


## PROCEEDINGS

HUGH RUSSELL: Good evening. This is the meeting of the Cambridge Planning Board. And the first item on our agenda is the review of the Zoning Board cases.

LIZA PADEN: So on this agenda one of the cases is for the Mount Auburn Hospital which you looked at, I believe it was last week, and you had some comments and suggested changes. So Mr. Sousa is here again with some revisions to the application to show you.

ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Thanks, Liza.

Good evening, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board, Ricardo Sousa on behalf of the applicant T-Mobile. As you recall last time, the nature of our application originally was to expand this existing site from three pane1 antennas to six panel antennas. And you gave us some suggestions on essentially going back
to the landlord and trying to redesign it so we try to get off of the parapet wall. Well in the meantime, during this two-week sort of hiatus that we had, T-Mobile went back and there are some performance issues associated with this site that they've discovered and I think it's going to entail probably a bigger redesign at some point depending on what the landlord's going to be allowing us to do or not to do. Primarily what's happened is that in between the time that we built this installation and today a new building was built, essentially towards the back part of our installation, and that's affecting our signal a fair amount. And so what T-Mobile would like to do at this point -- exactly, that glass building right there -- is to not expand the site in its current existing location, but to essentially just maintain it as just three panel antennas as it currently stands and just substitute the old antennas
for the new ones, not expand to six, but try to clean it up by essentially painting the antennas, the three antennas. And also we've received permission from the hospital to paint the stanchions for the lights as well. Those lights are in use according to the hospital. We did ask that, and they are in use. So we can't take them out, which is something that we entertained, but we can paint them so that they better blend into that parapet wall.

And so our experience with the hospital for a number of reasons, because it's a large institution, because there are -- it's probably not the highest priority list on their list. It takes a while to negotiate a relocation with them, so at this point we're just not going to expand the site. We're just going to keep it at three antennas, paint them to match, and paint the stanchions a darker color as well.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Do you need to go the Zoning Board?

ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: We think we do believe it or not.

THOMAS ANNINGER: To paint them?
ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: No. To replace the old antennas with the new ones, yes. Even though they're the same size. They're both 48 inches in height. Ranjit has taken the position that we need to go back to him. So we made the argument under the -- as I've said before, under Section 64.09 of the Tax Relief Act to simply swap out antennas, and he felt it still needed to go through the Zoning process.

HUGH RUSSELL: We11, that's his job. ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: That's his job, exactly. I respect that absolutely.

HUGH RUSSELL: The simulations are interesting because they show just the change in color and that it's actually, you know,

were thinking a darker, a darker brown to match better with the dark bricks to match the antennas.

HUGH RUSSELL: I think the color you selected that's shown on the rendering looks good to me.

ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Right. We're not going to do grout lines or anything like that. In the past our experience it's better just one flat color.
H. THEODORE COHEN: I know we've been talking about black last time, has that been considered, too?

ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: I think if we were going to come into the roof and do some faux smokestacks, then black would be appropriate. I think here just a darker brown color would be better with the older bricks, the older style bricks.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, so do we give this our acquiescence?

THOMAS ANNINGER: Is the lesson that we have to ask you to rethink it and then you come back and you tell us that you don't have to do it after all?

ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: We'd like to do it, Mr. Anninger, we really would. In this case we would gain an improvement by expanding this site. Because we're going to lose some capacity by staying to three antennas. But to do it right, because we know we're going to have to move away from that location at some point, we think it's better to do it better all at once. Because it's going to be pretty expensive to expand and then move all the way to a different location. But that's always the lesson.

HUGH RUSSELL: So I guess we're saying that we have no objection to proceeding this way, that it seems logical and it's a modest improvement.

STEVEN WINTER: Yes. I would like
to add that we appreciate Mr. Sousa's efforts with the photo sims and his thoroughness.

ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Thank you. HUGH RUSSELL: Now, is there another installation or is that somebody else? ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: That's somebody else.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.
ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

LIZA PADEN: The second antenna installation is a case that you, the comment that you sent to the Board of Zoning Appeal is for the case that the corner of Brookline Street and Putnam Avenue. And on that particular installation the Planning Board recommended that the applicant provide better photo sims that would illustrate how the proposed antennas would look from a distance further away from right on Brookline Street or right on Putnam Avenue.

ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board. My name is Susan Roberts. I'm from the law firm of Anderson and Krieger in Cambridge. With me is David Ford from Center Line on behalf of AT\&T.

So I don't want to repeat information that you may have already looked at, but we did file an application with the BZA on January 31st. It included all of our various site plans and photo sims and various reports and licenses and so forth. My understanding is that at some point the matter was referred to you to take a look at our submittals and that you made a comment that you wanted to see additional photo sims, photo simulations from points along Brookline and Putnam Streets. And photo sims showing how the facility will look amongst the surrounding two- and three-family homes and businesses. So, we have done that, and I wanted to
explain a little bit more about the photo sims and what you're looking at since that is the focus. We understand that that was your on7y issue with our submittal, and that was what you reported to the BZA.

We originally had a BZA hearing scheduled for last Thursday. However, because when we submitted additional materials to you on -- to the BZA rather, on Monday, February 25th, that didn't allow for enough time for your consideration. So here we are. The BZA hearing has been postponed to March 28th so that's when we're going to be before them.

In terms of the photo sims, just to give you an idea of how these work, we asked the engineer to go out and photograph the facility and report back where the facility is seen from. They do take a number of photos, but what you typically see is our photographs taken from where the facility can
be seen as opposed to where it can't be seen. So when you asked for more, we spoke to the A\&E firm, Drew Barry, and said this is it. This is, you know -- these are the only locations that we could tell that the facility could be seen from. And so what we did is we went around to the various locations that you had suggested to take more pictures. And in fact, facility's not visible from those locations. But you have a better sense of -- you have a better sense of, you know, the -- it's a more comprehensive set of photos, so you get an idea of where the facility can be seen from and where it can't be .

So if you're looking at the set which David has very nicely put up here. We welcome you, like the Chairman said, to come up and look. We've basically got eight photo sims for you, and the first four show the facility as being visible. The first one
from the rear of the building which shows the facility -- two of the antennas, on the penthouse. There's a penthouse on the back of the building. So we've got two antennas on the penthouse that will be painted to match the penthouse.

AHMED NUR: Can you show us that on that?

DAVID FORD: Yes, it's right here. The proposed view. This is the actual view versus the proposed view. And it is intended to be facade-mounted to the penthouse and paint to match as well.

ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: So the next photo sim which is taken from Peters and Putnam Streets, No. 2, shows that the -- one of the chimneys is barely visible. You can barely see it from photo 2.

DAVID FORD: Just coming up over that parapet wall right there. This is actual, and this is proposed.

ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: And on the map, so here, here is where the building is right on that corner. So photo 2 was taken from here. So just around the corner.

Photo 3, so along Brookline Street, about a half a block down from the building, and both chimneys are visible from that location in photo 3.

Photo 4 is along Putnam Street behind Putnam Street near Acorn, and the chimneys are visible, the faux chimneys. So what we've got if -- I guess I did not explain what we have. We have two antennas in each of three locations. So we've got two antennas on the penthouse, which we showed you from the back, then we've got these two faux chimneys. In other words, they're going to look like brick chimneys. On the inside they're going to be the two each, four-foot antennas. The chimneys are 10 feet high. They need to be 10 feet high because they
need to project and receive over the parapet, the roof. The roof, if you notice, has this parapet around it. So it needs to be above that in order to receive and send the signal.

DAVID FORD: The parapet extends roughly three feet above the roof, the top of the roof. So in order for us to clear that three-foot parapet wall and not get shadowing, that's why we proposed 10 foot faux chimneys.

PAMELA WINTERS: So the faux chimneys are not there now?

DAVID FORD: No.
HUGH RUSSELL: Can you bring them a little closer?
H. THEODORE COHEN: While she's looking at that, how large are the actual antennas?

ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: So the chimneys are four feet in length. The antennas are four feet in length.

DAVID FORD: This is actual versus proposed.
H. THEODORE COHEN: A11 right, and the chimneys are ten feet?

ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: Correct.
H. THEODORE COHEN: And if we didn't have chimneys and just had the antennas, it would only be four feet in height?

ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: We11, they would have to be mounted. So what's happening is that they're going to be mounted on the ballast. So the -- sorry, the bottom of the chimney still needs to be above the parapet. So you would see the antennas but they would be mounted on like a ballast structure if you didn't have them hidden inside the chimney, which is a possibility.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Right, if we didn't have them hidden inside the chimney, you'd see the parapet. Would you then see the base of the chim -- the ballast that it
was sitting on?
ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: Yes, right.
You would see the ballast. They wouldn't be as high as 10 feet but they would be, you know, seven feet or eight feet. Something like that.

DAVID FORD: Yeah, they would be eight and a half feet if there was no faux chimney involved. They would still be roughly the same height. So the proposed faux chimneys is only adding roughly a foot to the actual instal1 --
H. THEODORE COHEN: And there would be four antennas there?

ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: Right.
DAVID FORD: Two per sector.
ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: Yes.
STEVEN WINTER: What material is the faux chimney made out of?

DAVID FORD: It's fiberglass.
STEVEN WINTER: Okay.

DAVID FORD: Yes.
THOMAS ANNINGER: Can you paint a picture for us for of what an antenna looks like without a chimney?

DAVID FORD: We do have photo
simulations that were done just showing the antennas mounted to our original design which was to mount them directly to the penthouse. This, these designs throughout the photo simulations cane out and we decided we ruled it out, basically it was too visibly impacted to the surrounding community which is why we dumped that design, started over the proposed. The original antennas had four antennas per sector so we kind of revamped that design, did two per sector instead, and then proposed the faux chimney as well after we saw how the old simulations came out and we didn't like the looks.

ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: So in our packet of materials we have a picture of the
antennas themselves. They're not mounted. I don't know if you want to look at it, but we did provide this for you.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Can I see that?

ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: So here's a picture of what they look like and a drawing.
H. THEODORE COHEN: And if they were just without the chimney, without the faux chimney, you would just see some base and the antenna just sticking up there?

DAVID FORD: We11, they would have to be mounted to the penthouse in order to get the height we need. So the original design, like I said before, was four antennas per sector mounted directly to this penthouse as you can see. But due to the height that we need to get to clear the three-foot parapet walls, the antennas would have been sticking up and over the penthouse and we thought that faux chimneys were much better low impact way on the site.

| 1 | H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay. So then |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | to be sure that I understand, so they cannot |
| 3 | be freestanding in the location where the |
| 4 | faux chimneys are just on a pole on a |
| 5 | ballast. |
| 6 | DAVID FORD: They could be. If they |
| 7 | were to be, they would have to be ten feet at |
| 8 | a11. So they're not going down at all more |
| 9 | or less. |
| 10 | H. THEODORE COHEN: So the pole |
| 11 | would be smaller? |
| 12 | DAVID FORD: Roughly one foot, yes. |
| 13 | ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: It would |
| 14 | obviously be less dense. You would see the |
| 15 | antennas -- |
| 16 | H. THEODORE COHEN: Right, you would |
| 17 | see the antennas. |
| 18 | ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: You would |
| 19 | see piping which would be the mount. |
| 20 | THOMAS ANNINGER: I think what Ted |
| 21 | is saying, and he hasn't said this so I'm |

speculating, is that the chimneys, the faux chimneys that you've come up with are a little on the obese side. Overweight.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Bulky.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Yes, bulky. And the two of them is kind of a double, a double problem. So that I think that's what Ted is trying to say, but I trust your judgment that the chimneys are still better than the antennas, then the raw antenna.

DAVID FORD: Right.
THOMAS ANNINGER: Which is I think what you're saying.

DAVID FORD: Well, we're trying to match the surrounding character of the neighborhood. And as you can see from some of the other photos, there are as many rooftop chimneys in the area as here as well. There are rounds. So we just thought that would be the best case scenario and try to match in the character of the neighborhood
and just go with what's consistent and that's why we picked those as faux chimneys.

HUGH RUSSELL: Seems to me that particularly from the streets that are in Brookline Street and from Putnam, this is a pretty moderate or inconspicuous application. As a pedestrian gets close, they disappear behind the roof overhang and parapet. I'm not sure what other options there are in this part of the city for providing service because there aren't already big, ugly buildings sitting there that you can mount antennas on.
H. THEODORE COHEN: I concur that in most all the views you hardly see anything. In this one particular view, you see the two chimneys right next to each or and it's a very large, bulky structure. And generally we applaud putting things in faux chimneys because it looks much better. If it were just one, it would seem to be it would be
fine. If two were spaced out some distance, but I'm assuming you can't do that, that you need them all.

DAVID FORD: We originally thought we would just make one large antenna and have two separate ones, but that was going to look more out of place than having two skinnier, slender faux chimneys.

ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: So if you look at --

HUGH RUSSELL: Faux artist penthouse.

ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: I mean, we've tried to locate them on the rooftop in inconspicuous places. One, as we said, the penthouse is on the back. And two, the antennas are there. And then the other, it's an L-shaped building so the other two chimneys are next to each other again on the side as opposed to in front of Brook7ine street.

| 1 | HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Are we more or |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | less satisfied that they made a real effort |
| 3 | to try to minimize as far as we can tell and |
| 4 | they've succeeded? |
| 5 | STEVEN WINTER: Yes. |
| 6 | DAVID FORD: Thank you very much. |
| 7 | HUGH RUSSELL: We can send that |
| 8 | opinion to the Board. |
| 9 | LIZA PADEN: Yes, I will. |
| 10 | ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: Thank you |
| 11 | very much. |
| 12 | THOMAS ANNINGER: Thank you. |
| 13 | HUGH RUSSELL: Have we looked at the |
| 14 | Lesley wall sign? I've forgotten. |
| 15 | LIZA PADEN: No, you haven't seen |
| 16 | this one. So Lesley University, which is |
| 17 | located on the Mass. Avenue, the new |
| 18 | dormitory building, it has the High Rise |
| 19 | Bakery on the ground floor. It's proposing |
| 20 | to put in a wall sign. And the reason why |
| 21 | they're going to the Board of Zoning Appeal |

is that the location of the wall sign is going to be above the second floor sill 1ine and it says Lesley University in individual letters mounted to the wall at the second floor window line.

STEVEN WINTER: Would you point to it again?

HUGH RUSSELL: You can see the rendering. Probably be a little more visible in reality because of the color will be different.

Where is the entrance to the dormitory?
LIZA PADEN: The entrance to the dormitory I believe is --
H. THEODORE COHEN: It's over here.

LIZA PADEN: Right, around the corner. So the ground floor on Mass. Avenue is all the retail establishments, but when you go into the dormitory itself, it's -- I'm trying to see if it's in this picture or not.

