peopl e naki ng thei r trips to Porter Square by bi cycle.

So the questions fromlast time which I' mgoing to focus on now are how are the regul ations going to i mpact snæller residential projects, the one, tho, three- unit buil di ngs and then how, what nould the i mpact be on the dense commerci al areas I i ke Harvard Square and Central Square.

So, just jumping into the resi dential pi ece, one of the thi ngs we tal ked about the I ast time is the distinction between when you have owner occupi ed units where you might assune that, you know, it's the person who lives there really controls every aspect of it and can make deci si ons about where they want to st ore thei $r$ bi cycle and have the freedomto do that versus people who are renting housing who mæy have nore limited opportunities and choi ce and where there nay be nore of an effort that needs to be made to
ensure that they have space. We took a look at just by housing type because our Zoni ng doesn' t di sti ngui sh bet ween owner shi $p$ and rental units, just by building type what we tend to see in terns of ownership and rental. And, you know, single-fanilies as you hould expect nach nore owner occupi ed. As you get to tho-family, and then particularly the three and four-family buil dings, it becones very predominantly renter occupi ed. So, even -- so while si ngle families are naybe one category, as we get into the two's and three's and four's, we do feel that there needs to be sone concern about naking sure that there are adequate standards in pl ace to nake sure that renters can have pl aces to park thei r bi cycl es.

Ve di d make some updates to the, to the Zoni ng that we had prepared the first time in response to the concerns about the single families and the smaller units. And the
first thing we sai d was just by looking at that infornation about rental versus owner shi $p$ and al so looking at $j$ ust the fact that it's a kind of a small potatoes issue when you think about si ngle families and, you know even subdi visions of single families and the tho families, that it didn't, it di dn't really make sense to have to i mpose a requi renent in those cases. So we updated the requi renents to say that if you are -well, first of all, if you're expanding a resi dential project but you're not increasing the nunner of units, that's not an issue that should really rai se a concern in terns of bi cycl e parking. And then similarly for construction of single-family or a conversion of a let's say a subdi vi si on of a si ngl e-family in the two units, that ne noul dn't be concerned about requiring it. It hould still be all oned, certainly, to have bi cycl e parking, and we often, you know, we
hear -- we get questi ons, we get requests frompeople who have si ngle-family homes who say, hey, I want to build a bi ke shed. How does the Zoni ng apply? So maki ng sure that the standards that we tal ked about the I ast time where it doesn't count agai nst your gross floor area, you get flexi bility from your set backs, you can provi de coveri ngs without having it been counted for gross floor area or a structure. Making sure that those provi si ons are in pl ace to nake sure that when peopl e want to do that, that they can do it in an appropriate way. Those nould still apply to these.

Now as you get to the --
W LLI AM TI BBS: J eff?
J EFF ROBERTS: Yes.
W LLI AM TI BBS: Can you expl ai $n$ the I ast col unm, I mpact of Proj ect Type?

J EFF ROBERTS: Okay, so what we di d is we looked at new housing starts across the
city and we $j u s t$ wanted to get a sense of what -- when you look at these particular buil di ng types, how many units are on a, you know on a year-to-year basis, how many units are those provi di ng across the city. So as a percentage of all the new units that are bei ng created across the city, what percentages, construction of single-fanily hones, and it's a very small percentage. It's a half a percent or less of the new units that are coming on-line on the city are si $n g l e-f a n m l y ~ h o n e s . ~ B u t, ~ y o u ~ k n o w, ~ t h e y ~ d o, ~$ they do it now and then.

PAMELA WNTERS: Jeff, can I ask you another questions?

J EFF RCBERTS: Ri ght.
PAMELA WNIERS: Sure. Si nce you just nentioned it, if you put a cover over the bi cycl es, do you have to get a Variance for that fromthe BZA or how does that nork?

J EFF RCBERTS: Vel I, under the
current Zoning there could be conpl i cations to doing that. It could trigger gross floor area requi rements. It could be consi dered basically a structure, in whi ch case it would have to -- you nould have to count it as part of the gross floor -- if you don't have enough remai ni ng al I owed floor area on your site, you nay not be alloned to do that because it nould, it nould al nost be like al nost building a garage or building a nore gross floor area. That could be an issue. It could be, it could be -- there are set back requi renents for accessory structures like gar ages and you coul d have an i ssue dependi ng on where on the lot you wanted to put it, you could have an issue with that. So there are a lot of snall issues that could get in your way. It woul dn' t be entirel y allowed or not all oned. But the purpose of the Zoning is to renove sone of those inpedi nents to nake sure peopl e can provi de that covered bi cycle
parking on thei $r$ l ot and in an appropriate way without having Zoni ng get in thei $r$ way.

CARA SEI DERMAN: Car a Sei der man, I ' m in the Communi ty Devel opment Departnent.

Just a brief clarification because there was actually an update to the Zoni ng a coupl e years ago that nould al I ow bi ke sheds without counting agai nst the gross floor area, but the set backs remai ns a grey area and that's something that we nould like to have addressed so....

PAMELA WNTERS: I was thi nking nore about the aesthetics of it and, you know, what happens if you're in a condo devel opment and one of your nei ghbors doesn't like the way that it looks basi cally. So that's what I was thi nking of nore so than that.

HUGH RUSSELL: Vell, I think
condonnini uns usual ly have pretty tough rules about what you do in areas, in different areas of the site. It might be areas where
you'd have a deeded right to do it, probably nost areas you noul dn' t .

PAMELA WNTERS: Okay.
HUGH RUSSELL: So the condo
associ ation hould regul ate it. But then if they regul ate it and they sai $d$ you could build one, you want to nake sure that the Zoni ng all ous you to do it.

PAMELA WNTERS: I see, okay.
J EFF ROBERTS: Ckay.
PAMELA WNTERS: Thank you.
J EFF RCBERTS: So I can nove on to the second pi ece? Sorry, I'mnoving rel ati vely qui ckly because I want to save time.

So novi ng on to where we look at proj ects where we' re getting into the range of either constructing a new buil di ng that's I ess than four units or converting a building that næybe you have two units and you're addi ng a third unit or naybe you have three
units and you' re adding a fourth unit, in that category devel opment it does get to be a little bit nore preval ent. You start to see that nore units as a percentage of the overall units being created are in those categories. And the approach that we had recommended taking -- because in fact and of ten in these cases what you find is it nay be a building that has some common space or sone storage space al ready where they' re trying to convert and naybe nake sone I i vi ng space out of it, whi ch nay create an additional strain on the anount of bi cycle parking that you can provide. In thi s case the approach was to acqui re the parking spaces but to provi de desi gn flexi bility so that you can provi de themin a different way than what nould ot her wi se be requi red for another project. So you could provi de it, for instance, you could provi de it outdoors. If you had a covering over it. And I'II
actually show sone pi ct ures of sone different concepts what we looked at. But it could be just a si mpl e approach of taking an ei ther a covered space or an encl osed space and desi gnating that to say we have looked at, you know, when you' re going for your buil di ng permit you say, you know, we looked at the bi cycl e parki ng requi rements, here's a desi gnated space that we' re, you know, sel ecting to be for bi cycl es and maki ng sure that that is available to the resi dents.

HUGH RUSSELL: Does it incl ude rel axation of the requi rement of no stairs?

