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## PROCEEDINGS

HUGH RUSSELL: Good evening. This is a meeting of the Cambridge Planning Board, and we have a request to take our General Business item on Discovery Park first. And if there's no objection, I would like to proceed that way.
Mr. Schlager.

ROBERT SCHLAGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Robert Schlager on behalf of Cambridge Discovery Park Planning Board Permit No. 198. Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for accommodating me this evening. I'm embarrassed to te11 you my commitment, but my wife got tickets to a concert at the last minute and surprised me at 2:30 this afternoon. So, again, thank you very much for your accommodation. I guess what I would like to do and how I would like to approach
this is just give you a quick background on Cambridge Discovery Park.

We acquired Cambridge Discovery Park, formerly known as Acorn Park in 2001. And were confronted with the vacation and abandonment facility. When we acquired the property, there was a 55,455 space parking lot -- is this working? 454 space parking lot that was leased for many years to Arthur D. Little and that land was owned by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. We are in turn restored that land to a vegetated wetland as it exists today. In addition to that, we've constructed three buildings; building 100 which is leased to the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory, a six-story 150,000 square foot building; building 200 and 300 which were consolidated into one building which is now leased to

Forester Research occupying approximately 200,000 square feet. And what we are now here for this evening is to propose a hotel on the site of building 600 which is along Route 2's eastbound ramp in the district of Discovery Park.

The original master plan concept had provided for 820,000 square feet of office space, and what we would like to do is to take a portion of that 820,000 square feet and reduce it by approximately 7,000 square feet being proposed which will create a Hilton Garden Inn Hote1 on the site of the building 600. In comparison, the hotel project compared to an office building essentially uses less parking, roughly 50 percent of an office building. The hotel project doesn't alter the concept of the master plan. In terms of density, there's no
change to the total square footage. The hotel project also doesn't impact the floor area ratio. The hotel project doesn't alter the master plan for the campus. We still intend to construct the remaining 250-odd thousand square feet of space whether it be laboratory space, office space or the like. And in terms of land usage, there's no impact on the hotel project. At this time we do not intend to construct our garage $B$. Parking is capped at approximately 150 parking spaces. We do have some challenges that we are trying to overcome with respect to the PTDM plan, and Parking Transportation Department which we are working on. I am not on the those preferred developer lists anymore by Sue Clippinger. We have a tenant Forester who is in substantial compliance with their TDM regulations and parking and, transportation
however, there's a couple of deficiencies that we continue to work through those with Sue and her department. The deficiencies are essentially Forester pays approximately $\$ 115$ per month in transit subsidies and their obligation is to pay roughly $\$ 230$ per month in transit subsidies. They also pay for parking at the rate of $\$ 105$ per month, and I believe we are required to be charging $\$ 125$ per month. All of those issues we are aware of and cognizant of working with the department and resolving it.

The hotel project also does not alter any of the internal circulation of vehicles. And in all respects in terms of height it's considerably less than we're proposing a four-story building versus the approval under our master plan Special Permit for a six-story building.

We received inquiries over the years from several hote1 operators and XSC hote1s out of Newbury, Vermont, as brought to you us Hilton Garden Inn. And we're here this evening to request your approval as a Minor Amendment to allow for the construction of a Hilton Garden Inn which would have approximately 150 hotel rooms, including a cafe, restaurant, bar, indoor swimming pool, a health facility, and a small conference center. The ballroom, the restaurant area would be about 4500 square feet, nothing of significance.

I guess what I'd like to do at this point is turn things over to Add, Inc., our architects and hopefully Larry Grossman has arrived. He has. And we'11 take it from here.

Thank you.

## HUGH RUSSELL: I think before we

 proceed with that I think the question -- we should address the question of whether it's a Major or a Minor Amendment. I think, I think we probably don't need a design presentation to address that question. Should it come out in the way that the proponent would not like, then it would be a waste of time. So, we have a memo from the staff that discusses, among other things, the Major/Minor Amendment question. And I read it once, but maybe it would be best if the author of this memo would explain it to us.Is that you, Jeff?
JEFF ROBERTS: Sure.
Jeff Roberts, Community Development.
I'11 make it quick because I think it's sort of laid out in here and hopefully everyone has a copy of it.

The Major Amendment -- the Major/Minor amendment process applies to PUDs. This is not, but because of the Zoning District it's in and because of the provisions of the Special Permit, it is allowed to seek Major or Minor Amendments and according to the same process that applies to PUDs. The difference is this is just a Special Permit. So unlike a PUD, it doesn't have to go through a two-hearing process. It's just an amendment to the Special Permit. But there could be considered Major or Minor. And the Planning Board decides whether they're Major or Minor. I can -- the Applicant read a little bit of it, but I'11 try to read the whole thing.
(Reading) Minor Amendments are changes which do not alter the concept of the PUD in terms of density, floor area ratio, land usage, height, provision of open space or the
physical relationship of elements of the development. Minor Amendments shall include, but not be limited to small changes in the location of buildings, open space or parking or realignment of minor streets.

And then Major Amendments represent substantial deviations from the PUD concept approved by the Planning Board. Major

Amendments shall include, but not be limited to, large changes in floor space, mix of uses density, lot coverage, height, setbacks, lot sizes, open space, changes in location of buildings, open space or parking, or changes in the circulation system.

So it's the Planning Board's role to interpret what that means for a particular case. We pointed out in the memo that in the past it's been the Planning Board's practice when there's a significant change of use,
when a whole building is part of a project, it's shifted from one use to a different type of use, the Planning Board has treated that as a Major Amendment, but it can be evaluated on the merits of proposal.

HUGH RUSSELL: So it's my
understanding that hotel use is a permitted use in this district, but that permit that we issued did not include any language that would have allowed a change of use to a hotel use. We didn't consider that at the time. That was my recollection, wasn't it, on the table? Although we as a Board know that phase developments often go through changes.

So my own feeling about this is that there's nothing wrong with the proposal in change of use, but I'm -- unless we can find some wiggle room in this language, I'm reluctant to call it a Minor Amendment.

So does anyone have any other thoughts
on this?
STEVEN COHEN: Jeff, I had a question. I don't have the text in front of me. Did you say that a Minor change would include a change in land use whereas a Major Amendment would involve the mix of uses?

JEFF ROBERTS: I'11 try to narrow in just on that, just on the words that are used. I won't read the whole thing again. But Minor Amendments are changes that do not alter the concept of the PUD in terms of a number of things, including land usage, is the term that's used.

STEVEN COHEN: Which do not alter?
JEFF ROBERTS: Which do not alter the concept in terms of land usage.

Minor Amendments shall include a number
of things and change in use is not included
in the list of examples of Minor Amendments. Major Amendment shall include, but not be limited to, a list of things, including
large changes in things including mix of uses. So that's the parts I guess to isolate.

STEVEN COHEN: Gotcha.
HUGH RUSSELL: So we have to
determine if it's a Major or Minor Amendment.
TOM SIENIEWICZ: My reading of this memo prior to the hearing gave me the distinct impression that it was a Major Amendment, especially in light of the change of the use. And then tonight actually I have a question which we can hold after fellow Board members get a chance to speak, I guess I'm learning that you're not intending to build garage $B$, so that looks like another fairly significant change to the plan.

