


## PROCEEDINGS

HUGH RUSSELL: Good evening. This is the meeting of the Cambridge Planning Board, and the first item on our agenda is a review of the Board of Zoning Appeal cases. And we have to wait a second until Liza gets the paperwork on there because I put her on another task.

LIZA PADEN: Yes. So, tonight there is a Planning Board Special Permit -- I'm sure the Board of Zoning Appeals Special Permit for 330 Mount Auburn Hospital for a telecommunications and Mr. Sousa is here to run through the proposal with you.

ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Thank you, Liza.

Good evening, Members of the Board. Once again for the record, Ricardo Sousa on behalf of the applicant T-Mobile. If I could I would like to hand out some photo simulations to Members of the Board.

## HUGH RUSSELL: Sure.

There's a lever on the side of the podium that will allow you to raise it up for you.

ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, this is one of two remaining sites for T-Mobile to upgrade here in Cambridge as part of its modernization program which entails swapping out the existing antennas for new antennas on a 4G level so we can offer high speed telephone service and data transmission as well. And in some cases we're able to just utilize and just swap out existing antennas and replace them with the new antennas. In this case because of the high traffic count and high pop count, high population count, we need to add three additional antennas to this existing installation. And so this is an installation at Mount Auburn Hospital on the lower, one of the lower level buildings right
at the corner for the turn at Fresh Pond Parkway. This installation was approved by this Board and the BZA back in 2006. And it consists of just three existing panel antennas that are on pipe mounts along the edge of the building and essentially along the parapet wall, on the outside of the parapet wall. Our firm was involved in that original application. However, it was not myself, but we tried to utilize the elements of some light stanchions that are up there now and that were up there before that shine on that part of the property. And so what we'd like to do is just swap out the existing three antennas with our new panel antennas. They will not have any remote radio heads behind them because as you may recal1, those remote radio units are built in the antennas so there won't be any bulkiness behind the new antennas. And we're adding an additional three, essentially adjacent to the existing
three so it would be a total of six panel antennas as depicted in the photo simulations that I provided.

And I know there's some sensitivity to this particular site. Mr. Anninger in particular has mentioned that in previous applications that I've been involved in in connection with the taller buildings that are part of the hospital. In between the time that we installed this particular installation at this lower level building, there has been a new building, a new section of the hospital constructed, which is the collapsed section right behind it. And so that limits us to a certain extent to what we can do. However, our lease rights are with the hospital and they are at the locations that are, that we are currently utilizing that we'd like to utilize as part of this modification application. And so I'm open to some thoughts that you may have relative to
how to perhaps better disguise it. You know, we could paint the antennas a different color and try to have them blend into the building better, maybe a darker color, so that it matches the brick parapet wall. I think the white, I think blends in to a certain extent with the windows. However, I think a darker color would make them less noticeable. I'm sorry, Mr. Anninger, you may have a question. THOMAS ANNINGER: You're right. I think that they do. It looks like somebody was thinking about the windows and the columns when they painted it white and the cornus line rather than trying to have it blend in.

ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Right, exactly. And I also think the white pipes that hold those lights, existing lights was another thought. Those are white pipes so let's keep the antennas white. But I'm open to a darker color. I think -- I always find
that a darker color blends in better, especially with the HVAC units that are up there in that building. I think those are new. They're fairly sizable. I also believe, I looked at the old plans and it looks like there is a new penthouse there as well, a new brown penthouse. And so if we paint these antennas a darker color, I think there's a better chance that they could be less noticeable.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Do they really need to stick --

AHMED NUR: I'm sorry, go ahead. THOMAS ANNINGER: My fault.

Do they need to stick out above the height of the -- we'11 call it the parapet?

ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Right. Unfortunately because of their size, I think they will stick out no matter what. There's a, it looks like a ledge right below the antennas that protrudes out and that limits
our ability to push the antennas down because of that ledge, that white ledge that's on the photo sims. Exactly, right. And so as a result, if we're forced to essentially position the antennas where they are and therefore have them stick up above the parapet wall.

HUGH RUSSELL: So I have a couple of observations. If you look at existing conditions Photo 1, which is I think the third page in, you will note that there are two tall ugly metal pipes on the other corner of the building that are painted a dark color.

ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: I think that's a reasonable test for the notion that the dark color would be less obvious.

ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Right.
HUGH RUSSELL: My second comment is a question. Now that there's a brown
penthouse up there, could you mount them on the brown penthouse?

ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: And I have a question in to one of the engineers as to whether or not we can do that. We're going to have to deal with the fact that there is a parapet wall. And so the further we go back into the building, typically the higher we have to be as far as an antenna goes, so that we don't have roof blockage. Being facade-mounted we have no blockage whatsoever. But as soon as we go on into the roof, we have to go into the roof and we have to go higher. It's typically a one-for-one analysis. I'm willing to go back to the RF engineers to see if that's a possibility to clean up the facade at all.

HUGH RUSSELL: And the people you're serving are apt to be automobiles on the river roads?

ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: That's a
big part of the traffic coming into the site without a doubt.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: That being said, the nature of these networks these days is that everybody is transmitting, you know, on a Smartphone when they walk around as wel1. And, you know, BB\&N is right across the way. There's a huge population there. Not only students but, you know, teachers and parents, so there's -- and there are homes right across the street as well.

HUGH RUSSELL: I'm thinking that nearby users are apt to be on the ground and therefore shielding will be more of concern. ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Right.

So I would have to see what potential, what that would look like as far as utilizing that penthouse and, you know, the goal would clearly be if we can utilize it, to not protrude above the penthouse because I think


| 1 | ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: It most |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | likely is a stairway pass, right. |
| 3 | THOMAS ANNINGER: The one to the |
| 4 | right? |
| 5 | HUGH RUSSELL: We11, as it was |
| 6 | pictured. |
| 7 | AHMED NUR: Picture No. 2. |
| 8 | ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Picture No. |
| 9 | 2. |
| 10 | HUGH RUSSELL: The black thing is a |
| 11 | air handler of some sort. |
| 12 | THOMAS ANNINGER: You were talking |
| 13 | about this or this one or both? |
| 14 | HUGH RUSSELL: I'm talking about |
| 15 | using both of them one. |
| 16 | THOMAS ANNINGER: Okay. |
| 17 | ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: This is the |
| 18 | penthouse and this is the air handler. |
| 19 | HUGH RUSSELL: So I don't think he |
| 20 | would mount to the air handler, but you could |
| 21 | put something roof mounted that would be in |

front of it, that would visually blend withi t sort of.

ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Yes. I've even seen ballast-mounted antennas that almost look like structural elements of the air handler --

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, exactly.
ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: -- that are just painted the same color so that the backdrop is the same color as the (inaudible).

THOMAS ANNINGER: I just, if I may make the argument that you were referring to that I made a few years ago, although I think the argument is even stronger now. I do think that with the new building the view of the whole hospital in total is a big improvement, and I think it's come together and it's a cluster of very different buildings facing at somewhat different angles and so on, but I do think it has come
together in a way that is visually helpful to a rather sprawling rotary or huge intersection, and this one happens to be the historical building on the bunch.

ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Right.
THOMAS ANNINGER: And so it is worth making an effort to do the best we can here. It is not a side street in East Cambridge where we wouldn't have to worry so much.

ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Right.
As I mentioned to Liza, I thought this would be a first step in a discussion to try to get to a point where we could try to get your approval. You know, I agree that the hospital looks great on the other side, Mount Auburn Street together with this angle as we11. So I'm happy to go back and see what improvements we can make to alter this installation.

THOMAS ANNINGER: I think with the suggestions and I think it's a worthy effort.

ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Okay. I think those are good suggestions.

Yes, of course, Mr. Cohen.
H. THEODORE COHEN: I have a question. If they were to stay where they are and you painted them, can you also paint the poles and the light fixtures or that's outside of your control?

ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: We'd have to ask the hospital for permission to do so. I can't imagine that they would, you know, especially if it's at our cost, that they would oppose that.

HUGH RUSSELL: And at our request.
ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: And the Planning Board's request, exactly.
H. THEODORE COHEN: And if your antennas come off of where they are now, those poles and lights are still going to remain because that's the hospital's?

ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: That's the
hospital's. Those will still remain, that's right. And I don't fully understand their purpose I have to say. But I can include that as part of the dialogue.
H. THEODORE COHEN: A11 right, thank you.

ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Sure.
HUGH RUSSELL: Ahmed.
AHMED NUR: Yes, I further agree with my colleagues that the way it seems right now is really not presentable to us. And that maybe one other suggestion I would make it is if you could find a shorter antenna -- I know you said no -- a shorter antenna that would fit the parapet itself and would paint the same color as the brick so that way it doesn't project above the roof line or put it on this stair tower. The stair tower seems to have a door. And I'm pretty sure that door is no less than seven feet height. So that gives you at least a
six feet higher than where it is right now.
ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Some
additional height above it?
AHMED NUR: Right. But the ratio that you propose I think it will work out.

ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA:
Unfortunately we don't have a smaller antenna available to T-Mobile for this technology, for this upgrade. However, I will look at the stairway antennas, absolutely. I will report back.

AHMED NUR: Or the RTU, whichever one, you know.

HUGH RUSSELL: Let me ask my colleagues another question. There is the antenna in a tube solution where you set it back just a couple of feet and pretend it's a metal chimney. Is that something that should also be considered if these other strategies don't work?

AHMED NUR: A metal chimney as a
pipe?
HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. What you would see is a cylinder I guess 18 inches in diameter.

ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Exactly.
HUGH RUSSELL: It would stick up, you know, the full antenna height above the parapet so that it's not shielding, but it might be set back a couple of feet and it wouldn't be attached to the historic building. It would be --

AHMED NUR: Personally I would prefer that over anything attached to the architectural exterior facade.

ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Yes, we've utilized that design in the past. It looks like a stove pipe essentially?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Especially on a building like this. And it can either be a black stove pipe or it could be a silver

| 1 | stove pipe. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | HUGH RUSSELL: Right. |
| 3 | ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Yes. |
| 4 | And it may be a combination, |
| 5 | Mr. Chairman. Maybe a combination of some |
| 6 | antennas being facade-mounted now together |
| 7 | with others that -- where we can't facade |
| 8 | mount to a stairway penthouse, those perhaps |
| 9 | being stove pipes in front of the air |
| 10 | handlers. |
| 11 | HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, okay. Thank you |
| 12 | for consulting us. |
| 13 | ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Yes, I |
| 14 | appreciate your feedback, and we'11 be back. |
| 15 | Have a great night. Thank you. |
| 16 | HUGH RUSSELL: Do you want to |
| 17 | collect these? |
| 18 | ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Yes, I will |
| 19 | collect those. Thank you. |
| 20 | HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you. |
| 21 | The next item on our agenda is an |

update from Brian Murphy.
LIZA PADEN: Excuse me, there are other BZA cases. I didn't know if you wanted to look at the agenda for February 28th.

HUGH RUSSELL: Oh, I'm sorry.
LIZA PADEN: The first case on the agenda, 675 Mass. Avenue. This is the relocated New Asia to Prospect Street, and the Zoning recently changed to have them allow to have the entrance on Prospect Street. They are now going to the Board of Zoning Appeal to get a relief for the parking requirement for the use.

HUGH RUSSELL: I think that the
Board of Zoning Appeal can apply their usual standards to this case.

LIZA PADEN: We11, that's what I thought.

STEVEN WINTER: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair, I didn't hear.