J EFF ROBERTS: V£l I, we di dn't wite it that way, but I nean it could be something to think about. When we talk about the desi gn of bi cycle parking, we generally had a no stairs rule. The issue with parking and stai rs, and just as a general i ssue, is that bi cycl e parking works best when you can, you know when it's conveni ent to nove in and
out. So there næy be opport unities where if it's a few steps, you could, you know, it doesn't really make as mach of a difference, but if it's a lot of steps then all of sudden, then all of a sudden it nakes nore sense to lock your bi ke to the front fence rather than actually bring it inside. So it's a tricky issue but that is flexibility. Ve could consi der doing that. I thi nk -- I don't thi nk that would be inconsi stent with what we' ve been thi nki ng about. Ve can try to find a middle ground there in terns of so many steps or onl y so nach di stance fromthe out si de.

Okay. Are there any questions up to this poi nt? Ve can take themas they cone. THOMAS ANN NGER: I guess just one ot her qui ck one. Conversi on.

J EFF ROBERTS: Yes.
THOMAS ANN NGER: The nord conversi on conj ures up a few different thi ngs
for ne. Suppose you have a three or a four-fanily that you're converting from rental to condonini uns, that's not conversi on?

J EFF RCBERTS: No. That's not what we' re di scussing here. That's actually not regul ated under Zoni ng.

THOMAS ANN NGER: By conversi on you nean an increase in the nunber of units?

J EFF ROBERTS: Increase in the nuntber of units. Naybe I should have phrased it that way.

THOMAS ANN NGER: I thi nk maybe you can clarify that.

H THEODORE COEN: Can I pop in here?

J EFF ROBERTS: Yes.
H THEODRE COEN: Is it possible to separate the four and the larger fromthe tho and a three? Because I tell you l'm opposed to any bi ke parki ng requi renents for
any one, tho, and three-family houses. And I just -- it just seens wrong to me. And the percentages that you're tal ki ng about are so small I.

## PAMELA WNTERS: Ri ght.

H THEODRE COEN: And I don't see bi kes parked, you know chai ned to fences at si ngle, two and three family houses. And so, you know, I really cannot support this concept. I have no probl emwith four and above and I thi nk that goes into a different category, but I nould like to see if you can separate out the one, two, and threes from anything I arger.

THOMAS ANN NGER: Why do you draw the line at three?

H THECDORE COFEN VEll, because I thi nk hi storically the triple decker has been a hi storic, you know, buil di ng type pier. And that, you know even fromyour figures while it goes down in ownership, you still
have a thi rd of homeowners, the thi rd of the owners of one and tho, and three-families, you know, bei ng owner occupi ed. And even if they' re not owner occupi ed, I thi nk they tend to be people, you know, peopl e that nay have lived in it at one time næy have a family nentber coming back to live it in it, and I thi nk there is a difference as to what a property owner can do with a small property can do with thei $r$ own property and then forcing themto have, you know covered I ong-termor short-termparking is not just right.

J EFF ROBERTS: Wbul d you say that's true for new construction, if son巴one is buil di ng a three-unit buil ding?

PAMELA WNTERS: Yes.
H THEODORE COHEN: Yes. I don't
see any di sti nction bet ween ol d and new I agree that the Zoning shoul d nake it cl ear that if the peopl e choose to do it, they get
the same benefits fromthe Zoning with regard to FAR or set backs, but that appl ies to ot her situations. But I think peopl e who live, in you know, these one, tho, and three-families can deci de whether they' re going to carry thei $r$ five bi kes, as I do, down ny five stai rs into my basenent because I have a very snall backyard and I don't wi sh to have a shed in there. If I were going to have a shed, l'd rather it had garden equi pnent in it. So I thi nk people get -- and I don't see it as a problemcityw de interns of parking or in terns of visual, you know, aesthetic issues. I think, you know that people who live in one, tho, and three-family houses nanage to keep thei $r$ properties up generally very well, and I don't see bi kes as bei ng an issue there. l'mwilling to see it in when we get into a larger type of housing and apartments and I arger condomini uns and I arger townhouses and I arger devel opnents, but I see
a di stinction bet neen the two.
HUGH RUSSELL: I sn't there al so apt to be a different rel ati onshi $p$ bet neen tenants and I andl ords, tho and three-fanily calls where, you know, a tenant cones and says I've got thi s new $\$ 80$ bi cycl e, can we get toget her and, you know... So, it's I think that process næy be nore effective to get to large buil di ngs.

J EFF ROBERTS: So, I can't say that as a resi dent of a three- unit rental is not necessarily the case, but you're right that it's a different -- it is a different scenario than a large, than a large apartment buil ding, I think. But it is the case that it, you know, a rental is a rental.

CARA SEI DERMAN: As a per son who takes a lot of the calls frompeople who are in the city who don't have bi cycle parking, I guess I nould just have to say that this is an i ssue, and that's one of the things that
we' re trying to address. When you have, you know for every -- if you have a three- unit buil ding, you' re likel y to have 10 and above nunber of bi kes, and we get constant calls and peopl e requesting bi cycle parking on the si dewal $k$ and then we can't fit it on the si dewal $k$ and in front of the houses and a I ot of these residential properties. I live in a three- unit condo that was a new devel opnent rel at i vel y speaking, they could have easily put in sone space for the bi cycle parking that is not an onerous thing at all. And we are not in a large you l ot in any way, shape or form I guess I nould really say that based on our experience, this isn't a theoretical thing, this is something that does happen. And I thi nk it's important to know that we're not retrofitting. Nobody's asking anybody who is in an existing buil ding to go back and make changes. This is for a new creati on of new housing. Ve' re a snall
change in order to create a little space to make an enornous difference. And, agai $n$, with the nunbers that we're seeing and the experience around the city, it's not nothing. It is an issue. So it's --

H THEODORE COEN V\&l, I hould say I philosophi cally di sagree with you about that with regard to the small honæowner and that this is sonething that the market bet ween I andl ords and tenants coul d work out anongst thensel ves. That you could negotiate under the terns of the lease or you would find a different, you know, location. I don't think this is sonething that ought to be enshri ned in Zoni ng for this snall property owner.

THOMAS ANN NGER: Let ne ask a question. We have a single-family, as you know Cantri dge now is an expensi ve commanity where peopl e cone in and they gut houses and they' II al ways add some square footage to it.

Let's say they add 15 percent square footage to a single-family, it's not a new house, it's a renovated house, but they seemto be exceedi ng I thi nk that's the 15 percent line, do they have to provi de parking?

J EFF ROBERTS: No, that was the change that I was describing. Is that if -the requi rements that we are proposing here have nothing to do with the size or the per cent age of the increase. It really just has to do with adding a few units. Ve' ve deci ded to ref or mol at e that based on the concerns that --

THOMAS ANN NGER: The 15 percent is out?

J EFF ROBERTS: Based on the concer ns that we' ve heard, we' ve deci ded that a ref ormol ation based on unit increase and not based on square foot age increase nade the nost sense.

THOMAS ANN NGER: Okay. I missed
that. All right. I'mcatching up with al I of this because I nissed the first tho neetings. Okay.

J EFF ROBERTS: Okay. So we can proceed and cone back to this if it seens like there's still di scussi on to be had.

HUGH RUSSELL: It seens to be a hot button.