HUGH RUSSELL: I think that's at
this time.
TOM SIENIEWICZ: I see.
HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
TOM SIENIEWICZ: Okay.
HUGH RUSSELL: It's not needed unti1
it would be needed in the future?
ROBERT SCHLAGER: There's surplus
parking in garage A .
TOM SIENIEWICZ: Yes, okay. So I also understand that the height of the -having heard your presentation, the height of the hotel is two stories shorter than the office building that was proposed there in 2004.

ROBERT SCHLAGER: No, sir, the
office building on building 600 was always proposed to be less in height than buildings 100, 200, 300, 400.

ERIC WEIANT: Because the parkway
Overlay District we have to go down two ramps.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Okay, but is there a change of height in the mass of that building, building 600?

ERIC WEIANT: In the dimensions of the footprint of the building, yes. But not in height.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Okay.
ROBERT SCHLAGER: I would just add as Jeff read, large uses, this particular use building 600, would be less than eight percent, nine percent of the total floor area of 8200 -odd thousand square feet. So this would be a small change in that.

ERIC WEIANT: And it's not clear that it's a complete change of the entire building because the design guidelines, as
you may recal1, encourage the addition of restaurants and cafe spaces. We've done that for building 200 Forester. Building 600 might have had a restaurant cafe of similar size on the first floor and there's other public type spaces on the first floor of the conference room and the ballroom, so really it's the upper floors that go from office lab to hotel, but it's not a complete change of a building to the extent that that's a trigger point.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: And one last point, Mr. Chair. And I, it seems to be a change at least in the detail of the open space that's looking at it kind of a blank test over the three master plans, it's very helpful actually to see them in sequence, kind of noting the ways in which the landscape was detailed and also what was paved and what
wasn't paved as compared to the time. There seem to be significant changes obviously reflecting the new program elements that you're proposing tonight, but it appeared to me that there were some significant changes. And given that public open spaces, really the proper purview of this Board, I mean I think that's something to look at.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I think I share your thoughts, Mr. Chair, that I'm generally supportive of the proposal, but I do think that it probably is a Major Amendment. It is a Major Amendment, and that that requires certain procedures that we go through.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. Principally the advertising and the ability of the public hearing.

STEVEN COHEN: Yes, I would only
edify, you know, we're not constrained by the language of the Ordinance. I might be inclined to say that it seems like a Minor change, but unfortunately there is an Ordinance and we are constrained by the actual words, and the words seem to suggest that a change in the mix of use is such that presented constitutes a Major Amendment. I want to make that review of it as a Major Amendment as painless and quick as possible, but it does seem to me by the language that we're dealing with that it's a Major Amendment.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, so is that a motion to make that finding?

## STEVEN COHEN: Yes. So moved.

 HUGH RUSSELL: Second?Pam.
Any discussion on the motion?

Okay, voting as to that -- an
affirmative vote is that this would be a Major Amendment.

A11 those voting in a Major Amendment.
(Raising hands.)
HUGH RUSSELL: And that's al1
members of the Board.
(Russel1, Sieniewicz, Winters, S.
Cohen, Nur, Connolly.)
HUGH RUSSELL: So Mr. Schlager wil1
get to his concert, but he probably won't be as happy. I think there's no point in going on now, because we have to advertise. I
would encourage you to work with staff on any unresolved items.

ROBERT SCHLAGER: Thank you very
much. See you in a couple months.
PAMELA WINTERS: Enjoy the concert.
HUGH RUSSELL: The next item on our
agenda is the update by our Assistant City Manager.

BRIAN MURPHY: There are a few more additions making their way through process as well as the Ordinance Committee. November 20th at four is the Ordinance Committee hearing on medical marijuana. November 21st at $3: 30$ is the Ordinance Committee hearing on the Lutz Petition for Richdale Avenue up on Walden Street. November 22nd at 9:30-- the 22nd at 10:30 in the morning the Ordinance Committee hearing on the Chun Petition which would be rezoning in the Cambridge Highlands from Res $B$ to Res $\mathrm{A}-2$.

And December 4th is a hearing for municipal smoking in the park with the Ordinance Committee hearings.

Items coming up in terms of the
Planning Board, the 19th you've got the Chun

Petition, Norris Street design approval, 50 Binney Street, 840 Memorial Drive, and then a couple of Board of Zoning Appeals cases on AT\&T antennae for 840 Memorial Drive and 1925 Mass. Ave.

December 3rd we've got a public hearing on Essex Street as well as the Ames Street land disposition.

HUGH RUSSELL: What's Essex Street?
BRIAN MURPHY: Which one is that,
Liza?
LIZA PADEN: 10 Essex Street is the building outside of the Harvard Co-op, one of the parking lots. Not the one owned by the city.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.
AHMED NUR: (Inaudible).
LIZA PADEN: Yes, that one.
AHMED NUR: It's a wide welcoming
park.
HUGH RUSSELL: And what's to that site.

> LIZA PADEN: A residential development with ground floor retail.
> BRIAN MURPHY: Ames Street land disposition. We had, prior to this meeting at 5:30, we had a modestly attended hearing in terms of moving forward with the land disposition process later this evening.

Boston Properties was the bidder who is being recommended to the full City Council with a bid for the portion of Ames Street of $\$ 210,000$ again 2.110 process, that will be coming to the Planning Board on December 3rd. I expect next Monday City Council there will be a report from the City Manager which will then go to the Planning Board and City

Council, and in an anticipation of that we're
scheduling December 3rd for that hearing.
And on December 17th we've got hearings
on 75 New Street, the Lutz Petition and Planning Board 287, 1868 Mass. Ave. So a little bit to keep you busy for the next month.

LIZA PADEN: Gourmet Express.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Next Board of Zoning Appeal cases. I didn't have any.

LIZA PADEN: There are none.
Because of the Thanksgiving holiday, there's no -- there's only one BZA hearing in November.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.
And are there meeting transcripts?
LIZA PADEN: So there's two meeting transcripts that were submitted, one was for August 20th and the other was for September

17th. And they've both been certified by the stenographer.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.
Is there a motion to approve them?
PAMELA WINTERS: So moved.
HUGH RUSSELL: Pam.
STEVEN COHEN: Second.
HUGH RUSSELL: And Steve second.
On the motion?
(Raising hands.)
HUGH RUSSELL: A11 those voting in
favor.

HUGH RUSSELL: So the next item is
One Canal Park. The second hearing of the Major Amendment to allow the reduction of parking.

AHMED NUR: Mr. Chairman, I won't be here on December 17th because there's a
meeting coming up on the 17th. I don't know if anyone else is going to be around. We can talk about that while they're setting up who is going to be here when.

HUGH RUSSELL: Does anyone else know that they would not be present for that meeting?

Are you going back home?
AHMED NUR: No, going to Dubai.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, wel1 it will be warm.

AHMED NUR: Or cold. Ski indoors.
BRIAN MURPHY: They have slightly
different height conditions in Cambridge.
HUGH RUSSELL: Proceed, please.
ATTORNEY DAVID CONNOLLY: Mr.
Chairman, members of the Board, my name is
David Connolly. I'm an attorney with the
firm Hinckley, Allen, and Snyder, 28 State

Street, Boston, Massachusetts. I'm representing the Petitioner, MA One Canal

Park, LLC. With me tonight are John
Connolly, Senior Vice President of the petitioner; Nancy Doherty, senior project transportation planner for Tetra Tech Engineering who will speak to the adequacy of the requested parking space number even with the first floor retail spaces being completely leased out; and Melissa D'Amato, a commercial real estate broker right over here with the Dartmouth Company with a broad range of knowledge and experience regarding retail brokerage and significant retail experience in Cambridge and Boston.