STUART DASH: There's a small little


| 1 | application that they've had. The banner, |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | they withdrew that application. |
| 3 | PAMELA WINTERS: Why, Liza? Did |
| 4 | they not like -- why? |
| 5 | LIZA PADEN: Why they withdrew it, I |
| 6 | can't tell you, I don't know. |
| 7 | H. THEODORE COHEN: Because they |
| 8 | even built in the posts for the banner. |
| 9 | LIZA PADEN: Right. |
| 10 | HUGH RUSSELL: Probably the way they |
| 11 | designed the building for the banner. |
| 12 | PAMELA WINTERS: And so there's no |
| 13 | address on the building itself? |
| 14 | HUGH RUSSELL: We11, presuming the |
| 15 | storefronts have addresses. |
| 16 | STEVEN WINTER: Yes, High Rise and |
| 17 | there's a bank. |
| 18 | LIZA PADEN: Right. There's an ATM. |
| 19 | STEVEN WINTER: Right. |
| 20 | HUGH RUSSELL: And Wendel1 Street. |
| 21 | LIZA PADEN: So this is the Wendell |


| 1 | Street elevation. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | STEVEN WINTER: There's no more |
| 3 | commercial around the corner? |
| 4 | LIZA PADEN: No. |
| 5 | STEVEN WINTER: No. |
| 6 | HUGH RUSSELL: So the front door is |
| 7 | actually way back in the courtyard. |
| 8 | LIZA PADEN: Right. |
| 9 | H. THEODORE COHEN: And there's |
| 10 | another dormitory building -- |
| 11 | LIZA PADEN: In the back -- |
| 12 | H. THEODORE COHEN: -- next to it? |
| 13 | LIZA PADEN: -- yes, on Wende11 |
| 14 | Street behind it. |
| 15 | STEVEN WINTER: I guess, |
| 16 | Mr. Russel1, the question I would have is |
| 17 | what function does Lesley University wish the |
| 18 | sign to serve? Is it way finding? Is it |
| 19 | identification of a building for pedestrian |
| 20 | students? They do have the three campuses |
| 21 | now. |

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. I mean, I think that's the problem with it is that it, it's not clear what the purpose is and it's hard to imagine if you don't know what the purpose is, how do you establish a hardship? STEVEN WINTER: Correct.

PAMELA WINTERS: Right.
STEVEN WINTER: And in fact I think that the banner would look much better there. I'm not sure --

PAMELA WINTERS: I agree.
STEVEN WINTER: -- if it was cloth and attractive and change with some frequency, I think that's a much more attractive front.

PAMELA WINTERS: I agree with you, Steve.

THOMAS ANNINGER: But, you know, it -- if they want to identify this building as belonging to Lesley University and if they want to do it in their own design, graphic
design, I can't think of a lot of reasons why we wouldn't let them do it. I mean, there may be judgments that banners are colorful and exciting and so on, but banners, banners suggest to me something temporary. They wanted something more permanent, and I don't understand why we would not go along with that.

HUGH RUSSELL: Banners also suggest a public access, that's the place that the institution had received approval for banners. It's a place where the public is being -- the banner sort of stands for this is a place that the public might be looking for. I, you know, it just doesn't make sense to me.
H. THEODORE COHEN: We11, if it were not the university and it was just an apartment building that and came in and said that they wanted to be --

STEVEN WINTER: Could the owner put

Walter's Realty on the apartment building if they wanted it. And they said well, Lesley University put it on their building, it's not way finding, it's not an address marker, could we then do the same thing to our building?

HUGH RUSSELL: We11, we had a case like that a little while ago for the Putnam Square Building where -- and the Zoning Board denied that application on our advice.

STEVEN WINTER: The Glass Building.
HUGH RUSSELL: The Glass Building. The numbers -- you don't do that for apartment buildings. This is fundamentally an apartment building. If they wanted to be put a non-conforming, you know, freestanding sign at the entryway or a conforming one, but, you know, if they wanted to direct people to that, then I have no problem with it. I think stray signs floating around buildings is not really what we want around
the city.
STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, to me the, this Board and this staff of CDD has always put emphasis on the devil's in the detail, and it's these little kind of details that really do matter. If that signage does not serve a purpose, then it's static on the urban landscape.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
THOMAS ANNINGER: Well, I don't think we know that it doesn't serve a purpose. It's just that it hasn't been articulated to us. I can understand why they want to identify that building as belonging to Lesley University. I wouldn't know that otherwise. And why can't --

STEVEN WINTER: Sure, it's a Lesley dorm.

THOMAS ANNINGER: But if it doesn't say that how do I know that?
H. THEODORE COHEN: We11, then do we
want every Harvard building, every Harvard dorm to have a Harvard University sign?

HUGH RUSSELL: They all do and they're about this big.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Right, at street 1eve1.

HUGH RUSSELL: At street leve1. Which they're free to do that.

AHMED NUR: We11, in Tom's defense, I actually agree with him a hundred percent. Lesley, in my opinion, is caught in between all these institutions and they're trying to do the best they can to attract, you know, especially local students, to apply. And what does Lesley have for example? You know, in our Town Gown, they talking about fixing plumbing here and there and facing this and that, and Harvard and MIT are out there roaring with their new buildings and sustainability and so on and so forth. And I think this is the biggest thing that they
have, and I think they're entitled. And Lesley, I mean to say this is Lesley going forward. It seems to actually blend in artistically where it's located and I'm fine with it and I support Tom's comments.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Do you have a better picture than what we have?

LIZA PADEN: No, it's the same picture.

HUGH RUSSELL: This is a colored picture without the sign.

STEVEN WINTER: Actually, Liza, who makes this decision about whether or not to give a hardship to the university to put the sign up? Is this a --

LIZA PADEN: That's the Board of Zoning Appeal. They're at the Board of Zoning Appeal for a Variance for the sign.

STEVEN WINTER: And they have to show hardship?

LIZA PADEN: Yes.

STEVEN WINTER: Is that one of the criteria?

LIZA PADEN: Yes, for a Variance.
HUGH RUSSELL: I would suggest that the standard comment we used to make was show us the conforming sign and explain to us why it doesn't work.

STEVEN WINTER: We11, that works for me without taking a stand on whether or not we find that particular sign -- what are the options?

LIZA PADEN: Okay.
HUGH RUSSELL: And I don't think, I don't think that we should be making this judgments primarily on aesthetics. I think it's more than aesthetics. I don't disagree that this is quite an innocuous sign. As you say, it's just static on the urban landscape. But if that static then it becomes shroud, and then everybody who has an apartment building starts putting signs at the second

| 1 | 1 leve . |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | THOMAS ANNINGER: I would urge them |
| 3 | in light of this discussion to do exactly |
| 4 | what happened with the antennas and to come |
| 5 | and talk to this Board and answer the |
| 6 | questions rather than to let us dash an idea |
| 7 | that might be a perfectly good one if it just |
| 8 | were explained a little bit better. |
| 9 | LIZA PADEN: Okay. |
| 10 | HUGH RUSSELL: So in terms of a |
| 11 | report, can we write a report that says that |
| 12 | we don't have an explanation on what the |
| 13 | function of the sign is -- |
| 14 | LIZA PADEN: Right. |
| 15 | HUGH RUSSELL: -- and so it's |
| 16 | difficult to evaluate. |
| 17 | STEVEN WINTER: We have insufficient |
| 18 | information. |
| 19 | HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. |
| 20 | LIZA PADEN: Okay. |
| 21 | PAMELA WINTERS: Steve, one more |

comment. In terms of your comment about the banners, one permanent banner that I find very attractive is the one on the Carriage House going up North Mass. Avenue, the large brick building.

STEVEN WINTER: Yes.
PAMELA WINTERS: And they have, you know, this little triangular permanent banner there and it's sort of metal or something. And, you know, that is -- I find that to be very attractive on that building. But that gives the address. So I don't, I don't know. I just wanted to make that comment is all as an option if they decide to in fact put in a banner or whatever. Anyway, thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.
LIZA PADEN: The other BZA case I wanted to draw your attention to is the first one which is at 40 Granite Street, which is the Morse School. This is in a Residence C district and they are applying to expend the
farmer's market which currently runs from nine to four on Saturdays, and it's the -it's the request that has to come in periodically to get the Use Variance because the farmer's market is not accessory to the school and they're using the parking lot. So I don't know if anybody has any comments on that, but it's been very successful.

HUGH RUSSELL: We supported this in the past.

STEVEN WINTER: And we continue to support these kinds of urban amenities.

PAMELA WINTERS: Definitely.
LIZA PADEN: Okay.
And there are no transcripts.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.
When we take a break I might want to look at some of the plans for some of the other cases but I don't see any that fall under our jurisdiction. I'm curious.