W LLI AM TI BBS: Yes.
J EFF ROBERTS: As we get to the I arger units -- so thi s is where the nost new units are created and that's, these are the requi rements that are the same as proposed bef ore. And it's a one per unit and then it i ncreases as you get to I arger buil di ngs.

HUGH RUSSELL: Wyy is it 1.5 spaces?
J EFF ROBERTS: It's a, that's a deci si on that we made froml ooking at the bi cycl e owner shi $p$ data and seei ng not onl y that it's increasing but that it's al ready in many nei ghborhoods getting to be above one
space per unit. One bi cycle owned per househol $d$ and per unit. And for the I arger projects we thought that it was important to enphasize that the, that one space per unit isn't a -- isn't sonething that we figure is a -- we don't think it's a rule that necessarily should be thought of as, you know it's one per unit. It's al ways one per unit. It's the sane that the auto parking space per unit has becone in sone way enshrined as a standard. We don't think it's that simple with regard to bi cycl e parking. There nay in fact be-- a little over time we nay find that the denmand it conti nues to exceed and go even further than one space per unit. It's not the -- I've actually looked at sone other new newer bi ke parking requi renents in sone cities. Sone go as high as 1.5 spaces per unit.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. A tiny i ncrease seens like strange.

J EFF RCBERTS: Vell, what it means is that it's one pace per unit, and then as you get above 20 units, for every 20 units beyond that you add another space. That's sort of the reasoni ng behi nd it. Is that we sort of pi cked units, increments of 20 because that seened sort of a nat ural breakpoint. And then as you nove -- as you get beyond 20 units, in chunks of 20 you add another space. It's how you wite it. It's equally, you know

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, just curious.
J EFF ROBERTS: Okay.
And so these are just some photos.
Actual ly sone of these we took around
Cantoridge. The I ast time I nentioned, you know bi cycl e parking sheds and I ockers are an al ternati ve that have been used in different places, but as ne allow different types of flexibility. It could be providing a bi cycle under neath it, if you have a stair,
out door stai ruel I or encl osed porch, as I ong as you're desi gnating space that is -- and agai $n$, these are in cases where those ki nd of, those cases where say you have a buil ding and you' re i ncreasing the number of units, thi s nould -- nobody -- if they' re not i ncreasing the units, they woul dn't be requi red to do anyt hing. But if they're i ncreasi ng units, they would have to start thi nking about where they nould desi gnate roomfor parking and bi cycles. As I ong as there is a frane that it can be leaned agai nst and can be locked agai nst and a covering to protect it fromthe weather, and a, you know a reasonabl y conveni ent neans of access to that, to that location, then that noul d, that noul d be accept able in those snaller resi dential projects.

So that was a --
HUGH RUSSELL: Does this mean
Ranjit's going to requi re you to build a
waterproof deck?
J EFF RCBERTS: Nb.
WLLI AM TI BBS: That's sonething that the water can't drip through the cracks? HUGH RUSSELL: Ri ght, exactly.

J EFF RCBERTS: Nb, that's not the intent, no.

HUGH RUSSELL: It better be clear to Ranjit.

J EFF ROBERTS: That's actually a very good, that's a very good note. I will nake sure that gets....

PAMELA WNTERS: So when it says snall residential lots on the frane before, that white thing, that white box there, how many units are in that house?

J EFF RCBERTS: I'mnot sure. That's just a picture of the structure that's used to --

HUGH RUSSELL: That 's micro-housi ng, Pam

J EFF RCBERTS: You al nost think it's a doghouse. Yes, sol don't actually know what that buil ding is.

H THEODRE COFEN It's a third of ny lot.

J EFF RCBERTS: It doesn't need to be that big.

And thi s one's just sonething I thought was funny. Sonebody built a drawer at one point to put themin.

WLLI AM TI BBS: That's a big drawer. It slides. That's cute.

J EFF RCBERTS: Ye.
So just shifting to the conmercial aspect of it, and I just wanted to kind of wal $k$ through a little bit what the requi rements are. This may go fast, too, but you can sl ow me down.

Here we' ve kept that sort of 15 percent requi renent, basi cally meaning that if you are expandi ng or enl arging or converging a
non-resi dential use, but that increases it by at least tho spaces. So if it's a, if it's a very snall use and a very minor, even if it's 15 percent, if it's so minor that it doesn't even requi re you to put another tho bi ke parking spaces and then that gets wai ved. So we onl y really -- and I' mgoing to get into this, but when we tal $k$ about the commercial uses, really we' re tal ki ng about racks. W\&' re tal king about, you know, putting bi ke racks in the front of your busi ness sonewhere where it's accessi ble so peopl e can cone in to park. And if you' re not expanding something to the point where you noul d need even one rack, then we don't, we don' t worry about that.

And then I næde a note here, and I want to go into this, explain alittle bit nore about this, about what this means, is that you can shift some of the requi red long-term spaces to short-termspaces. This not onl y
hel ps out with some of the smaller uses，it＇s al ways I thi nk we heard actually when we di scussed with this bi cycle conminttee，and even with some other fol ks，what cones up a I ot，well，I have a lot of norkers who like to cone in and park in front．You know， n⿴囗十ybe thei $r$ hours are different or naybe just by preferences they want to park outsi de rather than go into the insi de bi ke room So we wanted to provi de sone flexi bility where it＇s at the discretion of the devel oper based on what type of use that they were doing， that they coul d，that they could reduce the anount of long－termparking and increase the anount of short－termparking．

This－－
WLLI AM TI BBS：This is indoor？
J EFF RCBERTS：Nb．So Iong－termis －－essentially long－termis indoor． Short－termis outdoor．

WLLI AM TI BBS：What about those
commercial places that have linnted or no set back or no I and?

JEFF RCBERTS: V\#ll, we'll tal k about that. I think that's the focus of this di scussi on real ly.

WLLI AM TI BBS: Okay.
J EFF RCBERTS: So, and this is -I'mkind of just buil di ng up to this, but I want ed to make sure that we had the overall context. The shifting of long-termto short-termbasi cally neans that if you're an of fice building of 13,333 square feet or I ess or retail of 40,000 square feet or less which nould be a pretty big supernarket or a mall, a strip nall or something like that, or a restaurant of 20,000 square feet or less, all you' re requi red to do is short-termparking. It's really not until you get into the scal es above that where you' re going to start to be required to put in the indoor I ong-termbike parking.

So, $j$ ust based on, agai $n$, based on sort of 15 percent rule, I just wanted to gi ve a sense of what ki nd of expansi on is going to tri gger a bicycle parking requi renent. And this is expansi on meaning, you know, there's nothing there, you know interns of an office building and then, you know you nake it bi gger by about 4, 000 square feet, that is something that could, that kind of increase could tri gger bi cycle parking. Retail use expansion of 3,000 square feet or nore or a restaurant of 2,000 square feet or nore, and the anount of bi ke parking you nould have to put in is -- the nunber of racks is based on the total size.