> HUGH RUSSELL: I think that in this

comment that I had is it seems like a huge amount of equipment, much more than we see with other installations. Is there anything different about this?
LIZA PADEN: This is a new installation so they're having to put everything in.
STEVEN WINTER: Okay.
LIZA PADEN: They have no existing equipment on the roof as it is now.
STEVEN WINTER: Okay.
LIZA PADEN: From the drawing that I have, Hugh, the proposed equipment is in the back of the building, in the -- it's the furthest set back from Brookline Street.
(William Tibbs Seated.)
AHMED NUR: Do you have the drawings?
LIZA PADEN: There's that drawing.
HUGH RUSSELL: And the chimney's are, there are two chimneys side by side.

## LIZA PADEN: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And they have no photo sims showing what it's going to look 1ike?
LIZA PADEN: You don't see it from the -- when they did the views, I thought that what ended up -- no, these are all --
H. THEODORE COHEN: They're all actual views.
LIZA PADEN: Here's proposed. Here's the proposal from the one location. You'11 be able to see it from the street.
H. THEODORE COHEN: This one says it's not visible from this location.
LIZA PADEN: Right. So that's -what happens is because it's in the center of the roof in the back here, you don't see it from Brookline street and you don't see it from Putnam Avenue.
AHMED NUR: What about the property owner adjacent on the northeast corner?

from the street and it's only visible to the abutter on the northeast corner and they're okay with it and they're aware that this is happening probably.

HUGH RUSSELL: I would agree with you.

THOMAS ANNINGER: I'm not entirely convinced that these are accurate. I don't feel like we've got the whole picture here. Somehow this seems to understate something.

HUGH RUSSELL: I also agree with you, that in the close-up it's quite clear you can't see it, but some of those views are from much further away. So we might suggest that the Board of Zoning Appeal ask for more information about -- that substantiates the assertion that it can't be seen.

STEVEN WINTER: We could indicate that it wasn't enough for us.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
LIZA PADEN: Okay.

| 1 | THOMAS ANNINGER: The simulations |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | are on the weak side. |
| 3 | LIZA PADEN: Okay. |
| 4 | THOMAS ANNINGER: Inadequate. |
| 5 | HUGH RUSSELL: Liza, here's another |
| 6 | piece. |
| 7 | LIZA PADEN: Oh, thank you. |
| 8 | Were there any other cases that you |
| 9 | wanted to look at? I thought they were |
| 10 | mostly additions and dormers. |
| 11 | HUGH RUSSELL: Dormers, new |
| 12 | additions, doorway, landing, two dormers. |
| 13 | LIZA PADEN: Yes. |
| 14 | HUGH RUSSELL: I sort of look back |
| 15 | with some nostalgia with my ten year service |
| 16 | on the Zoning Board. It sounds like, you |
| 17 | know, stuff that's trivial, but it's |
| 18 | important to the people who are nearby. |
| 19 | Okay, thank you Liza. |
| 20 | LIZA PADEN: Okay. |
| 21 | HUGH RUSSELL: Now, I'11 go back and |

ask Brian again.
BRIAN MURPHY: Sure, thank you.
We have tonight's meeting and then there are three meetings in March: March 5th, 12th, and 19th.

The 5th will be a hearing for 33
Cottage Park Avenue. Which is also known as Tyler Court.

The 12th there will be a hearing for 19-21 Wende11 Street.

And then just again to give you a sense of other meetings that are going that may be of interest; we will be taking up the MIT petition Tuesday the 26th, February at $4: 30$, and again on March 7th at 4:30. In addition in the wake of the Town Gown reports, on March 5th University Relations Committee will have a meeting and tour of Lesley College at 12:30.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Are there any --

WILLIAM TIBBS: Just for the record, I won't be able to make the 12th meeting and if a quorum is of concern, I just thought I'd mention that.

HUGH RUSSELL: It is always of a concern, but sooner or later we're going to have some more colleagues and that will help that.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Hopefully more sooner than later.

HUGH RUSSELL: Indeed.
Okay, Liza, is there a transcript?
LIZA PADEN: Yes. There was one transcript for the January 12th meeting and it was accurate and certified.

HUGH RUSSELL: Is there a motion to accept that?
H. THEODORE COHEN: So moved.

HUGH RUSSELL: Second.
THOMAS ANNINGER: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: Tom.

| 1 | A11 members in favor. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | LIZA PADEN: Actually, I misspoke. |
| 3 | It's not the 12th. The date of the |
| 4 | transcript is the 15th. And it's still |
| 5 | accurate except for what I said. It was |
| 6 | actually dated the 15th, I remember that. |
| 7 | HUGH RUSSELL: So we reconsider our |
| 8 | motion? |
| 9 | LIZA PADEN: Thank you. |
| 10 | (A11 members voting.) |
| 11 | HUGH RUSSELL: Next item on our |
| 12 | agenda is Planning Board case 273, 54R Cedar |
| 13 | Street which is a public hearing that's been |
| 14 | continued. |
| 15 | Mr. Hope, do you want to speak to us? |
| 16 | MOUHAB RIZKALLAH: Good evening. |
| 17 | I'm Doctor Rizkallah. I am the owner of the |
| 18 | lot known as 54R Cedar Street. I'm pleased |
| 19 | to inform you that as of the hearing, we've |
| 20 | been able to garnish additional support from |
| 21 | certain neighbors that are particularly |

relevant to the relief that we requested for this project.

To give you a little bit of history here, when we developed the plans for this project, I specifically was asking for plans that would not put me in a position to ask for any relief. When we took our plans down to get the permits at Inspectional Services, there was an interpretation question. Their interpretation was that neither of two houses on that lot could be further than 75 feet from the front of the lot. Our initial interpretation was that the second house on the lot couldn't be placed more than 75 feet from the front of the 1ot. I'm still not sure what's right, but here we are trying to get through this process.

When I had heard that from Inspectional Services, my initial response was well, okay, we will redesign the house in the rear because I really did not want to ask for
relief. It was only a matter of a few feet. Redesigning it didn't seem that complicated. But really the position of Inspectional Services was come on, Moe, just go down there and it's not significant. This is not more detrimental in any way. I'm sure you can produce a plan for them that makes sense for them. Okay.

I then decided, okay, I'm reasonably convinced by their position, let me go ahead and hire an attorney, put the money into this, show the different design options, and bring it to you.

At the last hearing we continued it because there was a question of whether or not redesigning the house made sense or if we should be doing other things with the plan. The problem as I see it, is that the cost to redesign a house is about $\$ 25,000$ and that's basically the extent of the relief that I'm asking for. So basically a $\$ 25,000$ relief.

The corner of the house that's relevant here is actually in the center of the lot. It's the furthest part of the house from anyone, any abutter. And in fact, I don't feel in my heart of hearts, and I don't believe anybody looking at it is going to look at that corner of the house and say that it is of any detriment of any 75 -foot rule. And I don't even think the 75 -foot rule is interpreted properly but probably it is.

When I come asking for relief, the conclusion that I have going into it, you're going to provide me with an option, hopefully, that is a lesser burden than what I'm asking for. If I'm asking for relief of $\$ 25,000$ and you give me relief that cost me \$50,000, what relief have I got? None. And some of the modifications that I've heard just simply don't make any sense for me, because, you know, the losses that I would take on those modifications are just too
burdensome.
So what I would like to do is offset my request by providing niceties that are important to these neighbors.

Now, when I refer specifically to the relief I'm asking for and the relevant neighbors, presumably the original Ordinance was developed to make sure that you didn't put a house too far back that really crept up too close to the rear members. Those are the neighbors that I am the most concerned about because those are the ones that the Ordinance is really built around. So we're not asking for any other relief, which means that basically the Zoning has concluded that our proposal, with the exception of the corner of that house, should be acceptable. So focusing the entire conversation really on that corner, which is in the center of the lot, the furthest part of that little 800 square foot, two-story house, from all of the
abutters, I would like to not redesign a corner of that house, please. I would rather take that amount of money and provide certain conditions in this, what I hope turns out to be an approval for these neighbors.

You have, in the last 24 hours, received a couple of letters from the two, the two abutters that are in the rear of that lot; Mike Fowler and Ernst Kare1. Mike Fowler representing his wife and his children, and Ernst Karel representing himself and his wife. And so they do represent the -- if I could read an excerpt from Ernst's letter: We feel the plan as put forth, including the impact, is a good one. Therefore, we ask the Planning Board to please approve this request.

These specific conditions that I have committed myself to them on is No. 1, I will place an eight-foot cedar fence in place of the existing chain link fence abutting their
properties.
I will limit the parking spaces to five parking spaces.

I will place paving stones in the parking area rather than asphalt.

I will plant additional landscape plants near the fence.

I will maintain the existing mature evergreen tree that Ernst wants to keep.

I will keep low intensity, low landscaping lines that don't extend beyond the property line.

And I will maintain the original flat roof of that new house, which I think has a wonderful dignity associated with it.

Additionally, all of these components that are going to be added at the borderline, I assure you, I will work very closely with them to make sure that they are not just put there but that they are really participating in the selection.

Now these may not seem like important things, but you know when you live there, to look at that fence matters. It's important to people who have to look at it all day, everyday. So instead of just putting an eight-foot cedar fence that's maybe eight-foot high and eight-foot panels, and maybe they would like lattice work. But these are niceties that I can afford to them by offsetting the redesign of that house. So that's really my appeal to you, is that I feel that this plan does make sense.

I think Ernst's description it is a good plan. I think it summarizes pretty well knowing also that the only relief that we have sought is a few feet off of the corner of a house, and that corner is in the middle of the lot.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you. MOUHAB RIZKALLAH: Do I just sit

| 1 | down? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. |
| 3 | AHMED NUR: Is this a public |
| 4 | hearing? |
| 5 | HUGH RUSSELL: I think it would be |
| 6 | prudent to hear from the public, yes. Do we |
| 7 | want to do that next? |
| 8 | I don't know if there's a sign-up sheet |
| 9 | or not. In any case, there is. I was asking |
| 10 | for the sign-up sheet while you were walking |
| 11 | to get it out of earshot. |
| 12 | I would ask people to be at their most |
| 13 | succinct, but tell us what you think. And, |
| 14 | Mr. Bingham, you're first on the list. |
| 15 | WAYNE BINGHAM: Yes, thank you, |
| 16 | Doctor -- |
| 17 | HUGH RUSSELL: And you'11 need to |
| 18 | give your name officially. |
| 19 | WAYNE BINGHAM: I'm Wayne Bingham. |
| 20 | I live at 54 Cedar Street. The last meeting |
| 21 | we had the panel asked for a view of what the |

house is going to look like. The panel also asked to reduce the building below the three stories. Doctor Rizkallah said he still wants to have it as three stories. There's still safety issues. There's still parking issues. Like, right now there's, there's a bucket truck. There used to be a dump truck. People live in the back. There's three people live there. There's three spots on weekends. There's -- two of the girlfriends are coming. That doesn't bother me, so that's, you know, that's six people. There's another person who parks there who lives on Norris Street. There's people who work at the school. There's four vehicles on any given day that are there. So any day there's 10 or 11 vehicles there. And I sent out pictures the last meeting, I didn't bring them with me. I spoke to Liza, and I was hoping you had them with you and you could see how narrow it is. If you went by there
this last snowstorm, there was probably like 75 -- it was this wide. Okay?

In fact, not an issue, but right down the street there's a fire in the corner of Rindge Ave. and Cedar Street. My son was on the roof, scared the blank out of me, but they got through that.

So, none of which you all asked has been addressed tonight; the size of the building, the design of the building, a view of the building, okay.