As background, we had respectfully
requested an amendment to the Board's decision, Planning Board Special Permit 38 to reduce the amount of parking required to be

> 1eased in the City's East Cambridge parking garage from 130 spaces to 100 spaces.

The Planning Board in its preliminary determination had approved the proposal with the request for additional information concerning the following two items:

One, discuss whether the parking needs will be adequately met for the ground floor retail space on First Street, which is currently vacant, when it is fully occupied.

And, two, to provide a report on the efforts made by the petitioner to secure a retail tenant for the ground floor space since the property was last considered by the Planning Board in 2010.

Miss Fitch will address the marketing and leasing effort for the space --

Ms. D'Amato, over the past two and a half years. And Ms. Doherty will show you her
analysis of the adequacy of the parking requested even with the first floor retail space having been completely leased out.

As you all know, the City's Traffic Parking and Transportation Department has submitted a revised memorandum in support of our requested relief dated as of October 29, 2013, finding that in relevant part our requested 100 parking spaces, would in their opinion, would be sufficient to meet the building's current and future parking needs with the retail space being leased out, and pointing out that there is more than sufficient additional parking in City's First Street garage for any ground floor retail use for the parking now or in the future. Currently I believe that there are approximately 330 to 350 available unused parking spaces available to hourly parkers on
a daily basis. We would also just point out in connection with the analysis, within the Business A PUD-4 District in which the property is located, the off-street requirement minimum for ground floor office and retail uses is the same; that is, one space for each 1125 square feet of space regardless of whether it's office or retail. And in addition I would just point out as I'm sure you're all aware, Section 13.57.2 providing that there be no requirement for accessory parking for any ground floor retail spaces which are located on First Street not in excess of 10,000 square feet for each separately leased establishment.

## I'11 now turn the microphone over to

Ms. Doherty, and then after that we'11
address the second issue that has been asked by the Board.

Thank you.
NANCY DOHERTY: Hi. Nancy Doherty from Tetra Tech. The first thing I want to do is a one minute review of what we talked about two weeks ago when I was here last, we talked about the survey and the demand, and I just want to go over that real quick.

So basically right now we lease 130 spaces --

JOHN HAWKINSON: Is the microphone on?

NANCY DOHERTY: I don't know. Is that better?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
NANCY DOHERTY: Okay, good.
So, we lease 130 spaces today at the First Street garage. Of that, approximately 90 have been activated or released to our tenants. And the survey that we did back in

March of 2012 showed us that approximately 63 of our tenants are parking in the First Street garage today. So we feel that, you know, 130 is a lot. And two weeks ago we talked about we wanted to lease 100 spaces. We knew at that time in March of 2012 that the building was only 92 percent occupied, so we increased the 63 vehicles by eight percent to get a new number of 68 spaces which will leave us 32 spaces in reserve. And we went through all that, and at the end someone said well, what if that space is not used for office but instead it's used for retail? And it was a legitimate question. So, we moved forward and we did that exercise to prove to ourselves and hopefully you that we still have plenty of parking at 100 spaces if the lower level is used for retail.

So basically today, like I said, the
demand is 63 spaces. And at that time 93,840 square feet of the building was being used, and that gave us a parking ratio of -- a parking ratio of .67 spaces per 1,000 square feet. It's a simple calculation. It's important because we know at that time we had 5200 square feet of office space at the lower level that at this point is empty and will be hopefully released to a retail tenant. So we want to -- from the demand we want to pull out the parking that's associated with that 5200 square feet, using that same rate, that's say three spaces.

Now we're hoping we will add another 10,000 square feet of retail tenants and hopefully in the near future, and according to Zoning Regulations your requirement is one space per or 1,125 square feet. So just doing the simple math of the 10,000 square
feet divided by 1125, we would need nine spaces. So doing the math, we've got 63 spaces, take away three, plus nine, we would estimate we would need 69 spaces which is one more than what we talked about last week as it turns out. Again, we're looking for -- we like to reduce our number of leased spaces to 100 and we would stil1 have a surplus of approximately 30 spaces.

So, again, we agree with the Cambridge Traffic Parking and Transportation's Department conclusion that sufficient parking is provided even with retail uses in the building. Also given the fact that we absolutely worked in increasing an alternative modes of transportation, we feel the reduction of 130 leased spaces to 100 is conservative and reasonable and would not have negative impact on street parking in the
city.
Thank you very much.
HUGH RUSSELL: Are there any
questions on this part of the presentation? Great.

NANCY DOHERTY: Thank you.
MELISSA D'AMATO: Good evening. I'm Melissa D'Amato with the Dartmouth Company. We're based out of Boston. A little brief history about the company itself. We've been in business for over 23 years. We have offices here in Boston with 20 brokers as well as New Jersey, New York, specifically Manhattan, Albany, Greenwich, Connecticut. So we have about 28 brokers total.

Here in Boston our office is divided into a suburban team and an urban team which I am a part of. It is myself, Sean Gildea, one of the principals of the company, J.P.

Kennedy and Lindsay Sande11. So there are four of us that handle the Boston and Cambridge listings.

We currently have 20 listings in Boston and Cambridge. We exclusively handle the equity office retail portfolio which is approximately 360,000 square feet in 19 buildings. It is 97 percent leased. There is just 9,000 square feet, approximately half of which is at One Canal Park.

My experience in Cambridge consists of One Kendall Square who we have helped feel, now related feel with the leasing of that we put in Friendly Toast, West Bridge Restaurant if your familiar with that, Bon Me who is most recently opened, and we are at lease for the lower level of that space. So we have a lot of experience within Cambridge.

We also handle listings in Harvard

Square, currently 10 Church Street, previously 24 J.F.K. also 39 J.F.K. Street which is currently available. So we are actively marketing space in Cambridge as well as One Canal Park.

This site, as you may or may not be
aware of, has -- we have two spaces. We have a 3,781 square foot space on the corner and then just over a thousand square feet of in line space. In the last three years we have been in direct communication with over 72 tenants for these spaces. We have done monthly marketing blasts or e-mail blasts to a brokerage and retail community of over 10,000 people. In the last 12 months we have had eight perspective tenants come in that have taken a very serious look at the space, but because of reasons, including the location, demographics, just the layout of
the space or the configuration wasn't exactly what they were looking for, they have chosen to pass on the site.

Obviously it is within our best interest for the Dartmouth Company, Equity as the landlord to get these spaces leased.

Goodness knows I have tried and I will
continue to try and it is my incentive to do so, but we have not had the time -- or have not had any luck so far.

Are there any questions you may have in regards to the retail space?

HUGH RUSSELL: Are there any
restrictions on the sorts of tenants that are being approached by Equity?

MELISSA D'AMATO: Not at this time. We have gone through at potential tenants by category. So we have spoken with a number of different food or quick service restaurant
uses that have been very active in the market. We've gone to some cycling shops, some fitness uses, educational, quasi retail in terms of medical indoor optical uses. You know, the non-traditional retailers for this space, and, you know, we're trying to hit all of those genres where it might be a little bit more comfortable in what is best described as a destination retail location. PAMELA WINTERS: I was just going to say, I'm assuming that your rents are compatible with other rents in the area of other retail?