And then in terns of conversion, this is -- the conversi on nay be nore maybe sonet hi ng that you noul d see possi bly nore often in a, like a Harvard Square or a Central Square context or even Kendal I Square. So say you have an office buil di ng
of sone size and you deci ded you' re going to take, you know 5, 000 square feet of that ground floor and you're converting that from office into a retail use. That scale of 5, 000 square feet or nore, the bi cycle parking requi renents would ki ck in. And what they nould essentially nean is about tho to four racks outsi de that busi ness. So now just getting into the -- because this is what you asked for earlier is the -- so getting a sense of what the quantity is that we're tal king about, in terns of the strategi es for how to locate those types of things, this is something that the city has been working on for a long time and its conmercial di stricts and devel op different criteria and ways of going about it. One thing is, you know, maki ng sure that -- having the bi cycle racks in sone nanner of clusters, naking sure that there' s sone available and that you can handle the turn over. You can see in the top

I eft that's a Central Square exampl e. In al ong Nass Ave. and Central Square there's opportunities for within the, what DPWtends to refer to as the furniture zone, which is nore than just furniture. It's benches, it's trees, it's transforners, it's mail boxes, it's light posts.

UN DENTI FI ED VIOMAN Trash cans.
J EFF RCBERTS: Yes, trash
recept acl es.
WLLI AM TI BBS: But it's al so city property.

J EFF ROBERTS: Yes, city property. So in areas like that you have -- oh --

WLLI AM TI BBS: Just to be cl ear you' re requi ring that on a --

J EFF RCBERTS: I ski pped an
i mportant part. V由 tal ked about this the I ast time.

So, you are alloned -- so when you' re provi di ng short-termbicycle parking, you're
all oned to do it on public, on publ ic right-of - way with the city's, with the city's agr eement. So the owner, if the owner's -property owner's requi red to install short-termbi cycl e racks, they can, you know, approach the city, and with the city's agreenent can fund the installation of bi cycle racks. And that's, that's fai rly typi cal now It's not a requi renent, but that's an arrangenent that people nake with the city on a fairly regul ar basis.

W LLI AM TI BBS: And the city doesn' t -- hell, if the requi rement pi ece is nakes a si gni fi cant difference.

J EFF ROBERTS: Ri ght. So if the city does -- if the city says -- and the city can provide-- if the city says, nell, it's tough to do it in the way that exactly meets the Zoni ng, then they can provi de flexi bility to do it, you know, naybe a little bit further away then noul $d$ be requi red. So
that's one alternative. And then the sort of the failsafe alternative is the owner can conpl y with the requi renent by making a contribution to the city equi val ent to the cost of installing bicycle racks of the number that's requi red, and then the city can use that as a suppl enent to the funding of the city al ready puts into installing bi cycle parking where it's needed throughout the city. And there are some creati ve ways that the city can do that that an indi vi dual property owner coul dn't do that nakes it northwhile to have that mechani sm. And l'Il get to that in a future slide.

PAMELA WNTERS: But if the property owner doesn' t want to put in a bi cycle rack, then what?

J EFF ROBERTS: They woul d be requi red to.

So that's an issue that's faced currently, and part of the, you know the
pur pose behi nd thi s approach is naki ng sure that property owners that are creating the need for bi cycle parking are requi red to satisfy that obl i gation, to provi de the bi cycl e parki ng.

Does that answer your question?
HUGH RUSSELL: As a bi cycl e user, I have to tell you that to find a legitimate of ficial bi cycle rack is impossi ble in the Harvard Square. Even the Traffic and Parking Department's anpl e supply of parking spaces is usually tough in Harvard Square. And it's very hard to get tho bi cycl es on a parking neter, because the one on the outsi de tends to get smushed by cars.

WLLI AM TI BBS: I just have a hard time getting ny head around the i dea that you' re requi red to do sonet hi ng, but if you don' $t$ have the I and to do it then you're doi $n g$ it on city property but the city has the ri ght to say yay or nay, and then you
have to get noney. I'mhaving a hard time with that one, but I can be convi nced.

JEFF RCBERTS: Procedurally it's handl ed. I nean I argel y it's the way it's handl ed currently.

WLLI AM TI BBS: But you' re not
requi red now right?
J EFF RCBERTS: V\&l I, you may -- you are requi red under our, you know under our current Zoni ng there are bi cycle parking requi renents. And, you know nmny projects do satisfy it. So the project down there on the bottomright is One First Street. So that parking was installed -- I nean, mach the same way that the project is maybe requi red to do si dewal $k$ i nprovenents or other traffic miti gation inprovenents, incl udi ng bi ke parking is typi cally part of that. The Planning Board doesn't al nays get into that Ievel of detail. But it's, it's not unusual. And, in fact, it's typical for new
devel opment to provi de bi cycle parking like it's shown there where it's a bicycle parking that, you know, outsi de of where the entrance where it's needed. But it is on, it is on the city si deval $k$ and it's funded and provi ded by the devel oper.

PAMELA WNTERS: It's like trees, you know, soneti n®s.

J EFF ROBERTS: Yes, trees are similar.

PAMELA WNTERS: So thi s noul d be just for new devel opnent then?

J EFF RCBERTS: Agai n , just for new devel opnent for --

PAMELA WNTERS: Ch, okay.
JEFF RCBERTS: -- if you're
expandi ng something or say a conversi on of office to something like office to retail or office to restaurant. So, and again I nentioned this the first time, too, really the way we look at this --

HUGH RUSSELL: Or if you' re a good citizen --

PAMELA WNTERS: What?
HUG RUSSELL: $\quad$ O if you' re a good citizen --

J EFF RCBERTS: Yes, if you' re --
HUGH RUSSELL: -- trying to næet the requi rements of your custoners.

J EFF RCBERTS: Right. And the way we look at this, it's a contbi nation of, you know a conbi nation requir renents, it's a contbi nation of public invol venent, and it's sort of the desire for busi nesses to satisfy their custoners which -- and as I showed in the slide before, the nunber of people who bi cycle to these busi nesses is fairly high and increasi ng.

THOMAS ANN NGER: Let ne see if I can junp in.

J EFF ROBERTS: Yes.
THOMAS ANN NGER: l'mlooki ng, tel l
ne if l'min the right provision bef ore I ask the question. I'mlooking at 6. 104.5 of your Iatest -- of the draft of $10 / 23 / 12$. Is that what you' re tal ki ng about?

J EFF RCBERTS: 6. --
THOMAS ANN NGER: 104. 5.
HUGH RUSSELL: Which is on page 45.
J EFF RCBERTS: Yes. Bi cycl e parking on public property, yes.

THOMAS ANN NGER: This is one tough readi $n g$ provi si on, but there's nothing that bothers ne nore than the sentence in the niddlle whi ch says: The city must approve such agreenent and næy rej ect such agreement for any reason.

How do you justify that?
JEFF RCBERTS: I nean part of this is just -- it's naybe a little legalistic in terns of, you know naking it clear that the city -- and in fact it's not -- it's not even necessary to say that, the city doesn' t--
never has an obl i gati on to let someone do something on publ ic property that it doesn't want, doesn't want it to do.

THOMAS ANN NGER: I know I nean, what Bill was saying, where l'm-- you can't do it on your own. You' ve got to do it on public. You go to themand you say let's nork sonet hi ng out. And then they say no for any reason, and then where does it go from there?

J EFF ROBERTS: And then that failsafe is the contribution that you can nake --

THOMAS ANN NGER: The contri bution?
J EFF ROBERTS: You can say, you know okay well, if you' re telling -- if the city's telling ne l can't put a bi ke rack on ny si dewal $k$, then I can fulfill the requi renent by paying the equi val ent anount and then basi cally being done with it.

THOMAS ANN NGER: VEl I . . .