The neighborhood, yeah, there are people in the back of $541 / 2$ or what some people refer to as 54R, they're agreeable. That's fine. They're not here, okay? That's fine. They can't voice it. They did in writing. I'm just voicing the fact that it's just a narrow, narrow, narrow spot that none of which you asked for has been addressed. And I would hope that that would be addressed tonight, but it did not happen. I don't know
if you agree, if you all remember, but, you know, that's where I am right now.

Once again, I've been up here several times, but you know the safety issues. It's just -- the configuration of the lot just does not allow for a small -- I mean, a narrow, narrow three-family home, three-story home, whatever, and it doesn't work in that neighborhood.

Now I'm an abutter, you know, I'm at 54. There's a driveway which is common and then right next to the driveway -- I don't know if you all have had a chance to look at that, and there are other people that may speak tonight that live on the other side of it. So I just don't think it fits in.

I mean, let's address what you al1 requested, which has not been addressed, tonight. Why? I don't know.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

I guess I'd like to make sure that people understand that we're not being asked whether we think this house is great or is appropriate or not. We're being asked to make a choice. And the choice is -- because the house itself conforms to the Zoning rules of the city. Now, it may be an example of why any kind of rules you set up can't cover every condition, but it does conform to the rules. So the choice we're being asked is do we say vote against the Special Permit, in which case Doctor Rizkallah made it perfectly clear he's going to proceed; build the house and modify the back building so he can get a Building Permit. Or do we leave the back building the way it is, in which case he said he will provide some amenities which he listed in his testimony around the back of the lot. That's the choice that we are being forced to because Doctor Rizkallah did not -said indirectly, but I think I understood him
to say he could not afford to take a story off the building.

Is that correct?
MOUHAB RIZKALLAH: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. So I don't want to mislead people to think that we can say no, you can't build anything there because I don't think we have the power to do that.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Mr. Chair, I do want to say I disagree with your interpretation of what our choices are. I'm perfectly willing to listen to the rest of the public testimony, but I would not -- I don't agree with that's our choice.

My choice is to look at what's been presented to me and look at the information we asked for, and the proponent has a choice to either -- we can either accept the -- what he's requesting or we can say, no, and he can do what he feels is appropriate. But I don't -- I think he has put that choice

| 1 | before us in those words, but I wouldn't |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | necessarily -- that's not how I see the |
| 3 | choice at least. |
| 4 | THOMAS ANNINGER: Let's finish the |
| 5 | hearing. |
| 6 | HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. |
| 7 | THOMAS ANNINGER: But I think you |
| 8 | both make good points and we'11 have to |
| 9 | struggle with that. |
| 10 | HUGH RUSSELL: Right. |
| 11 | THOMAS ANNINGER: Why don't we just |
| 12 | finish the public hearing and then we can get |
| 13 | on with what's not an easy case. |
| 14 | HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. The next |
| 15 | person is Peter Reid; is that correct? |
| 16 | PETER REID: I signed the wrong |
| 17 | sheet. |
| 18 | HUGH RUSSELL: Ed Kelly. |
| 19 | ED KELLY: Good evening, I'm Ed |
| 20 | Kelly. I grew up at 77 Rice Street, which is |
| 21 | the main abutting properties here. And my |

mother stil1 lives in that property and my name is on that deed and it's one of the properties that is closest to where this building would be constructed. So naturally we have several concerns:

One is a 14-foot wide, three-story
building in that neighborhood just doesn't fit. And the fact that you would need a Special Permit, I'm a little -- I don't understand the -- all of the rules and so forth that you struggle with as you grant these things, but the fact that a Special Permit needs to be granted has to indicate that there's something here that doesn't fit into the normal sort of rules and regulations. And I don't know enough about it, but I'm just telling you that triggers for me what exactly is that. And why would you build a building like that so close to this property that -- I haven't seen the most recent designs, but clearly it's meant as a
rental property. There's no toilet in the master bedroom and so forth and so on. It's a 2000 version of a boarding home. It's clearly meant for income. That means people will come and go, and that's much different than the neighborhood that I grew up in. So that's a significant concern to me.

The other one is one of process. And we -- I've testified here once before. And at the end of the meeting this committee, this Board, basically said, there was a suggestion you may get some support if you move the building back and you should talk to your abutters. There's been no effort to speak to me or the gentleman at 51 Cedar Street or 54 Cedar Street. So the fact that there are letters of endorsement here from neighbors that $I$ consider to be sort of in a secondary place because they're getting, you know, they're being accommodated with some parking spaces and so forth, just isn't
relevant to the people that are most affected by the construction of this building.

So I would urge -- I don't want to sound like I'm totally opposed to it, but I don't think that your wishes have been complied with from previous meetings. And until that happens, I think that's a reasonable, that's a reasonable request. There may be a way to move that building in a place where it doesn't do it. I understand it's going to be six or eight feet off of my mother's property. And, again, with a walkway through it, with people that are not, you know, again, I can testify to the fact that my mother at 88, her driveway gets plowed by the people who live across the street because it's a neighborhood and people live there. This is different than that, and I urge you to consider it.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

Paul who lives at 58 Cedar Street.
PAUL CORRIVEAU: Paul Corriveau, C-o-r-r-i-v-e-a-u. I live at 58 Cedar Street.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
PAUL CORRIVEAU: His building would be right against my building. God forbid if there was a fire, there would be no way to stop that fire from burning my building down. It doesn't fit the area. If I wanted to live in Boston, I'd a bought a house in Boston.

This is -- it's like a row house going in there. It just doesn't fit the area.

Besides safety, Wayne would absolutely be terrified about -- the house would be right against his house. His porch would be looking into the neighbor's window. That's -- it just doesn't fit the area. Leave the lot the way it is or move to the back as Ed Kelly said.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.

## Ernst Kare1.

ERNST KAREL: Hi, my name is Ernst Karel at 60 Norris Street. So this property is directly behind our house. We look out the back of our house and we have a very small yard, and it's directly behind that. So the new parking lot will be right there.

So, we, Helen and I, enjoy living in a dense urban area. We like to be able to walk to the things that -- to the places we go. We don't have a car. We appreciate diversity. Selfishly we would prefer that the green yard behind our house remain a green yard. We recognize that we live in a city, that development happens, that in-fill happens, and it does seem very clear that development is gonna happen in this case regardless of what this Planning Board decides. And so given that this does seem like a good plan, and that's what I said in my letter, given the situation, the choices
that we're presented with here, this does seem like a good plan. The houses in front, our house is as close or probably closer, actually, to both our houses on either side than this one would be. It's not unusual. There are lots of three-story houses in this neighborhood. I really don't see why it doesn't fit in the neighborhood. It seems interesting architecturally.

So, just to clarify, I think a previous speaker thought we were being accommodated with parking spaces. That's not the case. We don't have a car. We're not being offered anything like that.

We feel that if this development is going to happen, we obviously prefer that it happen with things that Moe is offering to do if he's not forced to chop off the corner of that building, which he made clear they're prepared to do, such as the fence, keeping the tree, etcetera, all those things. That
seems nice to us.
We appreciate the difficulty of this for our neighbors. I mean, it is going to be a change to the neighborhood, but it looks like that change is gonna happen.

I don't really see that it's a safety issue. I'm sure that there are ways of seeing that houses aren't going to burn down and that it's not an unusual risk. So that's what our position has come to be on this.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Young Kim.
YOUNG KIM: Good evening. My name is Young Kim, Y-o-u-n-g K-i-m, 70 Norris Street. I'd like to take a little different approach here. It has been my understanding that when the Special Permit applicant must submit all relevant document to the Planning Board in a timely manner to allow abutters, as well as the Planning Board members, sufficient time to review and comment. For
public to comment on the exterior. I didn't see any new material posted on the Planning Board website or -- when I checked first thing this morning.

So I asked Ms. Paden to forward any -if any new material comes, please forward it to me so I can disseminate it to the neighbors so that we can try to review it before we come here. Then to my surprise I received an e-mail back from Ms. Paden late in the afternoon, and it was a long chain of forwarded e-mail and that Doctor Rizkallah sent a letter to the Planning Board was first sent to Mr. Fowler and then it was sent to Ms. Paden and then it was routed to me. So there was no time for us to look at the material.

And although Doctor Rizkallah is to be commended for reaching out to the abutters, he did not address the concerns of all the abutters. He just addressed the abutters on
the Norris Street. There's Cedar Street side and the Rice Street side. And as far as I could tell from the material, there was no attempt to contact them.

He refers to the experience on 40 Norris Street, and one of the thing that was added to the Zoning Amendment was the community outreach. And there was, there was not follow through. You know, it's a different Special Permit case, and because of -- before the Norris Street, the character of this neighborhood is completely going to change. And now with this 54 R it's going to be further changed. And what we've been asking all along is that we need something there that would fit in the character of the neighborhood. And concerns like Mr. Bingham who is going to be right across has to be addressed.

Thank you very much.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Does anyone else wish to speak on this case?
(No Response.)
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. I want to ask the Petitioner, there are only five of us here who can vote on your case because Ahmed was not present at one of the hearings, just the previous hearing, and so, for your petition to be granted, all five members have to vote in favor. You can ask us to postpone and grant another extension until we can bring a sixth member. Unfortunately Ms. Winters is sick tonight, or you can go ahead tonight. What is your pleasure?
MOUHAB RIZKALLAH: I think we postpone.
THOMAS ANNINGER: Postpone?
MOUHAB RIZKALLAH: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.
So we stop now.
THOMAS ANNINGER: I guess can we
just talk about whether we can talk?
HUGH RUSSELL: I mean, he's asked us to -- exercised his right, asked for a postponement.

MOUHAB RIZKALLAH: I'm happy to retract that and offer the opportunity to talk. I'd love to hear what you have to say.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Well, we may have a problem because if we talk while one of us is not here and that person was to be at every public hearing, then we run into the same problem next time, they won't be able to vote. Sorry, we're caught in a web here. It's too bad, because I think a lot of good things could be said that are useful. I don't know what to do here.

AHMED NUR: Am I allowed to vote on the next one now that I'm here?

HUGH RUSSELL: There is a new provision in the state law which would address the circumstance that allow absent
members to read the transcripts, and -- but it's not enforced in the City of Cambridge at this point in time.

AHMED NUR: A11 right.
HUGH RUSSELL: And so it all stems from the fact that we are short two members and, therefore, don't have any excess people to hear.

WAYNE BINGHAM: Can I ask one question? Might the Board -- this is Wayne Bingham. I'd like -- the Board asked the last time for pictures, view, 3-D rendering drawings which was not provided. Can we see that? That was part of what was the hold up the last time.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. It wasn't provided to us, so I believe it does not exist.

WAYNE BINGHAM: So -- can we see that at the next meeting?

HUGH RUSSELL: Sorry, we should --

| 1 | THOMAS ANNINGER: Hugh, in a way we |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | may already be in the box that I talked about |
| 3 | because we went ahead with the public |
| 4 | hearing. |
| 5 | HUGH RUSSELL: Right. We shouldn't |
| 6 | have done that. |
| 7 | THOMAS ANNINGER: And we didn't ask |
| 8 | the question early enough so that now we may |
| 9 | not even have the option to postponing? |
| 10 | HUGH RUSSELL: Right. |
| 11 | AHMED NUR: I'm sorry, why is that? |
| 12 | THOMAS ANNINGER: Because we went |
| 13 | ahead with the public hearing and Pam wasn't |
| 14 | here. So can she vote next time not having |
| 15 | heard the hearing this time? |
| 16 | H. THEODORE COHEN: I don't think |
| 17 | So. |
| 18 | THOMAS ANNINGER: Mr. Rizkallah |
| 19 | would like six members, and I'm not sure we |
| 20 | can offer him that anymore. |
| 21 | HUGH RUSSELL: Right. So I think |

what probably has to be done is we have to rehear the case from the start. Hear all the testimony again, treat it as a new case.