MELISSA D'AMATO: They are, yes.
STEVEN COHEN: I would have asked that same question more directly. What's your asking rent?

MELISSA D'AMATO: You cut to the
point. So we are looking at $\$ 50$ a foot
gross, which is compatible with one of the most recent deals actually done just down the street at Cambridgeside Galleria. I don't know if you guys are aware of the space city retail had available, which is approximately 3500 square feet. So right on par with what our corner location is, and they just did that deal at the same or very similar rent. STEVEN COHEN: You're offering a reasonable TI allowance?

MELISSA D'AMATO: That would be based on the tenant's credit and what kind of setup they're looking for. It's on a case-by-case basis.

AHMED NUR: You talked about the Cambridgeside Galleria. So I don't think there's restrictions for people -- anybody can park at the Cambridgeside Galleria as you know, Monday through Friday, there might not
be capacity -- I could be wrong.
HUGH RUSSELL: There was a few
thousand spaces available there.
AHMED NUR: Exactly. But and it's the very next building, isn't it --

MELISSA D'AMATO: Right.
AHMED NUR: -- to these guys? And it's something like a dollar for the first hour or two dollars. It's really cheap. So I wonder if that has something to do with --

MELISSA D'AMATO: You know, in all of the tours that I've had on-site or the potential tenant walk-throughs and conversations that I've had with clients, they're looking specifically at urban locations. The parking is really the icing on the cake. I haven't had a single tenant come to me and tell me, Melissa, I really love your location at One Canal Park,
everything works except for the parking.
That has not been the case because it's just, you know, if it's a dollar in the garage next-door and you've got right across the street, there are a couple of street parking spaces right across the way, that has not been an issue.

HUGH RUSSELL: I mean, I think the -- I've come to understand that when you have a regional mall, it -- most retailers want to be inside the mall where all the people are and that's the challenge of marketing the spaces that are a block away. And there are certain retailers that have peculiarities like Pet Co, which is across the street. And, you know, they, they thrive across the street from the mal1, but I think that's the kind of operation they are. You know, people are carrying heavy bags of cat
food or dog food and they have a little tiny parking lot over there, and so -- and there's a -- there's always been mattress stores. I think there's probably a mattress store there. And if one was going to draw a line, you know, maybe I would say Equity Office might say we don't want Big John's. There are a bunch of office buildings on Massachusetts Avenue between Central Square and Harvard Square, and they were all pretty much developed by one guy, the Dupre Brothers (phonetic) in the '80s I guess, maybe '90s, and they -- and almost all the tenants on the ground floor are furniture stores. So now there's a critical mass of furniture stores. And they lease them at whatever they could get for a furniture store. And their thought became to the Harvard Square Advisory

Committee once and told us about this leasing
philosophy. You need something classy down there so that the retail tenant -- so that the office tenants feel like they're in a classy building. And furniture works for that. And it's nice if you can get as much per square foot as the office people are paying, but you may not be able to do that. And on the other hand, it's you know, it's a building that was built -- these buildings were built economically at a time that it's possible to do that, so they're probably -the economics and every building is different.

We11, my reaction is that serious
efforts are being made and that I'm encouraged to hear that, and it's too bad that they're not successful. But you're going to keep working at it until they are.

MELISSA D'AMATO: You bet.

HUGH RUSSELL: So I don't have a
copy of the latest Sue Clippinger memo. Does she have any reservations? The revision is the red line that says that people can park across the street at the city garage.

So this is a public hearing. One person has signed up saying they want to speak. Is that appropriate to do that now?

AHMED NUR: Sure.
HUGH RUSSELL: Jay Wasserman.
JAY WASSERMAN: I'm Jay Wasserman of 34 Second Street. As you know, I'm part of the East Cambridge Planning Team Board, but we have not spoken about this so I'm just representing myself. Though I will probably bring this up tomorrow.

Let me first just make a quick comment about the parking. The across the street parking probably vanish over time. Don't
forget the courthouse is expecting to use that building. So I'm not sure it's too much a problem. I actually marked myself as opposed. Reducing parking and with the Galleria, I don't think parking is an issue. What I am concerned about is the retail still being empty two and a half years. And we've been through this many years. There are retail spots directly between the T and the Galleria. We've heard numbers from a million to five million people are walking from the T to the Galleria. I cannot believe that retail space cannot be filled. We are seeing this whole area just explode. And we fought for years for Kendall Square to get stuff in there, and we finally got some things in there, and we know there's deals being made to -- because to start retail fresh is hard.

And deals need to be made, and the highest
rent possible is not what you're gonna get which I think you were hinting at. And it's right now there's nothing available in

Kendal1 Square from what I understand. It is completely filled, people are flocking there like anything. I don't understand why First Street hasn't exploded. It is starting to change. IBM has got a change and they're filling, I think the Fuji is opening a new restaurant and that should be coming very soon. I think the flow down First Street will happen. I'm really concerned that this building for another two and a half years has been sitting empty. I'm concerned that they already got away with, because there's a long-term deal here of, you know, in the '80s someone made a density deal, and they were required to fill it with retail. And two and a half years ago, as you know, they got out
of half of that deal. And now I think they're sitting on it so they get out of the other half. If they can't get the highest rent possible, they want to get office in there because that's a much higher rent. And that is not good for our city. Our city, you know, we made a tradeoff. We asked -- we said please go ahead and put the density in but we need city life at the base of it. And I just feel yet again we're doing -- they're playing games and I question -- I have nothing against the parking issue, but I question giving in to them until they fill the retail. We really need to hold them to their mitigation requirements.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you. Does anyone else wish to speak?
(No Response.)

## HUGH RUSSELL: I see no one.

Is there any discussion?
So I sense we all share Mr. Wasserman's unhappiness that this retail spot has been vacant, and I guess my -- I think requiring them to buy 30 parking spaces in the parking garage is probably pretty much independent of that issue. If we give them the carrot of not supporting our parking garage, is that going to increase the efforts of Ms. D'Amato? I don't think so.

I think I put it twice to reduce the retail on this particular building, and I voted to reduce retai 1 in other surrounding buildings. I'm not going to do it again. I won't be here forever, but you guys will. And I just don't think it's the right issue to hold them hostage. I think they are trying. I think they've got to try harder.

They've got to -- by try harder, they've got to basically lower the rent. That's -- and see if that makes a difference. I believe that's an appropriate condition for this Special Permit.

Are there any other comments or any other views?

If not, does someone wish to make a motion on this? We have a preliminary determination which I think with the -simply edited to indicate what happened tonight and then it can become final. I don't think there's any additional findings that are required.

So maybe a motion to make the preliminary determination and final approved Special Permit appropriate.

AHMED NUR: So moved.
HUGH RUSSELL: And is there a

## second?

STEVEN COHEN: Second.
HUGH RUSSELL: And a discussion on that motion?

A11 those voting in favor?
(Raising hands.)
HUGH RUSSELL: And a11 of us voting
in favor.
So, please, please try harder and --
STEVEN COHEN: Yes, I would also join in the sentiment already expressed. You can rent that space yet price has a lot to do the saleability of products. And, you know, it's been two and a half years. It's going to take some flexibility if that's what it takes. You know, we've got neighbors and community that's concerned. This Board is concerned. You know, it's time to do what it takes.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you very much.
This is an extraordinary meeting because we're running on schedule. I can't recall a meeting in the last 25 years.