AHMED NUR: I would be glad to step
out.
HUGH RUSSELL: Brian, would you like to give us an update?

BRIAN MURPHY: Sure.
March 12th there will be a public hearing for 19-21 Wendell Street as well as I believe the plan to have a discussion and presumably adoption of rules and regulations for the Planning Board. In addition, there's an extension of the Special Permit at AIB Lesley. They're not certain that they actually need the extension but just to cover themselves given the amount of litigation that they've had, they felt that it was the prudent course, as wel1 as a K2-C2 update. March 19th there will be the Bike Parking Zoning Petition which is, again, just because of the way the procedures work, the Planning Board's Bike's Parking Zoning comes back to you for a hearing which I would assume you would look upon favorably, but
maybe you've changed your mind.
As well as, again, more K2-C2. And on April 2nd, we will have a public hearing on Cottage Park Avenue, which had initially been scheduled for tonight.

We'11 also have meetings Apri1 9th presumably on K2-C2. April 16th there will be a hearing that will be actually at the Central Square Senior Center, and it likely will include the Martin Luther King School's Building Special Permit. And then again three meetings in May.

STEVEN WINTER: Can I ask,
Mr. Chair, can I ask for a clarification?
The meeting on the 16th is a regular Planning Board meeting but we'11 be at Central Square?

BRIAN MURPHY: Correct.
STEVEN WINTER: Okay. And I know I had a -- could you tell me exactly the status of the AIB? Are they in Land Court, out of

## Land Court?

BRIAN MURPHY: With AIB they are now finally done with litigation. The decision had been appealed. The appeal was ruled in favor of Lesley. The time for additional appeal has expired so they are now fully prepared to go forward. Actually spent part of the day today with the University Relations Committee at Lesley, and they are looking to move ahead fairly quick7y. I think there will be opening bids in the next few weeks. And although I don't think they're going to have a traditional groundbreaking they expect to have a celebration for a church moving.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.
So now do we have to take an action on the 33 Cottage Park Avenue?

LIZA PADEN: I had expected Jim Rafferty to be here. He must have gotten hung up. He did send me an e-mail and has
requested that the public hearing be continued to Apri1 2nd at 7:20 and we'11 re-advertise it. I'11 send new notices, they'11 put new placards on the site, and we'11 put the notice in the newspaper.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.
Is there a motion to continue the -- I will say that I formally opened the consideration of the case. And now is there a motion to continue until Apri1 2nd?

STEVEN WINTER: I move to continue based on Liza's report that the City can meet all of the legal guidelines to postpone and reconvene the meeting.

LIZA PADEN: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.
On that motion, all those in favor? (Show of hands).

THOMAS ANNINGER: You really need to open it?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, I think so.

THOMAS ANNINGER: It hasn't even come to us.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. It was on the agenda. We -- I think we need to open it and then continue it.

LIZA PADEN: Right.
HUGH RUSSELL: Now, I wil1 say that I'm concerned that we wouldn't, unless we have new people sitting on the Board on that date, we will not be able to hear that case.

BRIAN MURPHY: I have heard that from others in the Department, and I am quite confident, we will have new members prior to that time.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.
And then I guess we -- can we do anything unti1 8:30?

BRIAN MURPHY: Does it make sense to do rules and regs?

LIZA PADEN: It's not on the agenda. You couldn't take a vote. You could talk

| 1 2 | about what you're going to do when it is on the agenda. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 3 | THOMAS ANNINGER: The what? |
| 4 | BRIAN MURPHY: Rules and |
| 5 | regulations. |
| 6 | H. THEODORE COHEN: The only |
| 7 | objection I have to doing that is I know Bill |
| 8 | Tibbs has a number of questions about them. |
| 9 | PAMELA WINTERS: Right. |
| 10 | LIZA PADEN: Okay. |
| 11 | H. THEODORE COHEN: I think we would |
| 12 | just be spinning our wheels and repeating it |
| 13 | another time. |
| 14 | LIZA PADEN: It's going to be on the |
| 15 | agenda for next week. I have given you a |
| 16 | copy of the highlighted version that was |
| 17 | submitted to me, so that's in your package |
| 18 | for next week as well. |
| 19 | JEFF ROBERTS: If I'm not mistaken |
| 20 | Bill Tibbs won't be here next week either. |
| 21 | LIZA PADEN: Oh, that's right. So |

that's a decision -- you're right, thank you for reminding me.

Bill Tibbs is scheduled to be out of town next week, so a decision has to be made on that.

THOMAS ANNINGER: You can answer his questions personally.
h. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I have.

HUGH RUSSELL: But you're recommending that we wait until we can all discuss it together. And Tom will not be with us after next week, so since he and Ted were the movers in this, Tom could defend his actions.

PAMELA WINTERS: I think we should make Tom stay.
H. THEODORE COHEN: We11, perhaps if we did it next week, but let Bill know that it's on the agenda and if he wants to send in any questions, we can address them at the meeting.

|  | 47 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | LIZA PADEN: Okay. |
| 2 | HUGH RUSSELL: Right. If it plays |
| 3 | out that we need to go back and think about |
| 4 | it some more, then we'11 do it. |
| 5 | LIZA PADEN: Okay. |
| 6 | ROGER BOOTHE: I mean Wende11 Street |
| 7 | case is also -- |
| 8 | LIZA PADEN: But the rules and |
| 9 | regulations are general business. If the BZA |
| 10 | cases are finished today there won't be any |
| 11 | for next Tuesday. |
| 12 | HUGH RUSSELL: We basically can't do |
| 13 | any Special Permit hearings until we have |
| 14 | more members. |
| 15 | BRIAN MURPHY: I think the hang up |
| 16 | at this point is primarily from organized |
| 17 | (inaudible) and I expect it will be from this |
| 18 | week. |
| 19 | THOMAS ANNINGER: What is it? |
| 20 | PAMELA WINTERS: Appointing new |
| 21 | members? |



| 1 | HUGH RUSSELL: That's why I'm |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | rolling my eyes. So, it's been enacted by |
| 3 | the Council. |
| 4 | LIZA PADEN: Yes. |
| 5 | HUGH RUSSELL: And we have rules and |
| 6 | standards. |
| 7 | BRIAN MURPHY: They've gone through |
| 8 | the process with the City Engineer. |
| 9 | HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. |
| 10 | I don't know if people have looked |
| 11 | through the material at their desk but in the |
| 12 | decision that Jeff sent out, Tom and I |
| 13 | suggested some additional language. Jeff has |
| 14 | proposed and it's shown in grey if you |
| 15 | haven't seen that. This would be a time to |
| 16 | look at that. It's really more of expanding |
| 17 | on the process. |
| 18 | STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, is the |
| 19 | only new language then that came in today on |
| 20 | page 1 and 2? |
| 21 | HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, that's correct. |

THOMAS ANNINGER: Can you declare a break, Hugh?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, why don't we be in recess until 8:25.
(A short recess was taken.)
HUGH RUSSELL: All right, we will
start discussing the draft recommendation for the MIT PUD-5 Zoning Petition. We've received a draft and at my request there was some language, introductory language added in to that draft. Jeff, in his wisdom, chose to edit what I put in to make it flow better, and it seemed to work better. I'm not sure whether Tom is fully satisfied, if anything's gotten lost or not in that process.

The point of the added language actually is because the question was raised at the City Council as to why wasn't this a completely unified proposal for all of the districts? And so he thought it was important to explain to the Council why we


#### Abstract

were -- why the Board felt we should proceed the way we were proceeding.