AHMED NUR: Or may I suggest that next time he doesn't have a choice, he hears the five of you? We don't give the option.

LIZA PADEN: No, he always has the option. That's not for you to -- you can't do that.

AHMED NUR: Okay.
HUGH RUSSELL: So I also believe that we're not going to act of the same mind on this case and so you know --

THOMAS ANNINGER: Well, this is
always so painful when we're talking about a very small number in matter of units and so forth, and we're talking about the vast area of Cambridge and I hate to hold that up another second. HUGH RUSSELL: Right.

So I think we have to ask ourselves
what if we follow the law, or what do we do right now?

THOMAS ANNINGER: I kind of like -I don't know what Mr. Rizkallah really wants. Somehow you've -- I feel you've actually put us in a box also by structuring this and framing it in a way that is not how we see it. You've gone to Norris Street, we're focusing on Cedar Street, and that's what the hearing was all about tonight. And I felt the hearing actually was very, very good and helpful. I thought everybody made points that were worthy and that fit with how I think we were looking at it. I think the -I hate to throw this one to the wind and just give up on it. I'd like this to have a good resolution for everybody if it's possible. I'm not sure we can do that with you, if I may be so bold, given the letter you wrote us tonight which I thought was rather abrupt, and giving the -- giving us the choices the
way you framed them. My preference would be to start again and see if we can do better on a second go-round and see if we can -- I know, I know there's a cost involved and that you are very sensitive to that. There are lawyers, architects. I think you've heard enough about the interest of Cedar Street, our interest in seeing the plans. Some of the things that we've requested which have been totally ignored. I think it would be a very good idea to start again. Much time as we've already put into this, I hate to give up on it having --

MOUHAB RIZKALLAH: I'm actually sorry I started it to be honest with you. I really should have insisted Inspectional Services to give me a redesign and that's it. This is a small issue. I don't feel I put you in a box. I feel like the box is mathematical. Asking me to do something that is disproportionate to the problem, it's a
matter of proportions. The box is made by proportions. If you guys want to overthink this, you can do that, but the reality is it's a corner of the house. If you don't want me to provide the niceties to the neighbors, fine. But this is really -- it's that straight forward for me. I don't know why you would expect -- I don't believe that if you were in my position that you would do anything else. You would really see it the same way.

THOMAS ANNINGER: I don't think so. STEVEN WINTER: No.

THOMAS ANNINGER: No, no. I think you're absolutely right, it's a matter of proportions. But we're talking about different proportions. You're focusing on the corner of that house. I'm focusing on what's on Cedar Street. Those three stories -- the 14 feet, the whole thing doesn't fit. Those are the proportions that

| 1 | benefit -- |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MOUHAB RIZKALLAH: Those are the |
| 3 | benefit to do this -- |
| 4 | HUGH RUSSELL: Excuse me, |
| 5 | Doctor Rizkallah, I don't want to get into a |
| 6 | back and forth. |
| 7 | THOMAS ANNINGER: I agree. |
| 8 | So we've done as much as we can. Do |
| 9 | you have a suggestion, Hugh? It may be as |
| 10 | simple for Mr. Rizkallah to withdraw his |
| 11 | proposal rather than resubmit. I think |
| 12 | that's what he really wants to do, but it |
| 13 | feels like he's poking a finger in our eye |
| 14 | and I think that's exactly what he's doing. |
| 15 | HUGH RUSSELL: If I had -- I'm |
| 16 | afraid I'm -- I see this rather like |
| 17 | Doctor Rizkallah. |
| 18 | THOMAS ANNINGER: What's that? |
| 19 | HUGH RUSSELL: I see this rather |
| 20 | like Doctor Rizkallah. That this is, I think |
| 21 | it is a not great public policy for the |

Planning Board to consider this item on a single conforming single-family house, however strangely sized it is. It's, you know -- there are plenty of 14 -foot white houses in North Cambridge. I don't know of any one that's three stories tall. There are plenty of three-story houses. I don't know any that are 14 feet wide. I don't know what the thinnest house is. I don't know what the tallest one is. But it's, as a conforming building, you know, if it weren't for that corner on that house, he'd have the right to build it without any overview. And, you know, this is a Board that talks about the rights of people who own original properties. I think we're letting ourselves be swayed by who owns it rather than by the actual facts here. If I had to choose, I would rather see the fence and the, you know, the improvements to the back parking area than see the corner of the house chopped off. I think that's
just silly to chop that off. It's an artifact of the -- just the fact that when you make rules, you have to make rules to accomplish things. Sometimes the rules lead to silly consequences. This is a case where that happens. So, if I could choose what to do if it was a one member board, I'm the only vote, I would vote to grant the relief. I am sorry that he's, you know, that he can't do more with the design of the house, but I don't know -- we can't force him to do that.

WILLIAM TIBBS: One, I mean, as much as we try to agree with each other most of the time, there are times when we just disagree and that's what boards are for. HUGH RUSSELL: Right. WILLIAM TIBBS: I look at it slightly differently. One, we're not asking you to do anything. You have asked us to -- you put a Special Permit before us and you've just
asked us to act on it. And the issue of whether or not he wants to take a corner off the house is not our issue. I mean, the issue is the planning issues involved, and I for one would have a hard time if I go through those criteria that we set up. And granted, this is an odd lot. I mean, as you said earlier, we have -- we know that when we make general rules, and I was on the Board when we actually came up with these rules for buildings in the back of these long lots, but if I go through the criteria that we set up, I would have a hard time saying that this particular property is okay, and primarily because of how it fits. I think that very thin, narrow building doesn't fit. If it were a shorter building, it would fit. I mean, I think the case was made at a previous public hearing that there are buildings that are as narrow as this is, but it's just not as high. So that's what -- that's where it
sits. So if this were a Planning Board of one for me, I would not do it. But I understand there are implications with that, but that's always the case. I mean a proponent can always, and have many times, decided that they would rather do something as of right as opposed to, you know, do something -- I think the whole purpose of coming for a Special Permit is to try and see if we can improve it in some kind of way, and this is not an improvement as far as I'm concerned. And indeed as it's described, it's not going to change as of right or not, whether or not there's a chunk taken off the other house or not. So I just don't -- and I too feel that by not responding to anything we talked about, at least coming up with some pros and cons or some suggestions that we requested the last time, that that's -- I don't think the proponent has been in good faith in just terms working with us as a

Board.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I'm not sure where we're going with this entire conversation now that Doctor Rizkallah has said that he doesn't want less than the full Board that's heard it to act upon it. And so I, you know, personally don't feel the need to, you know, discuss the merits of it until, you know, we kind of figure out procedurally what's going to happen next. And, you know, it seems that, and I do think now we're in a bind because we'11 never have more than the members, five members who are here now who have sat on every session to actually vote upon it. So continuing it to a later date, I don't think is going to resolve our problem.

THOMAS ANNINGER: And the solution is?
H. THEODORE COHEN: I don't know what the solution is because, you know, Doctor Rizkallah could withdraw the petition
and we could start over. If we don't act or do anything, and the time period is not extended -- the time period expires when, Liza?

LIZA PADEN: February 28th.
H. THEODORE COHEN: February 28th.

Then I think it gets approved through an action?

LIZA PADEN: Yes.
H. THEODORE COHEN: I don't know where we are.

HUGH RUSSELL: Ahmed.
AHMED NUR: Obviously I'm not a lawyer. I'm just going to throw it out there and I was not present on the last one, so I don't want to waste your time. But from what I'm hearing it sounds like we don't have a choice but to -- for him and staff to -- and staff's -- our lawyers to talk about what's the next step is to see what the next step is as opposed rather than to solve the issue.

He said he doesn't want to do it with the full, we don't have the full, just move us on.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Suggestion?

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Well, I don't have a -- Sean Hope. I don't have a magical solution. I did think that if for completeness, resubmitting potentially -aside from the cost and time it would take, I do think it's appropriate to have a full and defendable decision, whatever the Board would do. But in terms of withdrawing, I am concerned about the idea of a repetitive petition and I would just want to make it clear that if we did take any action to withdraw, I'm not advocating we did, that's also another concern that only adds to the level of concerns. I do think it may be appropriate to sought some counsel from the Cambridge Legal Department and we might want to discuss the implications of what this
would mean. Because we have spent lots of time and resources to get to this point, and I would not want an action from this Board to kind of force us to feel like we had a fair and full hearing. So, I would maybe look to the city staff procedurally to figure out what's the most appropriate thing to do knowing that the 28th is also the date at which we need to act on this or it would have an automatic grant.

WILLIAM TIBBS: We don't have another meeting before the 28th.

THOMAS ANNINGER: I think there should be a discussion with the staff and try to figure out what to do next and what you want to do next. And your point about a repetitive petition is a good one, and I would hope there is some way for us to waive that in a situation like this and to agree not to treat this as a repetitive situation.

I would like to, I would like us to
find a way to stop talking about this now. And maybe Mr. Hope has given us as good as we're going to get.

WILLIAM TIBBS: I guess my only
concern is that the -- we don't fall into inaction.

THOMAS ANNINGER: That's right.
H. THEODORE COHEN: I think Mr. Hope and Doctor Rizkallah would have to agree to a further extension to at least say March 5th or the 12th to enable there to be a meeting with the Law Department and a discussion and a determination of the options.

MOUHAB RIZKALLAH: Is that a decision I have to make right now or can I sleep on that?

THOMAS ANNINGER: No, that would be now.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Because we don't have another meeting.

HUGH RUSSELL: It would helpful if
you made it now.
THOMAS ANNINGER: No, if we don't meet before the 28th and we can't do anything, then we're really in a box. So we have to resolve that tonight.

HUGH RUSSELL: Do you have some advice for us, Brian?

BRIAN MURPHY: I think that the course that you're going on is one that makes sense in terms of doing an extension for at least the purpose of consultation with the -between the Law Department and the City and Mr. Hope. I shot an e-mail to the City Solicitor, she was not on hold for this, so I haven't heard back. But I would think that would be a wise approach.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, I'11 just give you one more opinion which is this is a case that seems to be dividing the Board, and I think in fairness to the -- I think we should have a seven-person Board hearing this case

| 1 | if it goes that way. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | BRIAN MURPHY: Yes. |
| 3 | HUGH RUSSELL: So, I think we will |
| 4 | then -- |
| 5 | WILLIAM TIBBS: An extension. |
| 6 | HUGH RUSSELL: Will you give us the |
| 7 | extension is my question? |
| 8 | MOUHAB RIZKALLAH: I don't fee1 |
| 9 | prepared to give an extension. I don't feel |
| 10 | prepared to -- I don't even understand what |
| 11 | we're talking about and I don't feel -- I |
| 12 | feel pressured to make a decision that I |
| 13 | don't understand. |
| 14 | BRIAN MURPHY: The only other option |
| 15 | I can think of would be if you were to |
| 16 | advertise another meeting prior to the 28th. |
| 17 | WILLIAM TIBBS: Just for clarity |
| 18 | then, is voting not an option? |
| 19 | THOMAS ANNINGER: That's not going |
| 20 | to work. |
| 21 | HUGH RUSSELL: Can we meet the |

advertising rules?
LIZA PADEN: I can advertise a Planning Board meeting for next Tuesday evening, and my deadline for that is to post it by Thursday, but I don't know, given Ms. Winters' situation, whether or not she can be here on that Tuesday to get the six members here.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Mr. Hope, an extension is not heavy lifting. That is not a difficult question. You don't need to understand a lot to know why we're asking for an extension to get out of this very awkward situation. So, it would seem to me that between you and your client you ought to be able to resolve this maybe out in the room and then we'11 finish this after MIT or something.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: We11, yes, I do think it's appropriate that we maybe step outside to discuss the pros and cons. This
is a bit complex in terms of procedure, but also the implications to his application, and I know he doesn't want to be put through more. Maybe if we do that and I can talk to city staff about that and you can proceed with the next hearing.