BRIAN MURPHY: And that's for taking something out of order earlier.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right.
So the next item on our agenda is the Boston Properties Limited Partnership proposal to amend Article 14 of the Zoning Ordinance. Oh, a friendly face.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Good evening. For the record James Rafferty, 675 Massachusetts Avenue, appearing on behalf of the petitioner Boston Properties. Along with Madeleine Timin, their general counsel, and David Stewart who will be presenting the particulars. And he's Vice President with Boston Properties. Mr. Stewart spells his
name S-t-e-w-a-r-t. And Ms. Timin is
T-i-m-i-n.
This is a Zoning Petition that has been filed with the City Council in response to a Zoning Amendment that actually -- and by my recollection had its origin right in this room several years ago when citywide rezoning or ECaPs then, there was some discussion about how to best bring housing into the MXD District because at the time the MXD District did not contain any housing and it was about a couple hundred thousand square feet left of GFA in this district because this district is more akin to a PUD style district where its GFA is established with a cap overall as opposed to a straight FAR. And there were some voices that suggested that the way to ensure housing would be to amend the Zoning to require that the last few hundred thousand
square feet available under that cap be limited to housing. And then one of your colleagues, a wise and sage person, who's been here a little while suggested that it might be more appropriate to use the carrot than the stick, and that if you want to get housing here, what you should do is incentivize the developer and give them 200,000 square feet of additional GFA for which they could do housing. Lots of people took credit for that and said, see what I did for you? You came in to beat back a down zoning and you left getting 200,000 square feet of space. Our good friend Mr. Tulamari (phonetic) used to take a lot of credit for it, too. Even on occasion I did, I have to remind Boston Properties remember the great job I did for you? We came in and we wound up with 200,000 square feet.

So we got the 200,000 square feet, and
before they had a chance to build it, they actually had gone pretty far down the road. We had prepared a Special Permit application under Article 19 for a 200,000 square foot residential building. Mr. Manfredi had designed it, as he likes to do in Cambridge, and we were getting real close and Mr. Cantalupe (phonetic) and Mr. Stewart's colleague, I know you all know, went so far to say that the steel had been ordered for the building. And two things happened:

There was a shift in the residential market. There was a shift in the entire market. And then our friends at the Broad said we really need to get more space. So after the Broad came up with that idea, there was an effort undertaken to determine how we could best rezone to get the GFA needed for
the Broad. And the conclusion, we met with staff, we met with neighborhood groups, and we said well, one of the ways we could do it is that we could simply file a very subtle amendment that would say let's take the 200,000 square feet that's already out there and rather than limit it to housing, lift that restriction. And then we can take the 200,000, we can apply it to the Broad, the Broad will get their second building. At the time they were going to move to Boston, no one wanted that to happen.

And the response was well, no, we don't want to give up on the housing. City Council's answer was I'11 tell you what, we'11 amend the Ordinance to give the GFA for the Broad. I apologize for the length, but it's an interesting story. So we'll give the GFA to the Broad --

## HUGH RUSSELL: To some of us at

 least.ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Yes. You people are the stars. Mr. Russell, if we were to cast this as a movie, would be the leading man I have to tell you.

So, at any rate, the Council in its wisdom said, we want to keep the 200,000 for the housing. We'11 give you the necessary GFA to build the Broad. And not only will we not convert the 200,000 , when we adopted that Zoning, Boston Properties signed a letter of commitment that says we're going to either deliver the housing -- they're going to penalized financially every year with significant penalties if they don't deliver the housing within seven years of the CO of the Broad. So the Broad is nearing completion, and we had the K2 studies and

Boston Properties participated in that. And they looked to find a location where they could put the housing. And a location has been identified. But in the MXD District, because of some of the quirky aspects of its Zoning, there really isn't a lot that can accommodate this 200,000 square feet without running afoul of a few of the lot requirements contained in the MAC. So what this petition really does is lift a few of those lot requirements. Chief among them is FAR. So even though the district as a whole operates like the CRDD or some of the PUDs and it has a GFA cap, it also has a per block FAR of four. Well, there isn't a lot on a block that can take 200,000 square feet and not run up against that. There's a similar lot requirement around open space. Like the GFA, there's a district-wide open space
requirement and then there are lot area
requirements. And that doesn't mean that the amount of open space changes or that they're not delivering on the open space. It's just that under the current structure they can't do that. And which they'11 see from Mr. Stewart tonight there's some added benefit to some of these changes, one involves the opportunity to facilitate what appears to be a city goal of the potential opening of Third Street across to Main Street through Point Park. But I don't want to confuse you, but Mr. Stewart will give you that.

So, and then the last thing is when the MXD District was created, it contains a restriction that's, to my knowledge, only exists in one other Zoning District and that's a cap on fast food uses. And in the

MXD it's a cap of three fast food uses.
Centra1 Square has a cap of 14 . No place else has such a cap. But the combination of changing understanding of what fast food is, I mean, you know, we've come a long way from Burger King and McDonald's and we have things like currently there's an application for Clover which as you know, is a homegrown business, had some publicity recently, but we won't pay too much attention to that. But they're looking to open into Kendall Square. And they would, they would max out the cap if they went there. And we're trying to reconcile this with the goal of active ground floor uses in the MXD District, which perhaps in days gone by warrant this primary a focus. So we're taking this opportunity in the petition to amend that requirement. And after some discussion with staff and CRA and
a few others, the petition proposes 15. And
we had an Ordinance committee meeting last week, and the question was wel1, why 15 ? The questions range from why 15 to why any cap? And I think in particular the Chair of the Ordinance Committee said that the Ordinance Committee would welcome the thoughts of the Planning Board as to what's the right way to handle it. I would characterize it that there was support for the notion of lifting the cap, but you know, was 15 an arbitrary number? How did you arrive at 15 ? What does the Planning Board think of the $15 ?$ If you look at the language, the 15 limits -- is it eight in our subdistrict? No more than eight in our subdistrict.

So this petition affects what is called the Ames Street Subdistrict which is a cleverly crafted subdistrict that captures
land that's owned by Boston Properties because by necessity, we can only rezone our own land or we'd have co-petitioners here and this is complicated enough.

The other part of this that you've already heard about is the fact that in order to make this project come to fruition, Boston Properties has engaged in a process with the City to acquire a portion of Ames Street. The City initiated an RFP process, bids were submitted on Friday, and there's been a series of public hearings on that proposal, one as recently as this evening, pursuant to the City's Disposition Ordinance and the state statute around RFPs.

So what's before you tonight, really, is an amendment that hopefully gets us to where we were many years ago when it was suggested that the way to build this housing
is to create the GFA for it. So there's some generally understood concepts of what the building would look like and the impact and improvement which it will have on the streetscape, which Mr. Stewart will show you. And then we are eager to be able to advance the Zoning Petition contemporaneously with the public process associated with the disposition of the land because both would be necessary elements to deliver on the housing. The housing represents an opportunity that I think has long been sought, and it's occurring in a location right in the heart of the MXD District that hopefully will add to its vitality.

So that's the long-winded history of how we got here. The petition is frankly rather narrow. It's specific. It changes the application of certain definitions around
open space and FAR on lots, and I'm missing one. And Mr. Stewart will remind me what it is, but we'11 tell you what it is.

DAVID STEWART: Parking and loading.
ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Oh, parking and loading.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: So should this
petition prevail, what is the design review process that would govern this building?