## H THEODRE COFEN: Can I pop in

there? Because I think your section 6. 104. 6c is the only really workable answer which is that, you know either the city is going to just have to devel op parking areas for bi kes or somehow there's going to have to be, you know private devel opnent of bi ke parking. And I thi nk -- you know that's my whole probl emw th this whol e concept of, you know requiring it in all these various areas, is that, you know -- and the requi renents that they be within 50 feet or within 200 feet just doesn't nake sense to, you know it's putting bi cyclists who are presumably the fittest citizens at such a preferred category over people who drive and have to park, you know two or three blocks fromwhere they' re going or people who take the T and wal k from the subway or wal $k$ fromthe bus to wherever they' re going or people who $j u s t$ wal $k$ from their houses. And no I agree that bikes is
an issue and we have to address the parking of them, but it seens to me that requi ring every retail facility to provide parking spots in front of thei $r$ facility, doesn't nake sense. That fromny poi nt of vi ew the pi ctures that make the nost sense to ne are the gang parking areas where the city has taken over, you know, an auto parking spot. Or just devel op parking lots for them And, you know, yes, there needs to be, you know, short-termparking bi ke parking spaces around the city, but the requi rement mandating them so cl ose and, you know, the nunbers of them just doesn't nake sense to ne. I think it's just going to create such vi sual pollution in Harvard Square and Central Square and I nman Square and that, you know there has to be some ot her sol uti on to the probl em

HUGH RUSSELL: Nake peopl e dri ve.
H THEODORE COFEN: Pardon?
HUGH RUSSELL: Nake peopl e dri ve.

H THEODORE COFN VEll, make people drive and park in, you know Traffic and Parking is taki ng away parking spots so that peopl e figure out how they' re going to drive or they' re going to wal $k$ or they' re going to take the T or they' re going to bike. And, you know, I agree people are going to nove around, but, you know, I thi nk there has to be a different sol ution to the parking probl em Certai $n l y$ in new construction big buildings, you know we can put theminto garages, you know But, you know when I read this, and I've gone through it so many ti mes and made so many notes about it, it j ust doesn't nake sense to ne.

STEVEN WNTER: I have a suggestion.
I think it night be okay to bookmark his concern and to really -- and to just say yeah, we got it and to nove on with the di scussi on.

J EFF ROBERTS: And we certai nly,
yes, he certai nl y hear it. And we have been, you know, we' ve really been very cautious and very car ef ul of naking sure that requi renents that we' re proposing here line up with the practice that we' ve seen -- with what we' ve actually seen people able to accompl ish with new devel opment or si gni fi cant changes of use in the city. They Iine up well with what ot her commonities have been using in si milar ways to provi de that and, you know, personally because I' mactually not a cyclist nysel f. I don't use bi ke parki ng. But si nce we' ve been working on this project l've really been spendi ng a l ot of time doing what you' ve been doing, wal king around the city and checking in ny head how nach bi ke parking does this requi re? Does this have enough bi ke parking? Does it really match up? And I found this sort of real ity checking is actually been hel pful with our process i nternally, too, but it's hel ped me cone to a
better understanding that, you know, this really is sonet hing that works, the numbers. I nean, when you add it up, the nunbers make sense. It's not too onerous but it does provi de the bi cycle parking that you can see is needed. And a lot of it's really not necessarily a -- trying to create a preference for bi cyclists, but rather trying to manage the demand that we' re seei ng happen al ready. And where there's basi cally bi cycl es parked --

W LLI AM TI BBS: J eff, I thi nk Zoni ng, though, is a very bl unt instrument to do that. I think it can't repl ace planning. For instance, in Central Square you noul d I ook at it and the city nould say here's how we want to plan for -- if you use those nunbers that you cal cul ated, and say okay, in Central Square we need to have $X$ nunbers of bi kes, and this is how ne' re going to didit. Ve can put some on the si denal ks in these
areas. V\& can put sone in parking spaces. We need to plan for a parking facility. And then if you want to impose a fee for people, you know, it's that conmi nation of saying that you have to have it in front of your place, and then if that doesn't work, it's tryi ng to make Zoni ng do something that -but if you say okay, you know, we want -- you have to pay a fee for parking because you' ve done the conversion, and with that money we will then use it to do the pl an things that we know to make it better. I thi nk that it's -- Zoni ng is just not a great tool for nænagi $n g$ thi $s$ ki nd of thing.

J EFF ROBERTS: Yes, I agree with you. And I agree with that concept entirel y. And crafting the Zoni ng that's really been the purpose behi nd how we' ve structured it is to provi de options. To say -- because ne can't presune -- you know we want to have standards that apply generally, but we can' t
precl ude, you know, presune what ki nd of proj ect we' re goi ng to see cone in front of us.

WLLI AM TI BBS: I think in ny nind I still get the confusi on between a brand new facility with a devel oper which you could do exactly what you sai d, we do that all the time.

PAMELA WNTERS: Ri ght.
WLLI AM TI BBS: And what we' re l ooking at in that other picture up there which is Central Square.

ADAM SHLMAN I just want to put this into context al so if I can. Adam Shul nan, Traffic Departnent.

Ve' re tal king --- it has to be -- even if you recall one of the earlier slides, it has to be a fairly large project, a non-residential project, to even trigger a need for a bi ke rack or two. 4, 000 square feet, you know, these kind of sizes. In ny
anal ysis and my thi nking, I just don't -- I thi nk it's not goi ng to be a lot, a lot, a l ot of new bi ke racks that's goi ng to get tri ggered, you know It's not goi ng to all the exi sting sites.

WLLI AM TI BBS: I'ma data guy. When we Iook at Central Square, then you sort of say here are the places where, you know, if we look at those nodul es whi ch you have I ooked at, the nodul es of conmercial space, and say one is converted froman office or converted to retail or sonebody's doing an expansi on there, here are the opportunities where that can occur. And, agai $n, 1$ just don't want them-- in ny mind the goal s you' re trying to do -- what you're trying to do is okay, but I just have this, yeah, I just have the vi si on of --

J EFF ROBERTS: V\#l I, just to thi nk, I nean just to think through it, though. So what we' re I ooki ng at -- and the reason why I
incl uded these photos, and it's hard to pi ece out all the different issues I guess.

WLLI AM TI BBS: But the real ity is it's that right there which, Hugh, you talk about when you go to Harvard Square and you can't find a space, it's because there are a lot of snaller places that naybe not trigger it but that still doesn't mean you can't find a parking space for going into the stores.

J EFF RCBERTS: Right. And there's different -- and like I said, there's different parts of the overall strategy. Zoning is not going to sol ve all of the bi cycle parking needs around the city. There will be a public conponent that needs to be in place. But just to ki nd of pi ece out the issues a little bit.

So when you Iook at Central Square, if you look at the busi nesses there, you know, that's all fairly well established. If the busi ness turns over froma retail to another
type of retail, that's not a new Zoni ng requi rement. That's just busi nesses turni ng over. That's just turn over of space. However, if someone were to redevel op one of these sites here or sonewhere el se on Central Square to a larger scale buil di ng --

HUGH RUSSELL: Quest Di agnostics.
J EFF RCBERTS: Say the Quest
Diagnostics buil di ng, then you' re tal ki ng about the same space and the same si deval $k$, you're tal king about a different scenario and you have to stop and thi nk, okay, if we're really redevel oping the site, what type of bi ke parki ng do we need? And the purpose of thi s is to create, you know standards that we have I ooked at very car ef ully and have I ooked at in the context of new devel opnent to say, you know, if you're going to do office with ground floor retail, you know, thi s is the anount of bi ke parking you need for offices, this is what you need for
retail. Ve're providing you sone flexi bility in how you can provi de it, but it's something you need to really take seriously. As part of your desi gn and planni ng for your new buil ding, you need to thi nk about how you're going to provi de it in a way that ensures peopl e who bring their bi kes are going to be parking to the racks and not to a fence or parking neters or anything el se al lomed.