MOUHAB RIZKALLAH: Here's the thing, this sounds very complicated and I actually don't -- I'm going to relieve you as my counse1, okay? I don't want you to even be a part of this at this point. This seems so complicated that I'm actually -- out of concern for him, I don't want him even to be my counsel on this. And I don't exactly know what you're expecting of me, but I don't want him to give me any advice on this. As far as I'm concerned, I've relieved you as my counse1.

I am not going to be granting an extension. I don't understand it and the idea that you're expecting me to be pressured
under it, I don't accept that.
HUGH RUSSELL: We11, I suggest then that we take a vote on the merits of the application and then let that vote stand as one of the bargaining chips in the future things. That's all we can do. And we'11 take a vote, we'll write a decision. If --
H. THEODORE COHEN: I don't see how we can take a vote if Doctor Rizkallah has indicated that he doesn't want less than the six members who heard it before the vote.

HUGH RUSSELL: I understand that. But all I'm saying is that we have to put our intentions clearly out there. We have no options. We have no cooperation from the Petitioner in this matter which is a procedural matter. He's now relieved his attorney, and so I say jump in with both feet and say this is what we think is the right disposition before that decision is filed or made if there can be a discussion with the

Law Department and with the Petitioner, that may resolve it, that may result in an extension being, you know. I don't -- but I think we've agreed to do nothing. Our choice is either to do nothing, in which case I believe what will happen is the petition is automatically granted. Now that happens to be the position I favor, so I'm thinking -but I think there are not five people on this Board who don't want that to happen. So to facilitate that, I suggest we take a vote and let that vote stand and then someone can fight about what it means and whether we did it properly or not.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I'd ask Doctor Rizkallah whether he indicated earlier he might revoke his decision not to have us vote and what is your position now?

MOUHAB RIZKALLAH: No, I think that I regret that I've spent and I've invested so much on what, for me, is such a small issue
and could easily be resolved, and that Inspectional Services encouraged me to come over here and have this conversation. I regret that I moved forward in that way, but that I am here. I think I would, I would like to hear you decide on whether the amenities to this neighbor and the other neighbors is appropriate or if those amenities are not appropriate. It's that simple of a question. It's a small matter. It is arbitrary and capricious to come up with 75 feet --

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. I'm not asking you to argue your case. We're asking you a very specific question and you've answered the question.

MOUHAB RIZKALLAH: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
THOMAS ANNINGER: Let's vote.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.
So, would somebody form the motion?

There's a formal motion that happens at the City Counci1, if a motion is made hoping the same will not prevail. That's a motion we can make here.

THOMAS ANNINGER: You can do that. You can formulate it and then we can go that way, or one of us can make a motion to deny I suppose. I don't know where my colleagues are on this.
H. THEODORE COHEN: We11, I would move to grant the Special Permit for 54R Cedar Street in accordance with the provisions that -- I'm sorry, I don't have the actual application in front of me.

LIZA PADEN: Pass that down, please.
H. THEODORE COHEN: I would move to grant a Special Permit in accordance to Section 5.53 to allow for the building to be within the 75 feet of the street line in accordance with plans that were most recently submitted to us that show -- or the plans
that were submitted to us that show a three-story building fronting on Cedar Street with a flat roof.

And subject to the conditions that the Petitioner has indicated he would be willing to grant, that he would place an eight-foot Cedar fence in place of the existing chain link fence abutting his property and the property at 60 Norris Street and 58 Norris Street.

That they would limit the spaces to five parking spaces.

That he would place paving stones in the parking area rather than asphalt.

That he would plant additional landscaping trees near the fence, maintain a mature evergreen tree.

Use low intensity, low position landscaped lighting that does not extend beyond the property line, and involve the abutters at 60 Norris Street and 58 Norris

| 1 | Street as a minimum consultation or consult |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | with them as to the design of the fence and |
| 3 | the landscaping and the parking area. |
| 4 | HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, is there a |
| 5 | second to that motion? |
| 6 | (No Response.) |
| 7 | HUGH RUSSELL: Seeing none, I wil1 |
| 8 | second it. |
| 9 | Is there a discussion on the motion? |
| 10 | (No Response.) |
| 11 | HUGH RUSSELL: I see no request for |
| 12 | a discussion so I will take a vote. |
| 13 | Al1 those in favor of the motion raise |
| 14 | their hand. |
| 15 | (Show of hands.) |
| 16 | HUGH RUSSELL: So two members |
| 17 | voting. |
| 18 | (Russe11, Cohen.) |
| 19 | HUGH RUSSELL: A11 those opposed? |
| 20 | (Show of hands.) |
| 21 | (Anninger, Tibbs, Winter.) |

HUGH RUSSELL: So two members voting in favor and the motion is denied.

WAYNE BINGHAM: Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: We'11 take a five-minute break.
(A short recess was taken.)
HUGH RUSSELL: So we're going to reconvene. I would comment that there's an old story about no one should ever see how laws are made or sausage. I think we have another thing to add to the list. We regret that we've taken this up at such a late hour.

I think is it true that the staff wants to make a comment before we start with MIT?

BRIAN MURPHY: Sure. Just to provide a little bit of context. After the last hearing with MIT -- of the MIT petition, the staff and MIT came together to try to sort of continue to have discussions about, as directed by the Board, to try to find areas where we might be able to reconcile
sort of those minor differences that existed between the K2 Petition and the MIT Petition as I think is noted in the memo to the Planning Board that was sent out to you. I would suggest that a significant amount of progress was made in terms of both resolving language as well as coming to a better understanding of -- in some instances why there were certain approaches taken by MIT. And, you know, those are discussions have continued. Again, I would direct your attention to pages 6 and 7 of the memo. For example, on the innovation space subsequent to that there's been subsequent agreement on some of the language so there's less conflict there that had been referenced. And even with that, I think the goal that MIT had as far as we understand, which is to ensure that this is a given, we're talking about innovation, to ensure that this is an area that remains innovative and relevant in terms
of its language.
On sustainability there's still some minor differences around the academic sector, primarily around MIT's concerns about the fact on the areas where they're truly cutting edge and areas really that haven't even been contemplated by LEED to try to ensure that they're not hamstrung and in a competitive disadvantage going forward.

So really I would say that the differences remain are minor, but that is, you know, it has been a very fruitful discussion between the Institute and the City Staff as we tried to advance things. And with that, given the hour I think it probably makes as much sense to hear from MIT and then to allow the Board to really get into a discussion and then obviously we're happy, the City Staff is happy to clarify any issues or concerns as this goes forward.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. We may also be
asking for comments from the public since this is a public hearing.

Steve, are you going to start?
STEVE MARSH: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. Good evening Members of the Planning Board, members of the public. For the record, my name is Steve Marsh. I'm the Managing Director of Real Estate at MIT and I'm delighted to be joined by a number of our team members here tonight, including Israel Ruiz, MIT's Executive Vice President and Treasurer; Professor Marty Schmidt, our Associate Provost; Michae1 Owu, Director of Real Estate; Sara Gallop, our Co-director of Office of Government and Community Relations; and David Manfredi from Elkus Manfredi Architects.

We're pleased to be here tonight for our second formal hearing to discuss with you the Zoning Petition for the new PUD-5 District. The creation of this new district
represents a valuable opportunity to reinvest and revitalize Kendall Square. And as you know, we've spent considerable time developing this petition. We were very pleased with the reception and the guidance we received at our last Planning Board hearing.

Since that hearing we've also had the opportunity to appear before the City Counci1 Ordinance Committee, and we believe that that was a very successful overview which will lead to additional hearings to discuss the petition in greater detail as Brian has put us on the schedule.

Since our last hearing we've focussed a majority of our time and energy working with the Community Development Staff, as you requested, to further align our petition with the K2 study plan recommendations. We made significant progress and wanted to spend time tonight updating you on those areas.

Also since the last meeting the Board has had the opportunity to hear a presentation by CDD on the design guidelines for Kenda11 Square. And members of our team attended that hearing and have been working with CDD staff to coordinate those guidelines with our Zoning. And we feel that the guidelines give strong definition and context to our Zoning, and we're happy to include both references to these guidelines and incorporate them along with our Zoning.

Although it was acknowledged that our Zoning Petition reflected much of the K2 study, after our last hearing CDD staff provided a list of some areas where there was some diversion. So the Board has asked us to work with the staff to resolve these outstanding issues, and you had some related issues of your own that you asked us to consider. So much of what our discussion tonight will be on agenda item 2 regarding
progress on alignment and then some follow-up on some Board concerns.

Board members were helpful at the last meeting raising the issue of appropriate distribution of particular language between the Zoning text and the design guidelines. And frankly, the simultaneous evolution of the Zoning language and the design guidelines has given us opportunities to address issues in the right places. We've spent a lot of time with Community Development Staff on this, and we think we've reached the right balance with the staff's guidance and insight.

In short, we've done things like move floor plates and height reviews to the design guidelines. We believe setbacks and active uses should remain in Zoning because of the important role they play in relation to the Base Zoning of the district. And then beyond the language that was included in our initial
petition, you raised questions providing direction regarding setbacks from the Red Cross building as well as the centers for housing creation south of Main Street. So we've added language that we believe addresses both of these issues, and I'11 discuss these further in the relevant sections.

So let me get into the specifics. The purpose section has remained consistent, however, we were asked to reference a design guidelines here. Initially we had concerns when this arose because understandably we weren't really sure when these guidelines would be finalized or what they would actually include. So we're pleased that we've had the opportunity to provide input on that, and we really appreciate the Planning Board and the staff's hard work to finalize these guidelines. So at this point we hope that the Planning Board adopts these
guidelines and we're happy to reference them as part of our Zoning. We've added a section at the end of our proposal in which references the guidelines.

The Zoning includes language to incent MIT to build spaces for small retailers, to activate streets, and to provide housing south of Main Street.

In the active uses section, broader activation is set forth.

In this section we were asked to think about the appropriate maximum square footage of retail spaces that could be exempt from gross floor area calculations. After discussions with staff, we've agreed that the exemption for retail gross floor area should be limited to retail spaces 5,000 square feet of loss with the exception of a possible grocery store, a market, or a pharmacy that could be exempt up to 10,000 square feet.

We've also had further conversations
with staff about the retail exemption applying to floors above street level and basements. We initially requested that the exemption be applied to the second floor, but we understand that the purpose is the activation of ground levels. We do have basements that are partially above grade and we would like to activate these, so we've included the level below street as appropriate for the exemption as well.