## Tom?

## THOMAS ANNINGER: Yes, I was

 actually we were hoping to warm up and get to this issue later in the discussion, but this is fine. The point that we were trying to make is that there were good reasons why the Board chose the path it did which is to focus on the, on one sector and not the other three. And we could understand why the Council and others might ask why did you do that since this is Kendall Square and the report had been requested of Goody Clancy and others focussed on the whole area, and I don't want to go back over the history of it, but it's a very big area with sectors that have different characteristics, different goals. And we felt that the reports that we received weren't entirely consistent with each other and that it was a bit overwhelmingto try to put our arms around the entire area. And it turned out as we thought more about it, that there was one area in particular where the recommendations and the objectives and the goals could come together in a way that might serve as an excellent starting point for the rest of Kendall Square and it gave us a chance to focus in on the details. And it is all about details in the end. That we honed in on one sector in particular. It was not to favor anybody or to -- there were no deals in that process. And the paragraph that Hugh and I wrote as a supplement to this report tried to capture the reasons for that. I do think that in the integration of that paragraph in with the rest of the report that was done with very short time. What is today, Tuesday?

Yesterday. Lost some of the strength of the argument as to why we did it that way, and I would like to urge Jeff and others to take a
second look at what we had given you to see if you could capture the spirit and reasoning of how we got to where we did. That's a little obscure to -- most of you won't know what we're talking about because you haven't read one report or the other, but I'm reluctant to give you a dramatic reading of one than the other and have you figure out what's missing. That would be even worse. HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. I think the concept that I, I mean you and I see the kind of the logic behind this different -somewhat differently. And I think both things are alluded to here. To me it's more important that we try to achieve a real consensus in each sector and I don't see that the redevelopment authority is, you know, just in the process of reconstituting themselves, is in a position to be a full partner in that discussion, and so that was -- and I think once, once we got them on
board as a full partner in the discussion, we can try to figure out what the appropriate strategy is with the Department of Transportation site which is in fact the most, the largest amount of undeveloped land which -- because I mean, I don't think we can expect that the Department of Transportation is going to say well, here we are, we're a development partner. That's not, that's not what they're going to do. We're probably going to have to figure it out for them and then engage in a battle running over years to come up with the result that we can all be happy with. So, each sector has a different rule. But having the Redevelopment Board, you know, on our side working with us on the DOT is kind of I think produce a much better result than came out of the committee. The committee was a great first draft, but I think we, I think we've got to go beyond first drafts. And I think in the case of
this rezoning, K2 is actually the second draft. The first draft was the initial MIT petition. We have a second draft. We had a third draft a few months ago. And we've got a final draft before us for recommendation tonight. And while I would have hoped we didn't have to take so long, but I have to look at the result and say it's a good result. And I think the argument that Jeff has laid out in the -- and I'd say Jeff because I think he's the one who's responsible for coordinating and pulling it together, but I believe many of the other staff people were very much involved in all of this. So maybe I should say the staff, the Department, laid it all out in a logical fashion, you know, so it's easy to find whatever subject you're interested in. And, you know, so I think that part is done as wel1 as it can be done. It's not -- maybe it's bedtime reading. But anyway. I'm sort
of rambling on.
Does anyone else have a substantive remark to make?
H. THEODORE COHEN: I actually have a couple of questions and I, you know, I think staff did a great job with this and I'm, you know, really very pleased with it. I just still do have a couple of questions, and also with the proposed additions I guess you and Tom worked on and staff revised, I'm quite comfortable with, you know, both versions and I think it's good. But I think one thing that could be added to it is the fact that MIT -- it is MIT's petition and they started the process for themselves. So we took up that sector because that's what came before us. And so, you know, rather than preventing them, if we could to try to go forward, I think it was what was before us and what we had to act upon, and I think it's a great end result and will help guide the
other things.
I do have a couple of small questions. On what had been page, probably is still page 2, where it was talking about new development, I'm just unclear in the sentence, I guess the next to the last sentence where it says (Reading) Smaller scale ground floor retail uses would be exempt from these limitations. I'm just not quite sure what that's referring to and what they are being exempt from.

BRIAN MURPHY: It's essentially that would not count against the gross -- the square footage, the FAR.

STEVEN WINTER: It's an incentive.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay. So that gets to the 5,000 square feet and the 10,000 ? BRIAN MURPHY: Right.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay. Maybe that could just be clarified a little bit.

HUGH RUSSELL: The floor area

## 1imitations?

AHMED NUR: Right.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes. Okay.

And in the next paragraph down about building height and massing it's not clear here, although it does seem to be clear in the actual text where it says: (Reading) The Board would apply the Kendall Square design guidelines developed as part of the K2-C2 planning study. That the Board, you know, whatever Board is in existence at the time, will be following the guidelines that may exist at that point in time and that we're not freezing it at the gate, the guidelines that are being designed for it now. I think the text makes that clear, but, you know, maybe something we want to make clearer upfront.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Say that again.
HUGH RUSSELL: The reference to
the -- will be in reviewing in following the K2-C2 -- the design guidelines. Here it says that would apply the Kendall Square guidelines as developed as part of the K2-C2 planning study. And my understanding is that it would be whatever guidelines that happen to be in existence at that point in time. That they're not freezing the guidelines right now, is that January 2013. And I think that's what the text says.

With regard -- this is on page 9 of 25 where we're talking about this is Subsection $C$ of 13.83.2. I don't really understand, I'm not clear on the meaning of the "but only" clause. You know, we're exempting the gross floor area of any residential institution, dormitory use constructed in certain subdistricts after January 1, 2013. And then I get lost in the remaining clause, but only to the extent that such gross floor area when
taken together with the gross floor area -so forth. It goes back to the January 1, 2013, date and I'm just not sure what that's saying.

JEFF ROBERTS: Should I do this now? HUGH RUSSELL: Sure.

JEFF ROBERTS: Jeff Roberts, CDD. That was language -- it was -- the topic was discussed at the last meeting briefly, and I had consulted with the MIT representatives on this issue of would exempting future residential use have any unintended consequences if existing buildings were torn down and then replaced with particular -with residential uses and how would that be treated? And this is really just a way of saying that in order to get that exemption from floor area limitations from future residential, it has to be above and beyond what's there now. You couldn't start, you couldn't start getting benefits by tearing
things down and replacing the same amount.
And it's an issue that, you know, could conceivably come up at some point in the future if MIT were sort of weighing options in terms of what buildings could be taken down and what they could be replaced with. And this is just to sort of neutralize any sense that there could be any unintended consequences of doing that.
H. THEODORE COHEN: We11, I clearly didn't get that from reading it. So maybe if you could just take a look at that again and see if you can maybe clarify that a little bit.

HUGH RUSSELL: I'm afraid I sti11 don't understand it.

JEFF ROBERTS: What it means is that the --

HUGH RUSSELL: Michae1, do you want to try?

MICHAEL OWU: Sure.

Michael Owu, O-w-u. I think -- MIT.
I think what the intent there is if you took -- if an existing building were demolished, existing residential building were demolished, say it's 100,000 square foot building, if we demolished that building and rebuilt an existing building the same size, and we would not be able to take advantage of the exemption. If we took down 100,000 square feet and built a 200,000 square feet residential, then the incremental amount, the extra 100,000 , we would be able to take exemption but not the initial amount to replace the existing. I don't know if that's any clearer.

HUGH RUSSELL: I guess what I don't understand is why it makes any difference?

MICHAEL OWU: That's Jeff.
JEFF ROBERTS: We're going really deep into Zoning in this one. So this is a, you know, a hypothetical scenario which
probably wouldn't really happen, but imagine that if you had, you looked in -- you look at your overall capacity, overall capacity for development is governed by the FAR in the entire district. And the way this has been written is to allow a certain amount of commercial development, a certain amount of residential development, and a certain amount of residual academic development with the understanding that there are academic and residential and commercial uses that currently exist in that area. So if you looked at a future scenario where you might say well, any future residential is exempt, let's think about tearing down 100 Memorial Drive, rebuilding it to the same amount of floor area, taking that exemption, and by doing that, we've increased the amount of academic capacity that we have because the existing building was built under the old Zoning regime. The new building was built
under -- I mean, under the regime where it's exempt from floor area limitations, so we've done a little, you know, done a little motion and increased the amount of academic that we can build by that same amount of building -of residential development that we tore down. It's --

HUGH RUSSELL: Right, I mean you know another (inaudible) could come along and say I want to build a palace for graduate students that's not in these districts that's just over somewhere, and then the institute would say well, then maybe I want to reuse some of my housing in this district for academic purposes. I mean, that's a scenario that could happen.