W LLI AM TI BBS: I thi nk for ne when we were doing the buil di ng units in the backyard on I ong lots, when we were doing that exercise, we had a si milar conversation about 75 feet and what's, you know what's working. And it wasn't until we did some scenari os where we act ual ly saw sone pi ct ures of possi ble situations and how that noul d work that it -- I thi nk we all said okay, this could work. And I thi nk at sone point, because I made a note, a set of goal s. And I sai d new versus exi sting. New is very cl ear.

It's really the exi sting stuff when it's
triggered and when it's not, some scenarios of, take the new, the new Kor ean grocery store that's going in Central Square where the -- that's ki nd of the same retail use --

ADAM SHULMAN I don't thi nk that houl d tri gger anyt hi ng.

WLLI AM TI BBS: That's what I nean, but --

ADAM SHLMAN: It nould not, right? It's existing retail --

WLLI AM TI BBS: Exactly. And what I' msaying is exactly that. Is that in order to understand those ki nds of provi si ons and the thing worked, just some scenari os as to what works so I can get a better under st anding of the exi sting pi ece and how that goes toget her.

HUGH RUSSELL: I thi nk I just want to make one comment here that we do have to expand our thi nki ng around bi cycl es because
the usage is goi ng up, and what we have -and it's a system It's a system You have to have a pl ace at hone to keep the bi ke that's safe so that you will buy it and not norry about it. You need to have roots on streets. You need to have pl aces where you want to go at the other end of the your trip. And it's, you know, Cara has been working on this for about 20 years and we now have many pi eces in place. And thi s is just one of those pi eces that's needed for the systemto work and it's going to mean that, for example, the thi ngs are not going to be as quite as pretty as they used to be in the retail zones unl ess you happen to thi nk that bi cycl es are pretty, and I thi nk sone people do, you know? And I agree with you that you can't do it all on the si dewal k. And, you know, ny -- the block that l'm-- I have ny office on in Harvard Square, they' re rebuil ding al I the si dewal ks. And t no
parking spaces have been deconminssi oned and there are now probably you can tell ne how many racks there are at the corner of Nbunt Auburn and JFK and JFK and Brattle, but there are now you know that's happened. It's expensi ve to, really expensi ve to nove curbs. You know, sone guy can't go out there and say here's 200 bucks, nove that curb. It's an anazi ng process to actually see people rebuild streets and si dewal ks in Harvard Square, nai ntai ni ng traffic, mai ntai ni ng safety. You know detail officers, pedestrian -- it's a very cunbersone and difficult process. But as a user, you know, it's hard to find bicycle places.

I did want to make one other conment is that probably one of the first tines bi cycle racks were required in the Gity of Canbri dge was when Au Bon Pan got a Zoni ng Variance in Harvard Square 35 years ago and they were missing 10 parking places. And we on the
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Zoni ng Board sai d you' ve got to provi de 10 bi ke racks. And those bi ke racks took the uni versity to cone up with an accept able vi sual desi gn and a legal desi gn and constant prodding, but they' re there. And it's, you know if you get there after ni ne o' clock in the norning, you're not going to get one of them You have to go to the Shul man rack that's ar ound near the end of the si dewal $k$ and there are four of those, but they get filled up, too. You know we're in a place where if you want thi s to happen, and I really do thi nk we want it to happen, we' ve got to expand our vi si on. We have to accept thi ngs that we don't like. But at the same time ne can't force people to do thi ngs that are -- so it's a challenge. And I thi nk these peopl e have -- have thei $r$ expanded minds. And I don't thi nk, you know, the rest of the city is there yet and we're ki nd of in the middle.
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PAMELA WNTERS: Ri ght. V\&l, I'm one that's not quile there yet. There's a picture in front of Brattle Square Theatre.

J EFF RCBERTS: Yes, that's a coral similar to what's here on the screen on the right.

PAMELA WNTERS: Ri ght.
J EFF ROBERTS: But a little bit cl oser up shot.

PAMELA WNTERS: Ri ght, okay.
So how many parking spaces were nissing? How many di d you take out to put those racks in there? About three?

J EFF RCBERTS: I think it was one parking space --

PAMELA WNTERS: Ch, just one?
J EFF ROBERTS: -- and 14 bi ke parking spaces.

PAMELA WNTERS: d , it's only one parking spot?

CARA SEI DERMAN And there is one 14
parking spaces.
BRI AN MRPHY: And I think if I
renenber correctly --
PAMELA W NTERS: Ch, okay.
BRI AN MRPHY: -- that may be ei ther a no parki ng zone or a loadi ng zone at thi s point. Brattle.

PAMELA WNTERS: It was? Okay. To me it looked Iike a whole lot nore, sol'm sorry. My apol ogi es. My bad.

J EFF ROBERTS: So thi s goes al ong with what we were di scussing bef ore.

PAMELA WNTERS: Yes.
J EFF ROBERTS: You know, there are some sol uti ons that, you know, a pri vate property owner coul dn't i mpl enent.

PAMELA W NTERS: Ri ght.
J EFF ROBERTS: So this is still the publ ic i nvol venent is still important. And havi $n g$ an alternative to provide a contribution hel ps to fund thi ngs like
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seasonal bi cycle corrals that, you know, in many cases these are onl y in during warm nonths, they' re taken out during the wi nter where you need to store snow and do all these ot her thi ngs and then they cone back.

## PAMELA WNTERS: Ri ght.

I guess my onl y ot her concern is if a I ot of parking spaces are renoved, then how is that going to i mpact the busi ness commanity? You know, the busi ness commeni ty --

HUGH RUSSELL: Vell, 12 people who coul dn't get there bef ore, now are goi ng to get there compared to the one that coul d have dri ven there.

WLLI AM TI BBS: So are you basi cally saying that you -- basi cally what you're sayi ng, assuming we can all cone to an agreement as to what the threshol ds are in terns of if you' re requi red to provi de parking, that you have -- you can provi de it
on the city -- and you don't have space, you know to do it. You can either provide it on city property, that when the -- that the city accepts the way you're doing it or you have to give a contribution in order to do that. And but it can be that simple, I nean, in terns of this 50 yards from you know, you know it's just, I nean it doesn't need to be that conplicated if that's what you're sayi ng. Because and then, because then I thi nk that doesn't negate the city doing proper pl anni ng as to where are the appropriate places and what are the appropriate devi ces to get that done.

J EFF RCBERTS: Naybe I've done nysel $f$ a di sservice by overconpl i cating the conversation, but what you just described is exactly the approach that we take.