At the last board meeting there was a discussion about how to incent housing south of Main Street, and we've heard that suggestion from the Board, that we include an exemption for housing in this location. We have incorporated this concept into the Zoning language. And I think as we've said we're very challenged between the existing building south of Main in providing the growth opportunities for our core academic mission, but this exemption does provide
additional incentive for us to pursue possible future housing south of Main, and it also helps us consider existing housing sites for possible expansion with less potential impact on academic or commercial parcels as sites are evolving over time.

Regarding development plans. The staff has consistently wanted the Zoning language to require a submission of a conceptual development plan for all the FAR allowed in the PUD when submitting a development plan for a specific parcel or parcels. While it's been typically more challenging for institutions like MIT to do this given the given the nature of other evolving needs, during this process we've come to better understand the importance to the City of tracking the PUD rights, particularly for PUDs that would likely go through Article 19 in more than one development proposal. So we've worked with staff and we've become
comfortable with the concept. We've incorporated relevant language that requires a conceptual development plan illustrating how the remaining allowed development in the district would be distributed in the future with each Article 19 submission.

We're pleased that this approach would give the City and the Planning Board a better understanding of the Institute's thoughts over time while providing us with the flexibility that academic uses required. Again, I have said the floor plate section has been moved to the design guidelines so I'11 move right to the setbacks.

We were asked to think about the concerns raised by the American Red Cross within the context of our Zoning. It has always been our intent to respect our abutters and we consider the Red Cross a neighbor and partners in Kendall Square. While we think the Article 19 process would
be an appropriate venue for discussing the details, particularly the residential building at One Broadway, we're also happy to include setback requirements that relate directly to the Red Cross building in this section. So we are proposing a 20 -foot setback from the property line up to an 85 foot height, and then a 36-foot setback thereafter.

As noted in our earlier presentation, we have included a section regarding pedestrian bridges that was meant to deal with the aggregation of floor plates of buildings joined by a bridge. With the relocation of the floor plate section to the guidelines and given the amount of discussion of bridges already included in those guidelines, we believe there is no longer a need for this section in Zoning so we've deleted that.

Since our last meeting we've clarified
the language to ensure the square footage above 250 feet which is subject to the modern housing requirement, is also subject to the City's inclusionary Zoning Ordinance. So let me repeat that for clarification. The entire residential building is subject to the inclusionary affordable housing ordinance in the area above 250 feet also creates the modern income requirement.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Moderate or middle?
STUART DASH: Moderate.
STEVE MARSH: These provisions along with our Zoning incentive contribution to the affordable housing trust represent a fairly significant contribution towards affordable housing.

The Zoning also included a section regarding review of buildings over 250 feet. At staff's suggestion we have reduced that review threshold to 200 feet. And also, I think at the last meeting, I think it was

Mr. Anninger who may have suggested that the height review language might be better suited for the guidelines. So we appreciate those thoughts and have worked with staff on that issue, and we've come to an agreement that the appropriate location for that language is in the guidelines and review.

On open spaces, we very much understand and embrace the priority with the city and the community as consistently placing a connective and open spaces, active open spaces throughout the district and the neighborhoods. And similar to the conceptual development plan concept discussed earlier, staff has stressed the importance of seeing how this open space network may evolve as the district develops. So we have agreed and are happy to include language that requires conceptual open space plan for PUD-5 with each Article 19 submission in our Zoning language.

On parking, much of the parking requirements, including the ratios, have come directly from the K2 process. We continue to be aligned here, and we've agreed to language around pre-existing parking spaces.

Innovation space is clear throughout the K2 process that innovation space, you know, places for small entrepreneurial styles to thrive is a critically important component to Kenda11 Square. Based on our experience of housing innovation space at One Broadway for the past 15 years, we cannot agree more. We do believe that this is such an important use for Kendall Square that we do believe that this section remain in the Zoning. We realize that the precedent language that appears in our Zoning will set the stage for the entire Kendall District so we've gotten comfortable with including requirements for specific characteristics including the minimum size of innovation centers, the
maximum size of suites and units per single business entity, lease durations, shared resources, and eligible tenants.

Lastly we've agreed with the staff to adjust the language to reflect the K2 recommendation that 50 percent of innovation space be exempt from FAR.

On sustainability we recognize that Cambridge is a leader in this area and MIT is a critical partner. We were asked to incorporate more of the K2 language on sustainability much of which sets new precedents in the city. And we understand the perspective of Iram and others in the staff, the Kendall Square must lead in this regard. So we're pleased with the evolution of this section, which now includes a requirement for all new commercial and residential buildings to meet LEED Gold criteria, to provide a statement of energy design intent, to evaluate connecting to
district steam, and to be first in the city to require tracking and reporting energy use of new buildings in the PUD. We've worked a lot with the staff on sustainability. And as Brian has mentioned, the staff has asked us to require academic buildings to meet higher energy standards subject to the caveats mentioned earlier.

Next on signage in response to concerns, we have made PUD-5 subject to all of the Article 7 standards applicable for business, office, and industrial districts, period.

On active uses, the requirement for active uses remain in Zoning and we think that the design guidelines are an excellent complement to this language. The design guidelines can further direction on actually creating these important spaces throughout the district.

We also heard questions from the Board
about way finding, and this is an area that's very important to us and everyone who walks through Kendal1 Square recognizes it's a critical issue. So MIT is committed to working with KSA, working with the community and those stakeholders, create a way finding system that complements other open space improvements. It is appropriate for all the constituencies of Kendal1 Square; from long-time residents, students, faculty and staff, the businesses, and the first time visitors. All of them need help in regard to some of these way finding issues.

On the community fund, we discussed at the last meeting as we discussed the general principles of the community fund came out of the K2 process as wel1 as coming from City Council's interest in this form of community benefit. The concept has generally been well received by the various stakeholders. This was a topic of discussion at the Ordinance

Committee, and we anticipate working on this concept and further refining all its stakeholders.

There are a few other issues we discussed at the last meeting. They're outside of specific Zoning language. First, MIT wants to thank Chris Carter and staff for the excellent presentation on housing. The City has made amazing strides in this area, and we too have made housing a priority.

Second, we recently presented at a meeting of the graduate community and we wanted to update you on the progress of the graduate student housing study. As you may recall one of the recommendations from the task force appointed by of the Provost Chris Kaiser and chaired by Professor Tom Colkin, was to undertake a study of housing needs particularly in relation to the graduate student population. Recently the provost announced the appointment of former
chancellor in urban studies and planning professor Phil Clay as the Chair of the graduate student housing workforce group. And this work, working group which includes faculty and graduate student representatives is expected to issue preliminary findings later this year.

You also mentioned transportation generally. CDD addressed the issue of transportation at the last Planning Board meeting. It was a very detailed and informative presentation of how they evaluate opportunities for growth in Kendall and Central and how it relates to the Zoning petition for you. It showed progress on non-vehicular initiatives and that work on transportation infrastructure must continue. We thanked them for providing this context, and MIT is a partner in encouraging non-vehicular transit.

Again, I would like to thank the Board
for its comments at the last meeting and the staff in spending so much time working with us to refine the Zoning language to ensure that the language reflects the intent of the stakeholders, including the City, the neighborhoods, and MIT. A lot of hard work has gone into both the Zoning language and the design guidelines over the last several months, and I think they're in a far better place right now. We've done a lot of work collectively with this Board and the staff and others over the last two and a half years and we're excited to move forward. So I'11 stop there and take questions. HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

So I think maybe the place to start with questions are is any Member of the Board asked a question at the previous presentation that hasn't been addressed?

Ahmed.
AHMED NUR: Steve, I appreciate al1
the accommodations and working with the staff with regarding to the Planning Board comments and recommendations. One thing that I'm sort of maybe like to ask you was we had student body representing -- page 15 of your presentation, and there was housing and the graduate student housing and transportation. And there were a couple of concerns of the student body such as they walk alone and live in Somerville, and I was wondering if you could elaborate as to what you might have (inaudible).

STEVE MARSH: We11, I think where we are first and foremost at the highest level is that MIT is taking this housing issue very seriously. We care deeply about our graduate student population as you might understand, as well as our undergrads. The graduate students efforts are starting first and foremost with a comprehensive study of what our housing needs are. And I think there are
many things that are going on there including things like where is the federal budget issues going, and what is the research trajectory and what is the supporting graduate counts that have come up which are big issues. I think we recognize that we have been a leader in providing graduate housing as well, so we are out there in terms of sort of the northeast area of the country providing graduate housing. So I think this study, which we're delighted that we now have, a chair of this committee, a person in Professor Phil Clay who has spearheaded as the chancellor support for student issues as well as being a member of urban planning to think about these issues. So we think we have the right player involved here, and we look forward to this process to start to frame all of these issues. Because I think for us to answer this question, we need this further investigation.

## AHMED NUR: Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Steve.
STEVEN WINTER: Thank you,
Mr. Chair.
I want to -- before I actually make my comment I wanted to say that, I want to echo your optimism and the hard work, the cooperation, the collaboration. This is a wonderful, wonderful process that we've got here, and we should all be very proud of where it's taken us.

Now, the -- we mentioned the Red Cross building specifically. And I also want to make sure that the Kendall Hotel is going to receive care and attention. And my guess is that if you you're using the same caliber of architects and designers that you've been using that there are design mitigations, things that we can do. So I don't want to ask what they are, I simply want to bookmark it, because I didn't see them mentioned by
name where I did see the Red Cross.
STEVE MARSH: Yeah, I -- we take the Kendal1 Hotel very serious1y as we11. I think you may recal1 that the Kendal 1 Hote1 did expand and did pass with a Variance. And so the setback issue is slightly different knowing that we were going to eventually have a party wall up there with the way that was built. So setback is different, but I think the, you know, the evaluation of the right types of buildings, incentive design to our neighbors is critically important as you know and is certainly a key part of any Article 19 discussion that we will have as we get into more of the details.

STEVEN WINTER: That's what we're looking for.

Thank you. HUGH RUSSELL: Bi11. WILLIAM TIBBS: I guess I have a question for you and I as our -- as the staff
memo says, we still have some benefits and drawbacks relative to the idea of exempting the residential -- exempting residential from the FAR, and I don't have any -- conceptually I don't have a problem with that, but I do want to make sure that it is something that works. And I guess one question that I had was for an institution like MIT is exemption or something as significant as residential in a development like this from FAR? Is that really an incentive? I can see it from a developer, but I'm just wondering, just what your thoughts are on that strategy I guess. STEVE MARSH: I think I would say that we're following a lead from the Planning Board in terms of a suggestion about a way that we might be able to think about creating incentives for that. So I think we're starting with a hopefulness that, you know, including some mechanisms might be fruitful in that endeavor. I think for us, like
anything, you know, as we seek to figure out how we're going to deploy over time the academic capacity that we've reserved in the east campus to make sure that we continue the academic mission of MIT is first and foremost in our mind. That gives us an added element of flexibility in terms of trying to meet other objectives in the east campus area if that possibility ultimately exists as we go through some of the details of that academic planning. And I think the challenge we have now is there are too many unknowns at this point in time to answer that question so we're again, I think we're following the lead of the Planning Board and looking for a way to try to find something that could positively come out of that. WILLIAM TIBBS: Then I would turn to the staff and then to say that's an issue, because I think the incentive is to make it happen I guess or to make it well so it does
happen. So it sounds like you don't have any problem with the idea and it's just a matter of making sure that we can --

STUART DASH: I think so. And it enables us not to have to trade off some other key academic initiative potentially in there at the expense of housing. So I think it opens the door. And I think it was the intent to take it like that. You know, we're all here in terms of how to actually work a language with the staff.