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Good
question. It would be subject to an Article 19 project review Special Permit because buildings -- MXD which historically has not been the case in the MXD District, but this is a building over 50,000 square feet. So this building would be subject to Article 19 in the same way that the Broad building was subject to the Article 19 process. That was
the Broad building on Ames Street. I think we, when the Broad on Main Street the original Broad, we came here for a less formal design review process because at the time -- but the language of the Broad amendment subjected that building to Article 19. And design language do that or are we committing to do that?

ATTORNEY MADELEINE TIMIN: It's the residential, residential in the MXD. ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Oh, that's right. When the 200,000 was adopted a long time ago, it had an Article 19 requirement associated with it. That's right. Actually that was added by Council when it originally came out. But in the original amendment it might not contain that. This is very much subject to that. Similarly the fast food uses would be also subject to the Special

Permit requirement associated with fast food which is true throughout the city. So the modification on the cap doesn't mean that they become as-of-right uses. It means that those uses then proceed pursuant to the Special Permit process. But we were, you know, fast food, it's a head scratcher as to what it is these days and what isn't.

Chipotle turned out is was. No. Qdoba was, Chipotle wasn't. Peet's Coffee wasn't but Starbucks was. I remember griping and Ms. Gifford supported the as-of-right Peet's Coffee and I was in the Superior Court defending a Special Permit by the BZA for the as Starbucks Coffee on Church Street which was going to be the ruination of Harvard Square many years ago. And I couldn't understand why Peet's Coffee was acceptable. It was explained to me, at least in her eyes,
> that Peet's Coffee was a retail coffee establishment that sold coffee beans and coffee makers.

So Tasty Burger in Harvard Square doesn't have a fast food.

I just had the pleasure of representing Shake Shack going in across the street. We got a Special Permit for fast food.

So, greater minds and I figure out why it's fast food and why it isn't. So I just kind of wanted to share with you why this cap becomes a real problematic tool. Because I think the thinking even in Central Square I've heard from Mr. Murphy and others that the current cap at Central Square wil1 probably undergo some examination of what was a subject of discussion in the C 2 and Red Ribbon studies as to whether or not it's needed in the same way.

So that's what I have to say now for. The details is Mr. Stewart.

HUGH RUSSELL: Mr. Stewart, welcome. DAVID STEWART: Thanks, Jim. I don't know if there's much, you left me to say. But why don't I pul1 the boards over a little bit more.

HUGH RUSSELL: We11, where they are now means that people who are out there can actually kind of see them. If they wish to move at least to that side of the room. So even though it's a ways away.

DAVID STEWART: I'11 need someone to work them. David Stewart with Boston Properties.

And as Jim has said, he given you a lengthy history of the property and of the site, we've been at it for quite sometime, so I won't bore you with that. Hopefully you've
had a chance to f1ip through the images that I sent to you last week just to give you a bit of a background. So what I'd like to do tonight is two things:

I'11 describe what it is we're proposing, where it is, what our program is, and to the extent we've advanced the design so far.

And then secondly, what are the five items, and they're very specific things within the Zoning Petition, that we need to make a project go forward.

So that is a plan of the Ames Street District. Our project is located -- sorry, right here. Okay? On the east side of Ames Street right between Broadway and Main Street. Right now for those of you that know the area, it is a gaping hole in the streetscape. It is our entrance to our
garage, it's a loading dock entrance, and it really, really cuts through the urban fabric and doesn't make it a very nice street. So what we're proposing to do is put a residential building right in front of the garage. And as you know, there's a 20-foot slice of Ames Street. We need to narrow Ames Street by 20 feet to basically give us the site to work with and to create a better, a better pedestrian streetscape experience.

> So this is a, this is a rendering
looking south towards Main and it shows our building on the left and the two Broad buildings on the right. So what you're seeing is ground floor retail space here that doesn't exist today. And then second floor, which could be amenity, could be retail, and then our building above.

From a plan point of view, what it does
to the streetscape is this (indicating). So the red represents retail. So we have a space for roughly 9,000 square feet of retail. And then the yellow represents the residential lobby. And that 200,000 square feet of housing would be above that.

So the way we've planned it today, and again we're not -- we're nowhere near through the detail design, we think the 200,000 square feet would give us roughly 240 units in total. And of the 240 we come out with around 31 affordable units for the City's inclusionary housing policy. So in that mix -- that's based on a mix of studios, one bedrooms, two bedrooms, and that gets us to the 240 . We've been thinking along the way as we've developed the design, we're also going to investigate putting microunits in the building. So to the extent, and I don't
know how familiar the Board is with microunits, but these are popping up in locations like San Francisco, New York, and they're even trying a few in the City of Boston. And they're essentially smaller units for people that basically like to basically live outside of their unit. So they're okay with communal living. They use amenity space in other places in the building or other places in the neighborhood. So we think given the demographic and given who we might be targeting in this location, you know, your high tech companies, and your biotechs, and all the Generation $Y$ people that want housing in this area, that microunits could be -- this could be a place for microunits. So in the case where we do wind up adding some microunits, the 240 -unit count that I spoke of would actually increase
as well as the number of affordable units.
So that's where we are in a planning
standpoint from the building use.
The other -- so as Jim said, it's 240
or 200,000 square feet. Within the existing Zoning that allows up to 250 -foot building. So based on typical floor-to-floor as part residential building, we get somewhere around 22 stories. And this is just a section through the building that basically shows how the building ties into the existing garage, because the loading dock and the garage entrance, and even some of the parking spaces in the garage, will have to be removed. And actually what I didn't point out on the plan you can see the -- there's a loading dock here on the side. So the side alleyway, we'd actually move the loading dock off of the street and put it around, tuck it around
behind the building. And also the parking garage entrance would be reconfigured. Right now it empties right on to Ames Street. So we're showing a garage entrance right on the alleyway.

So there are, as Jim pointed out, there is an entrance here right now. And the main entrance to the garage is really the Broadway entrance. So we think that that will be a much more important entry and exit, and the side entrance is probably just an either in only in the morning out at night -- we're still working through the technical details -- but it will serve as a much more minor entrance than the Broadway entrance. So what that allows us to do is that allows us to take all of those uses from a street frontage and basically tuck them in behind the building. And that loading dock -- the
current loading dock is for Four and Five Cambridge Center and the retail spaces that are at the base we can -- and then this will get into our -- one of our -- the items that we need in the Zoning Petition. That loading dock will actually be shared with the residential building as well. So we can use it for multiple uses and I'11 explain why once we get there.

So the other thing that, if you look at the rendering that you'11 notice, and for those of you that know what the street looks like, that the street actually gets narrowed by 20 feet. So right now there's a median in the middle of the street. The street is too wide. It acts more as a service street. And when you think about good urban planning, and the city agrees with this, is that by narrowing the street and having retail on
both sides of the street, so a double loaded retail, it actually makes a more active pedestrian streetscape. So that's what this rendering is designed to show. You can actually, by reducing the width of the right of way from 100 feet down to 80 feet, we can still get two travel lanes, two bike lanes and parking on either side of the street. So there's plenty of room curb to curb. We also get a twelve-and-a-half foot sidewalk on the Broad side and a fifteen-and-a-half foot sidewalk on our building side. So it is a very generous right of way at 80 feet.