BRI AN MRPHY: And if I could just chime in with that as well. This isn't the onl $y$ thing that we' re doing in terns of bi ke
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parking. I apol ogize for not coning into the di scussion. But the Gity Council actually I ast year put in place a capital investment of $\$ 50,000$ to put bi ke racks throughout the city and to do that for the next several years. So we do have an ongoi ng process where we' ve got Jeff Rosenbl umgoing out and sort of identifying pl aces where we can do racks and pl anni ng. And so, for exanpl e, when you look at sone of the racks that cone in at the high school or the library, that work is ongoi ng. But in sone ways we look at how nany bi ke racks you can guy for $\$ 50,000$ and how many you can do for five years, based on what we see for the demand, that still is not goi ng to sol ve this problem So it is trying to sol ve Hugh's probl ens. HUGH RUSSELL: So I've got this fantastic parking space right across fromny office. It's a big sign that says there's construction on the bridge. Larz Anderson

Bridge and it's orange, and nobody el se has di scovered you can lock a bi cycle to it. And sone day it's going to go away but hopefully ny bi cycle won't be attached.

THOMAS ANN NGER: Jeff, it's ni ne ninutes to el even.

J EFF RCBERTS: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: And we' re endi ng by 10: 30.

THOMAS ANN NGER: And we' re havi ng trouble -- we' re bunping al ong. I've got stuff that I want to rai se, but it's too late to do that in a coherent way that's hel pful. How do we manage the next ni ne minutes and get this into an orderly process?

J EFF RCBERTS: V\&ll, as I said at the begi nning ny intent for this was to try to -- was to ask the Board to cone to a place where it could petition the Council. It houl dn't nean reconmendi ng it to the Council. It would j ust nean submitting to the Council
a Zoni ng Petition that incl udes thi s Zoni ng I anguage as we' ve provi ded it, whi ch woul d then lead to the public hearing process just like we have for Forest Gty, where there nould be opportunities for the public to respond and for the Pl anning Board to del $i$ berate on how they felt they would reconmend to the Council. And as is often the case, the Planni ng Board may incl ude in its reconmendations suggested changes and the like.

THOMAS ANN NGER: Are we -- you thi nk we can get there in ni ne minutes or seven minutes? Because I'mhoping that el even o' cl ock is when we all go hone.

HUGH RUSSELL: Ri ght. I thi nk that if we used the due diligence argunent, agai $n$, that we want, sone of us have gi ven a lot of thought to this and then not have had a chance to express. We just need to put it on the agenda agai n and keep worki ng. Keep
working at it.
THOMAS ANN NGER: I think that's a good i dea.

J EFF RCBERTS: Can I ask for sone specific -- so there were two -- so there were two things that cane up, and I want to know to what extent we have addressed them and to what extent we can -- that I can help you to continue to devel op better under st andi ng.

So in terns of the residential pi eces, there was still a strong desire expressed to not inpose requi renents on two and three-unit buil di ngs --

PAMELA WNTERS: Correct.
J EFF RCBERTS: -- whet her new or exi sting?

THOMAS ANN NGER: One, tho, and three.

PAMELA WNTERS: One, two, and three.

J EFF ROBERTS: Ri ght. We' ve al ready taken out three.

WLLI AM TI BBS: And I tend to agree with Ted.

J EFF RCBERTS: And that's what the Board would petition -- okay. So we can put nore work into that.

And then the second was -- and I think it seened Iike in the conmercial di stricts, and I think Bill naybe narrowed it down to really the question of existing versus new So sone nore thought into, and naybe sone nore clarity into what effects pertain to exi sting buil di ngs versus new buil di ngs. And then actually it's an issue that can becone a little conplicated when you start thi nki ng about it. There can be sone in between, you know what if you' re naking nodi fications to an exi sting building? So we can thi nk about that as well.

WLLI AM TI BBS: Sonething I ike that
we can flush out, though, as part of the process of getting a better understandi ng of it if it's a petition.

J EFF RCBERTS: Ri ght.
THOMAS ANN NGER: J eff, while we' re coning up with a list of qui ckly to-do thi ngs, you and I tal ked yesterday on the phone about a drafting issue that I think needs to be thought about. To ne the idea the di stinction bet ween parking and bi cycle parking is very conf using and will lead to constant problens for peopl e reading this. I thi nk the onl $y$ sol ution to that is to tal $k$ about bi cycle parking, and call it if you want MV parking, for not or vehicle parking in Section 6100 as opposed to all the rest of the Ordi nance where you can have the word parking and you can state sonewhere that parking everywhere el se I assune just neans aut onobi le parking. But the idea of havi ng bi cycle parking and then parking without
anything to it and peopl e are supposed to read in their head, that doesn't nean bi cycle. I think that's a problemthat has to be addressed.

J EFF RCBERTS: Ckay.
STEVEN WNTER: J eff, I thi nk there was al so sone concern about the unequi vocal nat ure of the city sayi ng, no, we reject that proposal out of hand, but perhaps sone ki nd of criteria might be needed for a proponent to consi der while that proponent is negotiating with the city.

HUG RUSSELL: I nean, that's just in a way the concept that is clear. I think it's the way it's stated.

WLLI AM TI BBS: Yes, I agree.
HUGH RUSSELL: You can nake a deal and if you can't make a deal, you have to pay the cost for the few peopl e who get triggered by this.

H THEODORE COFEN I have a coupl e
of ot her just qui ck I anguage. Your paragraph 6. 104. 3 about separation, I don't quite understand -- whi ch requi res a physi cal barrier bet neen notor vehi cle parking or I oading facilities, if we' re having parking in the furniture di strict, where if you're parking anywhere where it's going to be by the street and by cars, I don't, you know, now naybe your intent was not to requi re a physi cal barrier there, but if you do, I don't understand how that's going to nork.

CARA SEI DERMAN: It's I i ke a garage.
J EFF ROBERTS: Garages are really the concern. But we can clarify that.

HUGH RUSSELL: You night al so say that a curb might be a barrier, for example, whi ch might --

THOMAS ANN NGER: Al so on the list if I næy --

H THEODORE COFEN: Now, a couple ot her points. I was inpressed with MT's

## I etter --

THOMAS ANN NGER: I was just goi ng to tal k about that.

H THEODORE COEN: -- about thei $r$ ability to have different types of racks. A so, when I look at the, you know the three feet horizontal di stance, it doesn't seemto ne that nost of the bi ke racks in the city are three feet apart as it is now I al so noul d recommend that al ot of these things, you know, about the types of bi ke racks and the di stance, rather than bei ng enshri ned in the Zoni ng Ordi nance maybe shoul d be just adopted as regul ations whi ch can easily be anended as technol ogy changes rather than requi ring sonebody to get a Variance or requi ring to go through the whol e Zoni ng Anendnent process.

HUGH RUSSELL: But there are a lot of bad bi ke racks out there. And I thi nk the intent here was to say you need enough room
and this is the room you need, this is what you should pl an on. It's hard for me as an architect to plan bi cycle facilities because the owner says I can't gi ve up space for it. And if the rule is there, then it's going to happen.

H THECDORE COEEN Right. If it's in a regul ation presunabl y.

ADAM SHLMAN These cone froma national standards, and these have been successf ul si nce 2008. And the architects and the devel opers that I nork with constantly, constantly prai se us and thank us for the specific physicality in saying this i s really hel pf ul as we' re desi gni ng our bi ke roons, as we' re desi gni ng our project, he know exactly, you know, what the spacing should be. And they're the first ones to say, yes, he desi gned buil di ngs and we see al I over the pl ace when bi ke racks are too cl ose toget her, they' re not functional, you
know it just doesn't nork.
H THEODORE COFEN I understand that. And I'mcertai nly not the person to say what the right standard is. I'mjust suggesting that if it's in a regul ation that's easily changed as technol ogy and the publ ic opi ni on were --

HUGH RUSSELL: Ri ght, regul ati ons are not that easily found if you're a desi gner.