JEFF ROBERTS: Right.
HUGH RUSSELL: And the institute would be delighted if someone would come along and give them hundreds of millions of dollars for graduate housing. They would
attempt to take that money and use it. This is sort of an accounting paragraph.

JEFF ROBERTS: Exactly. It's -- and the example I mentioned isn't something that we would necessarily anticipate happening, but it's the kind of accounting issue that could become problematic, you know, 10 years from now when if a certain point, if the institute were looking at some of those existing property and altering them in some way.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, I mean I have to think that the -- I mean, in some way I've been in the city for 50 years, and in some ways it's surprising the things that haven't changed, but some things have changed a lot. I'm inclined to think that somebody's going to have to keep looking at Kendal1 Square every 10 or 15 years and see what the needs are and see what society is like and what transportation is like and respond to that.

is I didn't see anywhere else that we were talking about pedestrian bridges. Does that come into the guidelines or was the decision made to just eliminate the topic completely? JEFF ROBERTS: Yes, it is a component of the guidelines. And the other point is that it's related to the previous page where the discussion of floor plate limitations has been removed, the requirements for floor plate limitations. Without requirements for floor plate limitations, the language about pedestrian bridges is sort of irrelevant because it wouldn't, you know, we've seen projects that have done pedestrian bridges, they're allowed, they're counted as gross floor area. It's -- they only become a problem when you start to constrain the outer shape, the floor plate size of the building.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay. Why don't you stay there.

The next paragraph --
HUGH RUSSELL: Maybe you'd like to pul1 up a chair.
H. THEODORE COHEN: -- about the new -- the setbacks of these buildings. I got lost in that provision. Are we just talking about, you know, setbacks of certain buildings?

HUGH RUSSELL: We're talking about the Red Cross building.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Is that what this relates to?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
JEFF ROBERTS: Can you remind me what section you're looking at?
H. THEODORE COHEN: 13.85.2.

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes. So that section where in the Third Street transition subdistrict along the limited setback boundary which is the first 120 feet of the boundary between that -- so the boundary
that's being referred to is the boundary between the MIT owned property and the Red Cross building.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay, so that's the Red Cross building?

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Fine.

And the next page -- I'm sorry, I didn't go back to look at it. We were talking about height limitations in 13.86.1.1, the deleted -- the sentence (reading) the residential units situated above 250 feet shall not be subject to the provisions of Section 11.203 or 11.204.

What does that relate to?
JEFF ROBERTS: Section 11.203.2 and the corresponding 204 is the inclusionary Zoning requirements. So there was some discussion about how the -- with applying the new middle income unit standard how inclusionary, how it would be treated. It
was the recommendation in K2 that that not have any bearing on the inclusionary housing requirements so they would still apply it throughout the building.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay, great. Okay, the --

HUGH RUSSELL: Now the way it's set up is inclusionary rules go up to 250 feet and the middle income rules apply above 250; right?

JEFF ROBERTS: That's what is, that's what's suggested in the original text, and this revised version amends that so that any residential development --

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.
JEFF ROBERTS: -- would be subject
to -- in its entirety would be subject to the inclusionary housing.

HUGH RUSSELL: I see. The paragraph, we're taking out the not? JEFF ROBERTS: Yes.

STEVEN WINTER: Jeff, this is the part where the middle income housing has a percentage of units for anything that's above 250 feet, but those units are to be spread throughout the building.

JEFF ROBERTS: That's correct. So the -- it's -- the requirement is for the amount of square footage, the floor area for those middle income units is equivalent to 25 percent of the floor area above 250 feet, but those units would be located throughout.

STEVEN WINTER: Okay.
H. THEODORE COHEN: The next section 13.86.1.2 has been deleted. Has that been moved into the guidelines, too?

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: I think MIT didn't actually believe we could get the guidelines done in time.
H. THEODORE COHEN: That's it.

Those were my questions, thank you.

## HUGH RUSSELL: Ahmed.

AHMED NUR: Yes, okay. You took most of it so I only have two left.

I think last time we spoke about the -I brought up the point on page 9 of 25 , Article 13.83 .2 where the FAR exemptions for retail below grade. I think we do have an existing Zoning. And, Jeff, you can correct me if I'm wrong, for mechanical. And my worry is that we give them a total exemption on below grade, and I would like a little bit more language of what below grade is. Is it one step, is it nine inches, is it 50 inches? How far down first off? Right, it makes a big difference how many steps you go down to grade. And, therefore, by giving exemption that we have an existing exemption for mechanical, I thought that maybe the mechanical equipment in the basement now no longer needs to be in the basement because we've already given them the exemption and
they would be in backyards and rooftops and other things. So that hasn't been addressed yet. If you want to answer that one, I got one more to go.

JEFF ROBERTS: Sure. Let me try to clarify what you're asking.

So you're asking that the -- what the relationship is between the exemption from 4 A limitations of retail uses that are below grade -- oh, and first to answer the specific question, no more than one floor below grade means could be partially below grade or could be entirely below grade as long as the floor above it isn't also below grade. So you can't go too -- if you take any, anything that's at grade and you go to the next story down, that's what counts. You can't go then further, further below that.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. You'd use the Building Code definition of story above grade?

| 1 | JEFF ROBERTS: Essentially, yes. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | AHMED NUR: What is that? |
| 3 | HUGH RUSSELL: It's rather difficult |
| 4 | to explain but it's written down -- yeah. |
| 5 | AHMED NUR: Okay. It's written down |
| 6 | somewhere? |
| 7 | HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. |
| 8 | AHMED NUR: Don't worry. |
| 9 | JEFF ROBERTS: Definitions are |
| 10 | AHMED NUR: The definition is |
| 11 | partially below grade. |
| 12 | JEFF ROBERTS: Right. |
| 13 | There are definitions of what grading |
| 14 | is. |
| 15 | AHMED NUR: Okay. |
| 16 | HUGH RUSSELL: There is a matter now |
| 17 | with ADA, you can't put things a few feet |
| 18 | below grade because it's really hard to get |
| 19 | to them if they're retail. So, the old |
| 20 | split, the split system of up and down things |
| 21 | simply is very, very difficult to accomplish |

and it's -- I think the intention here is that there would be a retail use at grade, they might have retail uses in the basement like the recently opened Burger Palace in Harvard Square.

JEFF ROBERTS: Might have an
extended space or might have support storage or other types of space that makes it, might make it easier to operate that retail space as intended. And I think the rationale and maybe the point that you were getting at is that many of the types of uses that you find below grade in a new building, which would include mechanical space, parking, those types of uses are already exempt. So I think the logic was if you were doing something within that below grade area that would help to support the retail uses that are happening above it, and then we wouldn't have any problem also treating that as exempt. Rather than having the ground level retail exempt
and all the parking and mechanicals on the below grade exempt but then somehow having to count any, you know --

AHMED NUR: Right. I just wanted a language that monitors existing mechanical and other exemptions in there now that doesn't mean that we now can take those out of there because we've given them full, you know, retail is going in there and it's exempt as it is not to count towards the FAR. So, you know.

JEFF ROBERTS: I see. I think I see your point.

Is it a concern that having, that allowing retail use to be on the below grade would result in mechanical space being located above grade?

AHMED NUR: Above grade, yeah. They can try to find the exemptions for those areas.

JEFF ROBERTS: It's certain1y been
and the Planning Board has looked at in design review has looked at buildings with an eye towards what mechanical uses are located where and what impact they have on abutters as part of that review. So I mean -- while a lot of mechanical space is in the basement, you know, there's mechanical systems that are above grade and they're on the rooftop and other places because -- out of necessity. AHMED NUR: Okay, thank you.