WILLIAM TIBBS: And I only bring it up because I think from Day 1 I think as we looked at the two different studies that we did, and this study to the amount of residential or was an important issue for us. So making sure that kind of settles in. And you're too big of a player in this whole Kendal1 Square area, you know, for a big a substantial contributor at that point. So good.

HUGH RUSSELL: Let me also suggest another potential answer to your question, which is the housing need may prove to be something that is a need that wants to be addressed earlier, we understand that the way academic institutions grew their institutions, institutional space in a response to both an identification of need but also identification of people who can pay to build buildings. So if someone -- so by exempting FAR for housing, that means you don't have to say well, I'm not sure what we're going to do on the institutional side, but I know that all I'm losing is whatever piece of turf. I'm not losing the ability to respond at a later date to an academic initiative. So, whereas you might say wel1, I don't want to spend my housing, my entitlement on housing too early, so I think it may result in an earlier production of housing. It may not produce anything, but

I'm going to say your vision of apartments -WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: -- you know, on the second and third floor.

WILLIAM TIBBS: You remember that. HUGH RUSSELL: I remember that. It was a very, very powerful idea because it only takes 28 feet of that frontage in-depth. It doesn't take a lot of depth to produce a significant impact on the street, and I have my own ideas about how that might apply to some of the historic buildings also. Which might be more suited in terms of their floor to floor height and other things to a housing use provided you could make a deal with Charlie to maybe take the parts that are far away from the street and substitute a shiny new building. So, I'd like to keep that all in play, those possibilities there, and so that we can achieve the vision that you put on the table.

Is there any -- so on this question of the housing exemption, is there any discussion that the Department wanted to board while we're on this subject?

You laid out a couple of possible ways of handling the existing, and I'm in some ways feel confident and comfortable to leave you to think it through because I think it's --

WILLIAM TIBBS: I think the pros and cons or the benefits that you've mentioned I think were thoughtful. So that it just means that you've got to work on it a little bit more.

JEFF ROBERTS: That's correct, Mr. Chair. This is Jeff Roberts from CDD. I'11 kind of try to take a swing at it. We included some discussion to -- just to demonstrate that, you know, different, different approaches that you might take could have, could have different effects when
you look at the whole University of options that are out there. And as you mentioned, Mr. Chair, there is, there's -- we want to try to leave open the possibility for as many options as possible, and as a result, try to make sure that the incentives that are put in place or at least the mechanisms that are put in place aren't going to result in some issue down the road. For instance, the one that, the one that really came to my mind as I was looking through this is what might be the future of some of the existing residential uses as there are some substantial residential and dormitory uses in that area now. And so the question is how would this type of mechanism come into play if, you know, any of those were altered or partially at some point there was a discussion of do you -- for urban design purposes, do you take down parts of some of the buildings that exist and then redevelop them in some way?

And so there is some thought to be had and some pros and cons. But I think that in general the approach that was taken in the language and the approach that's suggested in the memo just saying anything that's new, just keeping what's there now is under -keeping it under the existing regime. And then saying that anything that you build in addition is exempt, is one that most directly addresses the desire, to as you were saying, Hugh, to remove any potential hang ups from pursuing those projects if they were reasonable.

AHMED NUR: Can you sum that up for me? I don't think I understood everything he just said.

HUGH RUSSELL: I don't think I can say it better than Jeff said it.

AHMED NUR: Okay, I'm out of luck. HUGH RUSSELL: I think from my understanding the bigger picture is that
there is a, there are opportunities to modify some of the existing housing, and if you make any new structure exempt, then what happens is they decide they're going to nip a corner off of something, well, it doesn't make any difference, because if they replace it by something, that's exempt. It doesn't -- now, they got to get passed Charlie Sullivan and the history, you know, for structures that are within his purview, but -- and it may be -- you know, I don't think they're going to come in and say well, we've decided we want to take the top 10 floors off the Eastgate because it's too tall. I don't think that's going to happen. Because it stands as a beacon that buildings with very small floor plates don't seem to have a very big impact on the cityscape. And a few people -- is that actually the tallest building? I think it has more floors than any other building in the city. No, there's no other 30-story
building.
AHMED NUR: Green Building might.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Depends on how you count the antennas structures.

HUGH RUSSELL: The Green Building might be further from the center of the earth.

So, I guess I have a big question in my mind which is what else do we have to do to send a recommendation to the Council on this? I believe we are -- feel that the proposal before us with the kind of conforming amendments that are being proposed that is really fine and is ready from our point of view to go. We don't have an outstanding issues.

STEVEN WINTER: Correct.
HUGH RUSSELL: The language, I'm not sure the CD's department has completed their work, and to some extent because they not only work for us but they work for the

Council and the city in general, we can say, you've crossed our threshold and they can still work with MIT on refining language or whatever. It doesn't sound like much on the table anymore.

Second, is I think we should hear from members of the public tonight because there's a -- there are things that have changed. So while we're thinking about -- or listening to the members of the public, maybe the department should give some thought to the process and when it's appropriate for us to take a make a formal recommendation.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Before we do that I have a question for either for Steve or for staff. I'm looking over my notes from the last session and we were talking about adding Third Street and Ames Street for a required ground floor retail. Has that been picked up in here or is that something --

STEVE MARSH: Third Street, we --
you know, in terms of doing that work, absolutely committed to doing that along the new building that we would do any in-fill there. The challenge we have is there's is some existing spaces on One Broadway. We've added retail on there but there's a garage entrance there. So the new piece absolutely. And we actually want to turn that corner as you know down Broad Canal Way and activate that whole area. So we're actually pretty excited about that. So that I think we're in harmony with.

The rest of this I think we're going to look for opportunities throughout the district. I mean at the end of the day we're going to try to move some things around and activate the space. So how we do that, I don't have all the answers yet, I'm going to be frank, but we are thinking about it, everything from some entertainment type things to retail uses. So we'11 continue to
think about that.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Is that written into the proposed Zoning now or is that going to end up in the guidelines or is that still something that's going to be worked out?

MICHAEL OWU: I'm Michael Owu from MIT. It's getting addressed in the definition of streets, primary streets and secondary streets and campus streets. We're trying to address some of that in the section of the guidelines.

HUGH RUSSELL: And as Steve points out, there's another phase which is the PUD --
H. THEODORE COHEN: Right.

HUGH RUSSELL: -- the actual PUDs and then the Article 19 and then you' 11 have more information, then we can look at the opportunities.

Any further questions?
(No Response.)

## Has anyone signed up?

LIZA PADEN: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Loretta
Siggers.
LORETTA SIGGERS: Good evening,
Mr. Chair and Members of the Board, Planning Committee. My name is Loretta Siggers. The last name is S-as-in-Sam-i-g-g-e-r-s and I'm with the American Red Cross. And I'm sorry but Jarrett could not make it this evening so I am here instead. But I do want to mention I appreciate all that MIT has presented this evening. We stil1 have not had an opportunity to meet with MIT. We've been trying to plan that meeting, and we finally had that meeting on record for Monday, and so we still haven't really had a chance to really truly go over some of the designs and some of our plans and concerns. And still feel as we're looking through some of the language through the revisions here it still
states some of the language has stil1 stayed in with regard to even though they said there are some setbacks, the paragraph in 80 -- I think it was Section $13: 86$ or 85 maybe it was, 0.5 , still remains there with regards to the six feet. And we only had two concerns in our original e-mail or memo to you, which was that particular paragraph and so that language is still stating. And then if you look at the next page of the revisions, it's taken out the language around the passageways so I'm not sure if it's really clear between that passageway between the two buildings, if that's -- how much space should be between the two buildings is really clear in these new revisions.

So, again, not having the opportunity to have met with MIT to really put some language and numbers of feet around this with still concern with regards to, you know, the distance between our buildings and the
setbacks. So we haven't had a chance to address that.

The other concern that we still
continue to have would be, and that was our only second -- other concern which was the height of the building, which it looks like it still would be somewhere around 300 . I think we had asked if there was that possibility of it not being quite as high. Because again if you look at the building next to us, and that building we will be completely massed on both sides. And so there was stil1 that concern of the height of the building which again doesn't seem like it's been addressed in any of the changes here. So those concerns still remain. And I just want to bring that to the attention as I still went through the revisions here, that those, those concerns were still there. So I think that's all I had to address this evening.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
STEVEN WINTER: Thank you.
Mr. Chair.
HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
STEVEN WINTER: May I ask, Brian, wil1 CDD attend these meetings as well between the Red Cross and the MIT?

BRIAN MURPHY: I don't think we're planning to. We haven't met with the Red Cross previously.

STEVEN WINTER: Okay.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, the next person is James Williamson.

JAMES WILLIAMSON: Thank you. James Williamson, 1000 Jackson Place.

First of all, I continue to have concerns about height which I think can be best expressed by the experience that many people in Cambridge are now finding themselves having when they walk out on to any of the nearby streets and look that way
and see the new Broad building going up at what strikes me as a startling unexpectedly enormous height and mass. And I think that might provide background to what I hope will be consideration of the allowable heights in this district, not that there shouldn't be more density but how much? And the mass of the buildings is important as well. And when I was at the AAAS annual meeting over the weekend and looked out from the Hynes, that building stuck out like an enormous structure in the Kendal 1 Square area.

On transportation, I really don't think you're, you know, paying a lot of attention, it doesn't seem to me, to the transportation conundrums. For the first time ever I was literally unable to get on the Red Line in Kendal1 Square at 5:15. The train was there, the doors were open, it was so packed with people that I literally couldn't get on. And I think it's kind of unfair and disingenuous
to take as your metric whether or not you can get on a train sometime during a full hour as the measure of whether the infrastructure is accepted -- that we currently have is acceptable for what needs to be done here.

On housing, housing is extremely important. I don't know that it's as wonderfully done at MIT as was said. 39 percent of a 50 percent growth in the graduate student body ends up being, you know, a significant -- rather large number of graduate students who are looking for housing in Cambridge and Somerville and contributing to the pressure on rents. And this, so this is a problem not just for MIT graduate students, who I think there's a coalition here that's emerging, house -- MIT really has a responsibility to do, I would argue for 100 percent over time. And the question is what can be done over time, and I'm not sure why there needs to be incentives for something
that should be seen as a moral obligation for MIT. The side of this that sometimes isn't mentioned is the benefit to the community of Cambridge. People can't afford to live here. So this is not just gonna benefit MIT graduate students, this will benefit affordability for the rest of Cambridge. And that sort of leads into my last observation, which I think is really what I came here to talk about tonight, which is transferrable development rights. Done, what I would argue is a proper way. There's a lot of talk about innovation. There doesn't seem to be innovation in the way we do the planning in this instance where if done with the right kind of imagination, we could have what someone would call a win/win situation 1inking Central Square to Kendal1 Square where the development rights to build the kind of density that may be close to what MIT are requesting would be allowed but it would
be -- but MIT and other property owner, Boston Properties, other major corporate developers, would have to buy those rights from Central Square either from property owners or into a fund that would be in the hands of the city. And that money -otherwise they're making huge, huge financial -- there are huge financial benefits here for MIT to take some of those benefits and distribute them to Central Square, to allow the development in Central Square that people want to be of a more modest scale, to have a hundred percent affordable housing in Central Square at four or five stories. To have affordable neighborhood-oriented locally-owned retail in Central Square. To do that without going higher which is some of the people who are involved in the Central Square task force have been suggesting, then you need to have a subsidy. There needs to be some money
involved, not from greater height but from this kind of cross subsidy. So this is a great idea. I'm sorry we haven't had the chance, those of us who've got an interest in it, to put this out on the table sooner, but I don't think it's too late. Transferring the right to develop the kind of density that is being talked about in Kendall, allowing that to happen in exchange for subsidizing a better square and a more modest development and a more affordable development in Centra1 Square .