So as I said, our project really aims to improve the streetscape. Some of the key benefits of the project, just to summarize, are one being the delivery of much needed housing in Kendall Square and specifically in the Ames Street District. Both from a market
rate perspective and from an affordable housing perspective.

Better urban pedestrian streetscape where we're essentially rebuilding Ames Street between Main and Broadway. Brand new street for the city.

The third thing is this building we figure would bring in for the city an additional real estate taxes of at least \$500,000 per year.

And then the fourth thing that appears in our petition that might be a little bit confusing, and I'11 just point it out, is that the city is really, the city really wants a street connection going from -- to be able to make the connection from Third Street on to Main Street going west. Right now you can't do that. You'11 recall there's a little bus turn around right here from Point

Park. You can't actually get from Third to Main. One of the things that we can do through the Zoning Petition, and this relates to the district-wide open space in relaxing the lot-by-lot open space requirement, is that will give us the ability to give the city a real street connection there.

So what do we need from a Zoning perspective to move the project forward? So as Jim pointed out, the actual petition is -it's only a couple pages long, and there are five, five things we've asked for that really we can consider them as Minor Amendments. We're not asking for anything related to additional density, height. All of the -that, that type of -- those types of rights are already included within the MXD Zoning.

So the first thing that we're -- that's in our petition is the elimination of the lot
density or the FAR of four. And that, for whatever reason, I don't know why that's in the current MXD, but you couldn't build a residential building of this scale of 200,000 square feet anywhere in the MXD District with an FAR of four. It just doesn't work. The lots don't exist. So --

HUGH RUSSELL: And let me put you on
notice that I'd like to see you build about four of these, and there's been a study that shows there might be possibilities. DAVID STEWART: That's right. That's a very good point.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Don't make it too easy for them. They won't need counsel.

DAVID STEWART: We'd like to build four of them. Yeah, similarly you'd need to relax the FAR.

The density is already -- you already protected, the City's already protected from a density point of view in that there's a 200,000 square foot 1 imit in density and there's a 250-foot height limit. So the FAR just seems like it's not required. That's why we need that to be relaxed.

The second item relates to lot open space. So this one's a little more complicated. If you think of it from a planning perspective, having fewer and larger open space areas on a district-wide basis are much more useful for people than lot specific little strips of land, one-foot strips of land, around a lot that technically meet the criteria for lot open space but really aren't usable. So what we've -- what we're proposing, as you may know, the MXD has a, has a Zoning minimum for 100,000 square feet
of public open space within the district as a whole. So what we're saying is okay, within the Ames Street subdistrict there are really four areas right now that are large areas that we consider pub1ic open space -- that are large usable public space, open areas. And these are the West Park here over towards the Residence Inn, the public park on top of the garage, the plaza in front of the Marriott, and Point Park. So we're saying is that as long as you have those on a district-wide basis, as long as those remain intact, that you really don't need a lot, a lot open space requirement. So if we keep 53,000 square feet, and that is the area of those four, those are the area of those four parks that we, Boston Properties, control, there's a little -- there's a piece here on the end that the Cambridge Redevelopment

Authority owns and controls on Point Park that we don't own. So we didn't include that in our petition as part of what we're recommending remains, but obviously if the CRA keeps that land as park and the total -and I think it's roughly 10,000 square feet, so the total in the district would be around 63,000 . We're saying the 53,000 we control, we'11 keep that, and that will be district open space provided that the lot open space requirement goes away.

So as I said, this has two benefits-this has two benefits for us.

One, it obviously allows us to build a residential, because based on that little slice of land and the size, the size of the lot -- that the lot that we're actually creating here, we would never be able to meet the lot open space requirement. So this
allows the residential building.
And then secondly it allows, through this whole process, the city alerted us to the fact that they'd love to have this connection from Third Street on to Main. We said we could -- we'd be happy to give it to you, but under the current Zoning it would, it would put one of our buildings, our One Cambridge Center building, it would put it out of compliance from a lot open space issue. If we lift that lot open space requirement for buildings in the district, then it allows us to grant the city essentially an easement for that connection.

So that's the second item as it relates to open space. I'11 just pause there for a second. Are there any questions on this one? Because this can be a little bit confusing in the petition.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: I'm sorry, can you just trace where that potential street would be, connection roughly?

DAVID STEWART: So roughly Third
Street's here. So it would cut through like this. Something like that.

HUGH RUSSELL: It would probably be renamed Microsoft Way or something for 50 feet of its frontage.

STEVEN COHEN: Would that connection require a signal?

DAVID STEWART: I belive there's a signal right there.

STEVEN COHEN: Oh, there's a signal right there?

DAVID STEWART: There's a signal
right there on Third.
ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: It's a T intersection now where Third comes into

Main -- where Third comes into Broadway. I don't want to speak for Traffic. But this has been in planning discussion -- well, one of the big benefits it would allow for the shuttle run by the Charles River TMA to come down Main Street and come down directly -come down Third Street and get directly on to Main where the T stop is.

STEVEN COHEN: Sure.
But there is a signal there already?
DAVID STEWART: There is, yeah.
ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Oh, yes.
STEVEN COHEN: Just going back to the open space, more out of curiosity, you know, much of that open space of course on the top of the garage, I'm just wondering about the public access to it. And A, how is it possible? And $B$, as a practical matter does the public actually use that?

## DAVID STEWART: It is pub7icly

accessible. And we're going through, I'd say we're enhancing the signage so that the public knows about it more. It's not, unless you're from the neighborhood, I think there was an article in The Globe weeks ago -- oh, there's Heather saying -- it's the best kept secret in Cambridge in terms of public open space.

STEVEN COHEN: How do you get there? HUGH RUSSELL: There's an elevator. DAVID STEWART: There's an elevator and a stair tower. Right here (indicating). So as I said, we're going through and enhancing the signage for some of the tenants, some of the new retail tenants. But as well there's going to be a very prominent, very public open space sign on the Main Street side and improving the way finding to
make it more, I'd say, findable by members of the public.

HUGH RUSSELL: Or you get a job at Google.

STEVEN COHEN: Right.
TOM SIENIEWICZ: So just --
ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: More people know about it now than they did about two years ago as a result of certain modifications.

DAVID STEWART: That's right.
HUGH RUSSELL: There's a little
sketch here --
TOM SIENIEWICZ: While we're talking about open space --

HUGH RUSSELL: Sure.
TOM SIENIEWICZ: Looking at your
plan, and you're probably not acquiring this
20 feet. You're only acquiring the 20 feet
that's required to build the building. But it appears, by this diagram, and that's a great board to have up for the hearing to see, to the top part of the -- above your red plan there's a triangular -- yes, triangular piece of ground there that seems like it's a significant piece of open space.

DAVID STEWART: So we own that right today.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: You own that little triangle there?

DAVID STEWART: We're actually
acquiring the whole 20 -foot stretch from Broadway through to Main. So we would be acquiring this as well.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Wow.
DAVID STEWART: So that would be
part of the requirement from, by the City and our thinking as well, is to make that open
space. And quite frankly we think that it would be a real benefit to our tenants, our retail tenants at Four Cambridge Center. Maybe you're familiar with Mead Hall.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Yes.
DAVID STEWART: If they ever want a patio, that's a great location.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: We11, I don't want to make it too easy on you, but it seems like you could take credit for that open space in your calculations as well.