The second question that I have is page 5 of 25 , Article 13.89 .4 specifically requirements of sustainability revised. And here we're suggesting that future academic buildings, basically because of its specialized nature, which I'm not sure what that means, may not particularly lead to LEED Gold standards. (Inaudible) and the petitioner and city staff will help clarify additional measures that would apply to improve the energy, so on and so forth. So I
just want to --
HUGH RUSSELL: Let me give you an example. The last building we did for Harvard was under the Harvard regime of old buildings and (inaudible) buildings. We were building a refrigerated storage building in Southboro to contain 2 million books. And you better believe me, believe me when I say the university was extremely interested in energy efficiency. That's always been an issue with these repositories. But when you start taking the rules, there aren't any LEED rules, you measure it against a standard for that building type, there's no standard for a book storage warehouse, and there's nothing -- it's a huge box with a mechanical room and a couple of additions to the retail space, no place to do anything. So, there was a case where the university decided themselves that they would be as efficient as they possibly could be, and that's kind of the standard
that's written in here, but they wouldn't bother to try to do the paperwork because it wasn't going to work. You can think of -- I mean it's -- I don't know whether the Harvard nanotechnology building met the Gold LEED standard. That's the building that's built under the courtyard behind the Science Center as -- it's a three-story underground building, two floors of mechanical sandwiching the nano tech labs. I mean, I have no idea what the energy issues are there. Clearly they're very good in terms of throwing away energy in the sunlight, but what's needed to keep the nanotechnology equipment functioning is a tremendous amount of mechanical equipment. Again, does that fall within the purview? This is stuff like that that we're trying to write that in. And while MIT is not up to the Harvard LEED standards, maybe some day they wil1 catch up. Or sorry your Vice President isn't here
tonight.
STEVE MARSH: We'11 take that back to him.

HUGH RUSSELL: It's not really extraordinary that Harvard which is, you know, is now apparently the greenest major university in the world and how did it happen here? It probably happened because one extraordinary individual who came to lead that effort now, a very wise Vice President who hired her when he first met her and said make this happen here. It doesn't happen very often.

STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, I want to
remind you that I sent you an e-mail that talked about, in the Harvard sustainability newsletter, the sustainability has pointed out that Harvard recycled more cans than Yale. And in fact, it's about that kind of behavior change that that's where Harvard really hit the home run, is changing
behaviors by burrowing in like that and finding the really important issue beating Yale.

HUGH RUSSELL: And was that on a per capita basis? Because I could imagine the Yale consumption of cans might have exceeded Harvard?

PAMELA WINTERS: I also wanted to point out, too, that the whole green initiative was initiated by President Summers which not too many people know.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. So let's go back to work.

Sorry for that diversion.
STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair.
HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
STEVEN WINTER: Just two smal1
points. The first is I -- I'm very impressed with the text that you and Members of the Board and the staff added. I think it's terrific. I think that that's -- that was
needed. And I also think that that text brings forward the vision that you had earlier, which is let's make this something that comes from a lot of different people. Let's not make this something that MIT said here's what we want, boom, lay this on the table. This vision comes from a lot of different sources, and I think we've effectively said that. We've documented that, we've bookmarked that.

The other thing I wanted to say is that on the overview of recommended modifications, page 4 of 25 and 5 of 25 , I went through each one of those, and each one of those sets up a defensible position so this, the language was correct, I want to congratulate, Brian, your staff for the language that they used. This is really tight language. This really looks good. So I simply wanted to add those two points.

PAMELA WINTERS: So I guess I had
one quick question. And so, Tom, and, Tom, I apologize but while you were making your comments, I was reading those paragraphs on page 1 and 2, and I just wanted you to repeat just a sentence or two. Did you say that you wanted more historical information in those paragraphs or you were not pleased? It sounded like you weren't pleased with something. And I just wanted you to reiterate that. And I apologize for not listening more carefully to your comments.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Well, it wasn't easy to understand. I was quite a little bit short.

As I've been thinking about it since -while others were talking, I now think the better way to handle this section, which -let me explain what this section does. This section tries to put in a broader context the path we went down and working only on the MIT sector even though Kendal1 Square is so much

PAMELA WINTERS: Right.
THOMAS ANNINGER: And why we did that. And I don't want to go back over the reasons. There are a number of them, but I think they're good, strong ones. I now think it would be better to take these paragraphs out and put them in a cover letter from Hugh.

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay.
THOMAS ANNINGER: I think that would work better and give us a chance, give us a chance to be freer in the way we word it. Because it is an awkward fit. And I think that was, that's the heart of the problem. The tone of what we were trying to say did not match the tone of this which is more business-1ike and that's where I'd like to end up. And I'm hoping that Hugh would agree with me.

It's rare that we don't agree, right, Hugh?

HUGH RUSSELL: And I've been sort of trained over 25 years to restrain the editing by committee in Board meetings function, so I've sort of turned that off. I think your -- does it work better as a cover letter or in here? I'm not sure. I think I'd like to see a little -- I'd like to see some of the -- I think there are a couple of minor missing emphasis and comments that ought to be there. I think ultimately if the comments are there, the form is less important. So I'm not coming down on either side because I don't like to do that. I think, you know -we11....

PAMELA WINTERS: Could both things be done? Could this happen and also a cover 1etter explaining the Board's decision to add, you know, and be a little bit more -give it a little bit more depth? I don't know.

HUGH RUSSELL: I don't know, to me
this first part looks like a cover letter. ROGER BOOTHE: We11, yes, it was really meant to be that.

PAMELA WINTERS: Oh, okay. HUGH RUSSELL: So I mean it could just be that you start on a new piece of paper when you get to overview of the proposal on that, helps to clarify the organization and then kind of -- if you had the time to think about all this Jeff?

JEFF ROBERTS: We11, I'11 say that as Roger just commented, you know, the introduction to the Planning Board recommendation is really meant to encompass that, the larger context of how the Board -what the Board heard and how it arrived at its decision. Having a separate cover letter not officially as the Planning Board recommendation would be somewhat unconventional. So I don't know. I don't really know what the procedure would be for
doing that. I will say that, you know, I'm happy to either take any specific suggestions and to work those comments back into the draft. If you wanted to -- I don't have a copy with me, but I could circulate the original language for Board Members to look at and decide whether that should be included as a section.

BRIAN MURPHY: The one other thing I would say, though, is that I think if it's at all possible, there is an ordinance hearing tomorrow -- no, sorry. Thursday rather, Thursday afternoon. So I think the Council's goal would be to have a formal communication from the Planning Board for that Thursday meeting if that's possible. If it's not, I understand but I think that would be the Council's goal.

STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair. Might I suggest that the Board ask the Chair to work with staff to the extent that you feel it's
necessary on the text, on the formatting issues, and your decisions are fine with me, I can tell you that.

HUGH RUSSELL: I'm just trying to see if I can wiggle out from under that because I'm -- I mean, I think, you know, Tom's training is as a lawyer with words and I'm an architect and I use words but I also -- my training's in pictures. So I would prefer actually to say, Tom and Jeff, put your heads together and if there's a little, if there's fine tuning that's needed, to do it. I'm thinking Jeff's argument about the format question is a good one, that it needs to be a single document, you know, whether there's a page break between one part or another, that's, you know, we're a green city, we shouldn't be putting in blank paper.

STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, you've done a fine job of wiggling and I appreciate that. I'm happy to have at your direction,
to have Tom work with staff. That's fine. I don't want to do did by committee.