So, thank you, appreciate it.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Peter Reeve.
PETER REEVE: Thank you. My name is Peter Reeve. I'm a businessowner in Kendal1 Square. My father and I opened 20 years ago. It's a family business in the Boston Properties building, 5 Cambridge Center. We are members of the chamber, a founding member
of Cambridge Local First, member of the KSA, and I'm a member of the K2 Committee.

Kendal1 Square is important to us. Important to our family, important to our employees, and we are happy to see how MIT has come in alignment with the K2 recommendations and supportive of this program. We think that developing these properties in this way is what Kenda11 Square's needed. It's been an awkward space for sometime. It's a small business, walking the streets, servicing the clientele, we need more retail space for local businesses and supportive of this plan. Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you very much. Brian Dacy.

BRIAN DACY: Good evening. I'm Brian Dacy from the Cambridge Innovation Center. And really I want to echo Peter's sentiments. I served on the K2 Committee as well, and we put in a lot of hours, although

I don't know if we come close to what the Planning Board puts in, but -- and it's remarkable I think how MIT's plan now aligns with those recommendations. And we all took this process very seriously, and as I know you do. And I'm very pleased with how this has come out. And the mixed use nature of the plan is just so special and so needed, and this is really Kendall Square's moment in the sun and hopefully it lasts for a while. But, there are cities around the country and around the world that would like to do what Kendall Square does. And we all have different feelings about pushes and pulls of different pieces, but most importantly something good needs to be done, and this is a case where we don't want perfect to get in the way of good. Something good here is going to make an enormous difference to all of us in Kendall; to all of the businesses, to all of the people that live around it, and
to this region and it's an opportunity that shouldn't be missed.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Carol Ballou.
CAROL BALLOU: Carol Ballou, 257
Charles Street. You know this evening I was late because I went to the Harvard Graduate School of Design to watch a man who is on the -- is it the American --

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: Planning association, he's the president.

CAROL BALLOU: President. And it was very interesting because he was talking about density. And what he said was that density is going to get -- going to be the thing of the next 20 years. That people who are older want to be closer in to the city to stores and also said the same thing about young adults. He went through all the different generational groups. And he is out
of Raleigh, North Carolina, and he just did a planning study which he showed us. It was just terrific to see. And I know we've worked with MIT to really pull them together, and I do believe Central Square should be doing the same thing. I mean, that's my gut, because watching this whole play out on this screen tonight was very, very interesting. But I know that we worked with MIT, we'11 be working with them, you know, for a long time. And they are listening, they are coming around, and they are, you know -- I believe in these big structures for housing. You know, we've got to have housing. And I don't care whether it's for 20 -year-olds and I don't care if it's for 60-year-olds, we need housing and we don't have it in Kendall Square and we need it. So I'm all for giving them tons of space to do that with, and so I just wanted to give me support.

Thanks.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you, Carol.
Charles Marquardt.
CHARLES MARQUARDT: Hi, Charlie Marquardt, 10 Rogers Street.

I want to remember that we started this a little over two years ago because I seem to recall going through a snowstorm at WBUR to supposed to fight with Ms. Gallop for the need for more housing. At that time there was 60,000 square feet, give or take, in the plan. We're over 240 now. It's working. The process has been working. I think it's been a great process. We've seen significant changes. Before we had all commercial, maybe a smattering of retail, and a housing afterthought. Now we have a whole building that's going to be devoted to housing up to 300 feet. I wish we went a little bit taller. I know Ms. Sigger won't like that, but I like tall buildings. We've got a better definition of what the entrance to MIT
could be. I'm actually really thrilled about what the gateway could be. MIT needs an iconic entrance to MIT in Kendall Square, not just on Mass. Ave. a mile away. So I think they really have to do something great there and I'm looking forward to seeing what that looks like.

And I think that they've taken the academic piece to heart. There was really not that much in the original plan about what went where and where it would go. They've 1istened. And I think that's what's been shown throughout this entire petition, that they will listen and they've actually adopted, and tonight's presentation showed this crystal clear. But you know what? This is just a petition. I want a whole lot more than a petition. I mean, I look at the expansion space for academic as being important, and they set that aside. But I want the creation of more housing. They're
proposing true mixed income housing. I think it could be one of the first times we ever do this in Cambridge where you have affordable, middle, and market all on the same building. That's like a neighborhood in a building. That's great. And I think that at Broad Canal you're actually starting to see a neighborhood develop. If we could just get someone to work with Glenn Nickrum (phonetic) and get that space taken care of, we will really knit the fabric of that little neighborhood together. And I think the sooner we can get that done the better. And look at the retail options. It's growing. You're starting to see more stuff in there, but more local retail can only happen if you have more space. I think you've heard from the retail consultants and others that there's really nothing now down there. There's no space. Wrapping the rest of Broad Canal and wrapping up and down Main Street,
that will give people the chance to start new businesses. Sure some of them might not work. But you never know what's going to happen there.

And the last piece is innovation. We need more space for innovation. You keep seeing it in other cities, towns. It was just Monday that they were just talking about CIC opening CIC St. Louis and Baltimore. I don't want our people going to Baltimore. I want them to stay in Kenda11 Square. So I'm actually looking forward to the rest of the process. This is just the start. Passing this petition, giving it a favorable recommendation opens up the PUD process and the Article 19 process which I think you can make the real difference on this proposal. This is just creating the envelope. The fun stuff starts in a couple months. Thanks.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you, Charles.

Is there anyone else wish to speak? Barbara, come on.

BARBARA BROUSSARD: I'm sorry, I didn't think we could get to speak this evening. Barbara Broussard, President of the East Cambridge Planning Team. MIT will be coming before the community next Wednesday evening, but as a person who has looked at this change, this petition over two years, I'm happy. I'm more into the innovation housing. I would like -- I don't want to shuttle and I want an elevator. And I don't need a11 that space and a11 the worry. I think it is for everybody, and I'm into the tall building. Maybe it shouldn't be the only housing, but I certainly don't think that Kenda11 Square should be at the brunt of Central Square becoming nice and as it is. They have to do their own part. I really look forward to the other side of the Broad Canal being developed. It's very, very
important. We have business there now, but we need to support them. Innovation space is really key. I certainly don't want Kendall Square to become another urban office park of very large companies. Innovation drives these companies and we need to put more time into entrepreneurial space.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Does anyone else wish to speak?
CHRIS MATTHEWS: Chris Matthews, 26 Sixth Street, Vice President of the East Cambridge Planning Team. I just wanted to echo some of the previous remarks from the neighbors. We've had a really grown up conversation of the last two years, and I feel like we've got to know MIT a lot better, and the people of the Kendal1 Square Association. And I hope we can translate that now into a built reality that represents much more openness and porosity between the
university, the neighborhood, and the businesses that are moving into Kendall Square. I feel that future's bright and the proof will be in the pudding.
Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Does anyone else wish to speak?
(No Response.)
HUGH RUSSELL: I see no one.
So, Brian, are we ready to fill in line to draft us a place where we can forward it?
BRIAN MURPHY: Sure. I mean I think if you like based on what we've done with Forest City what we could try to do is come up with a recommendation for the Board for your reaction at the next meeting, which I believe would be March 5th. Does that seem reasonable? As I'm cavalierly saying that without looking at those people who actually have to write this. Is March 5th reasonable? Is March 12th more realistic?

JEFF ROBERTS: You want to afford enough time to review it, say a week in advance and it's easier to do it that way. BRIAN MURPHY: Is the 12th acceptable?

WILLIAM TIBBS: That gives us --
HUGH RUSSELL: Right, I think, you know, I don't know at what point the Council, the Counci1 is meeting and so we want to get our advice to them. I assume that in the meetings that the Council is having there will be a description of just what we've seen tonight and someone can get up, say an Assistant City Manager, and say the Planning Board has seen this, they're on board and we're writing the recommendation.

BRIAN MURPHY: And right. And is it fair to say that would be a recommendation that was supported by all six members who are here this evening?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. STEVEN WINTER: Yes.

BRIAN MURPHY: Okay.
What we'11 do is work as quickly as we can to get you a formal recommendation, but we will certainly present to the City Council the expectation that that would be forthcoming with a favorable recommendation, and with, you know, giving them some of the background, the background that we gave the Board is sort of in line with what they'11 be seeing.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.
So a while ago I made myself a sheet of all the comments I made on this over the last six months or so, and almost everything's been addressed. There's still some work that's down the road. Some of it is literally things that have to be done in the future: Study of historic buildings, which you're working on. How we, you know, address housing for middle income and for that, the
graduate student housing is actually addressed to that. Some things aren't going to happen. I -- Tom and I had wished that the buildings could be no higher than 150 feet. I think we've both now convinced that that's just not going to accomplish all the goals here. But that there's a process and a review criteria to try to make the 200-foot buildings or 250 -foot buildings fit in properly.

I was interested in James's comment about the Broad building, because as I bicycled down from the Somerville Star Market, I see this now. I think which one of those buildings is it? And I of course it's the Broad building. I think what will happen is in fact what is happening around Museum Towers, which is there will be a district, there will be a new shape to the skyline and Kendal1 Square will -- things that are now sticking up will now blend to be a more
blending effect.
You know, I like Washington, D.C. a lot. You know, could we have enforced a thing, no building can be higher than the base of the MIT dome? I don't think so. WILLIAM TIBBS: The Green Building. HUGH RUSSELL: I'm also pleased, I'm particularly pleased because I put out a challenge, I think it was in September or so, that there be a Zoning proposal for this site which was our proposal, not your proposal. And to hear from Carol and Charlie and Chris and Barbara say that they feel like this is our proposal, I think we feel that way. So I think, you know, the City and MIT have done an enormous amount of work to make it that way. And that pleases me more than perhaps anything.

Anyone want to say anything else? Steve.

STEVEN WINTER: At the risk of
putting you on the spot, Roger, I wanted to give you the opportunity if you wish just to make some comments in a general sense of where this is taking Kenda11 Square and kind of -- and comments, the perspectives that you might have, because you've certainly been involved in the area for a while. ROGER BOOTHE: We11, thank you very much. It's an honor to say something after so many people have already spoken. I'm very happy with this whole process, too, and I share exactly the concern that Hugh and Tom have talked about. I was worried about the heights initially and we've had a lot of discussion with the K2 Committee about that and on staff. And I think the key is that these things will develop incrementally. And I think that's what we've seen over my 33 years in Cambridge, is trying to think incrementally, but with a vision that -- so that the hole is greater than some of the
parts. So we're well poised to do that. I'm happy where we are.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Can I just -- I want to thank everybody on the staff and MIT, but I also want to say that there are some board members who are not opposed to height. You find actually downtown D.C. kind of boring. But I do like height, but not just arbitrarily and I do think, you know, the requirements for housing, and I agree the density is really the need and necessity of the future and that I think that we've reached a good compromise, I think, for what the city needs and what MIT needs and the future of the city and I think that this is very good.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. There's nobody here from the Council tonight.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Don't worry, they'11 get their chance.

HUGH RUSSELL: So are we complete?

| 1 | Thank you very much. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | We are adjourned. |
| 3 | (Whereupon, at 9:45 p.m., the |
| 4 | Planning Board Adjourned.) |
| 5 | * * * * * |
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