THOMAS ANN NGER: Does Cantori dge really have regul ations? Ve don't have that -- that's the anal ogy to federal law for exampl e, but I don't thi nk we have regul ations.

HUGH RUSSELL: I think Public Vbrks has regul ation standards.

STEVEN WNTER: J eff, I have two other points I wanted to make bef ore we hit el even.

That is I think we just need the mark
the fact that we're seeing many different sizes and kinds of bi kes, and we need to begin to acconmodate for that. You know but people have thei $r$ groceries, they have thei $r$ children, sone bi kes are too heavy to go upstairs. There's really a lot of different thi ngs invol ved. And al so I think it's really inportant that we renenber what Hugh sai d, whi ch is that I don't know how we nork this into the preantole or there's something here, but we need to be able to say, we have to push and pull oursel ves a little bit. We have to stretch. We have to -- we' re encour agi ng the use of bi cycles, and we -- so we have to be flexi ble and ni ntble and try thi ngs we haven't tried before, and næybe have sone confiort level and go back and fix it if it's not working right for us.

HUGH RUSSELL: So I guess I noul d encourage anybody who's got nore detailed conments to actually gi ve themto J eff
offline.
J EFF RCBERTS: I noul d be happy to get your nore detailed comments via Brian or to ne by e-mail.

HUGH RUSSELL: I guess it's
frustrating for you guys that $A$, you al ways get put at the end of the agenda. And $B$, that this has been dragging and there's pressure. There's a desire fromthe Council to act and it's a clear need.

BRI AN MRPHY: Nay I suggest that we I ook at the J anuary 22nd Pl anni ng Board neeting? I think given the anount of work that was done in Forest G ty toni ght, I don't thi nk that should take up too mach time.

Medi cal narijuana di scussi on, I agai n I thi nk it's going to be less about substance and nore about -- I usually make jokes like that, that time I didn't. That a di scussion will be nore about how do ne cone up with the process going forward rather than getting
into the details of the Zoning. So I think there nay be roomon the 22nd to try to have a little bit earlier hour and a nore engaged di scussi on, and I thi nk that still should be enough time for Jeff and Cara to respond.

STEVEN WNIER: Can we put the di scussi on earlier than we have here? BRI AN MRPHY: W也 have heari ngs the 22nd. I don't think we do.

LI ZA PADEN Medi cal narijuana. THOMAS ANN NGER: The MT letter was
-- I just want to make sure that we spend time addressing what they' ve tal ked about.

J EFF RCBERTS: Ri ght. We have seen that. I nean, it's gotten late now so I won't respond to it now--

THOMAS ANN NGER: But I thi nk we want to respond that.

J EFF ROBERTS: Ve' re certainly prepared to respond to what was in there.

CARA SEI DERMAN Ve di d respond to
them
J EFF ROBERTS: And we di d make sone -- they sent us an initial round of nodi ficati ons and conments. And he di d nake sone changes based on their initial comments, but the i ssues that they poi nted out I thi nk are still ones that we do have a response.

THOMAS ANN NGER: Okay.
HUGH RUSSELL: Councillor, di d you want to say sonet hi ng?

M NKA vanBEUZEKOM Yes. M nka vanBeuzekon, $\mathrm{Mi}-\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{k}-\mathrm{av}$ v-a-n-B-e-u-z-e-k-o-n. I just wanted to find out if you were i ncl udi ng the new Lechmere T Station and whet her there noul $d$ be a requi rement for a bi cycle parking there or is that going to fall under some --

HUGH RUSSELL: I thi nk we can' t nake the T do anything.

CARA SEI DERMAN: They are i ncl udi ng it in thei r proposal. And in fact, l can
share it with you if you want to see what they' re prosing. Sonebody el se in ny office does have it. They do have bi cycle parking in there.

M NKA vanBELZEKKM And it's ni ce what they did in Central Square even though it's small.

CARA SEI DERMAN Yes, yes. Covered bi cycle parking.

M NKA vanBEUZEKOM Okay.
THOMAS ANN NGER: Thank you, J eff.
HUG RUSSELL: Thank you, J eff.
STEVEN WNTER: Thank you.
HUG RUSSELL: Last itemon the agenda is voting for officers and I think we should do that.

STEVEN WNTER: How do we open that up?

HUGH RUSSELL: I guess the floor hould be open for nomn nations for Chai $r$.

STEVEN WNTER: Mr. Chai $r$ ?
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| 1 | HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | STEVEN WNTER: I nould I i ke to |
| 3 | nominate Hugh Russel I be the Chai $r$ of the |
| 4 | Cantori dge Pl anni ng Board. |
| 5 | HUGH RUSSELL: Is there a second? |
| 6 | H THECDORE COHEN: Second. |
| 7 | HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, is there ot her |
| 8 | nomin nati ons? |
| 9 | ( No Response.) |
| 10 | HUGH RUSSELL: Hearing none, then I |
| 11 | nould say we vote on the proposal that I be |
| 12 | Chair for another year. |
| 13 | Al those in favor? |
| 14 | ( Rai si ng hands). |
| 15 | HUGH RUSSELL: Because I' mwill ing |
| 16 | to do it. Okay. |
| 17 | PAMELA W NTERS: Thank you, Hugh. |
| 18 | Thank you. |
| 19 | W LLI AM TI BBS: I do want to say |
| 20 | that as a person who was on the Board when we |
| 21 | had a Chair for a zillion years, and a while |

back ago thi ngs changed and so we were nore than likel y to change. We don't want to a Chai $r$ to go forever. And, Hugh, I have no probl emw th Hugh doing it. But I think that our new nenbers have to step up to the table at sone point.

STEVEN WNTER: Poi nt taken.
WLLI AM TI BBS: And maybe the Vice Chai rshi p is the way to do that. I think actually in the past that ki nd of happened. Ve had a Vice Chai $r$ and the Vice Chai $r$ ki nd of noved into the Chai $r$ because the Vice Chai $r$ got a feel for it as they were.

STEVEN WNIER: M. Chai $r$ ?
HUG RUSSELL: Steve.
STEVEN WNIER: I mould like to nomn nate Ted -- it's so Iate I can't renenøer your I ast nane. I would like to nominate Ted Cohen for Vice Chai r of the Cantori idge Pl anni ng Board.

HUGH RUSSELL: Is there a second?
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| 1 | of get oursel ves together and what -- as to |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | the issues are and what to be looked at and |
| 3 | that's been very hel pf ul to $m 巴$ as Chai $r$. |
| 4 | PAMELA WNIERS: Thanks. |
| 5 | HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. |
| 6 | Are we adj ourned? |
| 7 | We are adj ourned. |
| 8 | ( Whereupon, at 11:08 p.m, the |
| 9 | Pl anni ng Board Adj our ned. ) |
| 10 |  |
| 11 |  |
| 12 |  |
| 13 |  |
| 14 |  |
| 15 |  |
| 16 |  |
| 17 |  |
| 18 |  |
| 19 |  |
| 20 |  |
| 21 |  |
|  |  |
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