HUGH RUSSELL: Do you want to do that?
H. THEODORE COHEN: I'm fine with that. I mean, as I read this, I thought the first page was the introduction to the general recommendation and I can see feeling that this told three-quarters, four-fifths of the story, but there was a little piece that wasn't covered and that was added. I'm fine with that, and I'm, I mean, it seems we're so there --

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
H. THEODORE COHEN: -- that to not get something to the Ordinance Committee for Thursday would be a disservice to them. And if, I'm quite comfortable with Tom or Hugh working with Jeff and just finalizing it.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. And it might be possible to adjourn the meeting and ask
them to sit down for ten minutes and do it.
PAMELA WINTERS: Are you willing?
THOMAS ANNINGER: Yes, I'11 do it.
PAMELA WINTERS: Okay.
HUGH RUSSELL: And I can refer it.
So would someone like to make a motion to send this recommendation to the City Counci1?
H. THEODORE COHEN: We11, I'11 move to recommend the MIT Zoning Petition subject to the changes that have been recommended by the Planning Board and its staff as encompassed in the draft we've reviewed this evening, subject to final fine tuning by staff and members of the Planning Board and its signature by the Chair.

JOHN HAWKINSON: Mr. Chair, did the public meeting take place?

HUGH RUSSELL: No. Does any member of the public want to be heard on this subject?
(No Response.)
JOHN HAWKINSON: Just checking.
HUGH RUSSELL: We haven't formally adopted those rules yet, but maybe. We've got to keep that in mind. Okay.

So we have a motion on the table. Is there a second?

AHMED NUR: Are we going to close the public hearing now? Do we need to close the public hearing?

HUGH RUSSELL: The proposing rules say if we take a vote and then it automatically closes the hearing. We don't need a separate motion.

## Is there a second?

AHMED NUR: Second.
STEVEN WINTER: I have a comment. I simply want to make sure that when we forward this, we forward it with our great enthusiasm. I think we need to say that this is a very, very powerful document and that we
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| $\begin{aligned} & 54: 5 \\ & \text { unified }[1]-50: 19 \\ & \text { unintended }[2]- \\ & 60: 12,61: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 93:16, 94:6 } \\ & \text { vote }[2]-44: 21,91: 12 \\ & \text { voting }[1]-92: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Winters }[1]-1: 11 \\ & \text { wisdom }[1]-50: 11 \\ & \text { wise }[1]-80: 10 \\ & \text { wish }[1]-29: 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | W | WITH [1] - 93:19 |
| 71:11 <br> university $[5]-31: 18$, 35:14, 78:9, 78:19, 80:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { wait }[1]-46: 10^{\text {wall }[9]-4: 2,5: 11,} \begin{array}{l} 7: 16,14: 20,16: 8, \\ 25: 14,25: 20,26: 1, \\ 26: 4 \end{array}, \end{aligned}$ | WITNESS ${ }_{[1]}$ - 95:11 <br> word [1] - 84:12 <br> words [3] - 15:17, $\text { 88:7, } 88: 8$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { University [9]-25:16, } \\ & \text { 26:3, 27:11, 29:17, } \\ & 30: 20,32: 3,33: 15, \\ & 34: 2,42: 8 \\ & \text { unless }[1]-44: 8 \\ & \text { UNLESS }[1]-95: 19 \\ & \text { up [25] - } 5: 2,13: 17, \\ & \text { 13:19, 14:19, 20:10, } \\ & \text { 20:19, 22:2, 35:15, } \\ & 38: 4,42: 21,47: 15, \\ & 48: 9,51: 5,54: 13, \\ & 56: 16,61: 3,68: 3, \\ & 70: 8,72: 5,74: 20, \\ & 79: 19,79: 20,82: 14, \\ & 84: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { walls }[1]-20: 18 \\ & \text { Walter's }[1]-32: 1 \\ & \text { wants }[1]-46: 19 \\ & \text { warehouse }[1]-78: 15 \\ & \text { warm }[1]-51: 5 \\ & \text { ways }[1]-65: 15 \\ & \text { week }[9]-3: 9,4: 3 \text {, } \\ & 45: 15,45: 18,45: 20, \\ & 46: 4,46: 12,46: 18 \text {, } \\ & 47: 18 \\ & \text { weeks }[1]-42: 12 \\ & \text { weighing }[1]-61: 4 \\ & \text { welcome }[1]-13: 18 \\ & \text { well... }[1]-85: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { works }[1]-36: 8 \\ & \text { world }[1]-80: 7 \\ & \text { worry }[2]-72: 10,74: 8 \\ & \text { worse }[1]-53: 9 \\ & \text { write }[2]-37: 11 \text {, } \\ & 79: 18 \\ & \text { written }[4]-63: 6, \\ & 74: 4,74: 5,79: 1 \\ & \text { wrote }[1]-52: 13 \\ & \text { www.reportersinc. } \\ & \text { com }[1]-1: 21 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Update }[1]-2: 6 \\ & \text { update }[2]-40: 3 \text {, } \\ & \text { 40:15 } \\ & \text { upfront }[1]-58: 18 \\ & \text { urban }[3]-33: 8 \text {, } \\ & 36: 18,39: 12 \\ & \text { urge }[2]-37: 2,52: 21 \\ & \text { useful }[1]-27: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Wendell }[7]-28: 20, \\ & 28: 21,29: 13,40: 6 \text {, } \\ & \text { 47:6, 48:17, 48:18 } \\ & \text { wheels }[1]-45: 12 \\ & \text { WHEN }[1]-93: 20 \\ & \text { WHEREOF }[1]-95: 11 \\ & \text { whole }[2]-51: 15 \text {, } \\ & 81: 9 \end{aligned}$ | ```Yale [3]-80:19, 81:3, 81:6 years [5]-54:12, 65:7, 65:14, 65:19, 85:2 yellow [1]-66:9 yesterday [1] - 52:19``` |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { uses [9] - 57:8, 60:15, } \\ & 63: 11,73: 9,75: 3, \\ & 75: 12,75: 15,75: 18, \\ & 77: 3 \end{aligned}$ | wiggle [1] - 88:5 <br> wiggling [1] - 88:20 <br> willing [1] - 90:2 <br> window [2] - 26:5, <br> 27:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Zelinski [2]-95:4, } \\ & 95: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| V | Winter [1] - 1:11 <br> WINTER [38] - 9:21, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Zoning }[18]-2: 5, \\ & 2: 17,3: 5,6: 2,6: 15, \end{aligned}$ |
| ```Variance [3]-35:18, 36:3, 39:4 various [3] - 11:10, 11:11, 13:7 version [2]-45:16, 70:13 versions [1]-56:12 versus [2]-14:11, 17:1 Vice [3]-1:10, 79:21, 80:10 view [4]-14:10, 14:11, 23:16 views [1] - 23:15 visible [6] - 13:10, 13:21, 14:17, 15:7, 15:11, \(26: 9\) visibly [1]-19:11 vision [2]-82:2, 82:7 volume [3]-93:14,``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:18, 18:21, 25:5, } \\ & \text { 26:6, 27:16, 28:16, } \\ & \text { 28:19, 29:2, 29:5, } \\ & \text { 29:15, 30:6, 30:8, } \\ & 30: 12,31: 21,32: 11, \\ & 33: 2,33: 17,35: 12, \\ & 35: 19,36: 1,36: 8, \\ & 37: 17,38: 6,39: 11, \\ & 41: 13,41: 19,43: 11, \\ & 49: 18,57: 15,71: 1, \\ & 71: 12,80: 14,81: 15, \\ & 81: 17,87: 19,88: 19, \\ & 91: 17 \end{aligned}$ <br> WINTERS [20] - <br> 16:11, 28:3, 28:12, 30:7, 30:11, 30:16, 37:21, 38:7, 39:13, 45:9, 46:15, 47:20, 81:8, 82:21, 84:2, 84:9, 85:15, 86:4, 90:2, 90:4 | $\begin{aligned} & 35: 17,35: 18,40: 17 \\ & 40: 19,50: 8,62: 20 \\ & 63: 21,69: 18,72: 8 \\ & 90: 10 \end{aligned}$ |
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