DAVID STEWART: You're right, we could, but it still doesn't get us there.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: No, but it gets you
closer.
HUGH RUSSELL: Right, but I think the point is that they're -- that's a valuable open space. The rebuilding -- you know, the rebuilding of the street will
produce for, you know, amenities for pedestrians and the loading dock is huge.

So, okay, let's continue on through the Zoning part of it. DAVID STEWART: Okay.

So the next item in our Zoning Petition relates to parking. So this is a good slot for that. And so what we're proposing is to reduce -- right now in the MXD the requirement for parking is one space per unit, and you're probably familiar with the Kendal1 Square study came out with a recommendation which we fully agree to produce that to 0.5 spaces per unit which we think is entirely appropriate. And given the mixed nature of the project, so the there's a counter cyclicality in how parking is used; residential people park there on weekends and at night, commercial people use it during the
day. So it actually -- when you look at the best use of the infrastructure and what's already there, that it makes a lot of sense to be able to reduce that.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: It may be worth noting here that the project doesn't propose to add any additional parking spaces. It will utilize the existing parking supply in this garage. The parking in MXD is in three pooled garages. So this doesn't represent any net increase in spaces.

DAVID STEWART: And then similarly with, as to parking, our loading, as I explained before, by moving the loading dock and making this dock, opening it up for use to residential office and retail, there's a similar economy of scale like there is in parking where the uses peak at different teams. So we're able to adjust the formula
for calculating the number of loading spaces required and we've asked that that be reflected in our Zoning Petition. So that's loading and parking.

And the last item which Jim went into in quite some detail was the increasing the cap on fast food. And at the Ordinance Committee hearing we got asked, you know, what are the three fast foods now -- licenses that you have now? So it's Starbucks and the Residence Inn, Chipotle, and we just signed a lease with Clover as a local operator.

JOHN HAWKINSON: Food court?
DAVID STEWART: Food court is not actually -- doesn't have a license. We believe through our research is that it's because it's seen as an ancillary use to the Coop, that it didn't need one at the time.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Just
because -- they're permits, they're not
1icenses. They are licensed but --
DAVID STEWART: Thank you, Jim.
ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: They don't have a Special Permit for fast food.

DAVID STEWART: So we're out of fast food permits within the MXD as of signing of the Clover Leaf. So if you look at the red there on our plan for retail spaces, and you think of -- and we think about activating, activating Ames Street from a pedestrian point of view and some of the active uses, we could see ourselves -- we do see ourselves in a situation where we need more fast food permits and we're not -- we don't, we don't want to take on the liability of discussing and changing what the definition of fast food is, nor did we want to just eliminate the cap in its entirety even though there's only one
other location in the city that has a cap.
So we picked a number that we thought was one we would never reach so that we wouldn't have to come back. We wouldn't have to come back and ask for more. So that's how we came up with the 15 in the MXD, eight within the subdistrict. And as Jim points out, we still have to go through a Special Permit process with whatever fast food -- with whatever, quote, fast food operator we come in with.

So that's a summary of our Zoning
Petition and our project. Any questions?
Yes.
PAMELA WINTERS: Hi. I have a
question about your -- the housing units. DAVID STEWART: Yes.

PAMELA WINTERS: And so you're going to be having one- and two-bedrooms units.

And so like out of the 240 units, like, what
proportion would be roughly, like, one and two bedrooms -- I'm asking this because I'm such a fan of the microunits in this area. I think that they would do really well, you know, with young, single people who work really hard a11 day and then come home at night and just for a place to crash. So, you know, I don't know -- I'd like to see more microunits. I guess that's what I'm saying. And my colleagues may not agree with me, but I was just wondering if you could give me a rough estimate?

> DAVID STEWART: So, I'd say it's
more heavily weighted towards studios and one bedrooms for our initial cut of the percentages. You know, it would be -- given the demographic and, you're right, that it's more young people, more Generation $Y$ in this area. I think the percentage of the two
bedrooms would be pretty low.
PAMELA WINTERS: Okay.
DAVID STEWART: You know, in the 10
to 15 percent range. But, again, I'11 just
caution you with my response because it's really based on a preliminary unit program.

And until we, quote, design the product and really go after who our target market is, I would say the unit mix is going to --

PAMELA WINTERS: Fluctuate?
DAVID STEWART: It's going to
fluctuate and evolve based on who we're going after and who we think we can get. And really based on the customer demand. So we'11 do a very detailed study of the customer demand. If the customer wants a whole bunch of two bedrooms, then we'll build a bunch of two bedroom.

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay. I
understand.
Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: I think we have to accept that this building will be, it's an expensive kind of building to build, high rise building and therefore the rents will be reflective of that situation. I mean, if we look at a comparable building might be the one at Third Street that have such names -- I always forget what's what.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: The Twining?

HUGH RUSSELL: Watermark. Where I understand the rents are in the three to four thousand dollar a month range.

PAMELA WINTERS: For how many bedrooms?

HUGH RUSSELL: Two bedroom.
ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: One
bedroom starts at three.
HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
So it's not because, you know, Alex
Twining is a greedy guy. It's more that it's very expensive to build these buildings. And so, I'm wondering, you know, whether actually microunits do make sense here because would somebody pay $\$ 2500$ a month for a microunit? But that's what you'11 find out when you do the study.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: It could be like the SROs coming back.

HUGH RUSSELL: We11, I mean -- I actually was an architect for what it turns out to have been a microunit project.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: But didn't know it at the time. I know which one.

HUGH RUSSELL: And it was -- partly rooms rented for $\$ 125$ a week. It was a,
completely affordable. It was for people who were working who could afford that rent, and it's down on corner of Lenox Street and Washington Street in Roxbury.

So, while I'd like to see more housing like that in the city, it's not going to be on this site because of the economics. And that project was extremely heavily subsidized by many people to make that happen.

Okay. We -- this is a public hearing. Maybe we should ask if anyone wants to speak on this matter. This is a Zoning recommendation.

Heather, please come forward.
HEATHER HOFFMAN: Hi, my name is
Heather Hoffman. I live at 213 Hurley
Street, fairly close to this. And I have just a several comments on this that -- not necessarily a recommendation, but the first
one is, okay, 4.0 FAR might not have been a good idea for housing here, but un1imited? I understand that there are limits -- that there are physical limits on the size of the box you can build and all that, but I think that unlimited is a really rotten precedent to set anywhere. There's no good reason for it, and I would strongly urge you to recommend against an unlimited FAR for anything.

On the issue of open space, I would agree that theoretically having planned open space for the whole area is a good idea, and I would say that Boston Properties has never shown the first bit of good faith in this regard. Boston Properties has never done anything unless forced.

And the public garden that you didn't know about used to be a glorious place. And
for someone to talk about -- to deny, joke about the loss of most of that glorious incredibly wonderful open space in this presentation was insulting to me at least and maybe to others as well. Boston Properties can and does wonderful open space when forced. Do nothing to let them slide by the way they've have been because this district and the city deserve better.

With respect to the 20-foot strip, I so agree with Mr. Sieniewicz. Why on earth are they going to get 20 feet of our public way? The City of Boston manages to do smaller discontinuances. They do vertical discontinuances. You know, if you've got a roof that extends a couple inches into the public way, they do a discontinuance that's two inches deep by however high the roof is by the length of the roof. Why on earth are
we giving away our public way? What is the public purpose to giving away? I don't care if they're buying it, we're still giving away our public space to a private entity for its own profit. We need a public benefit to this, and I hope that the Planning Board will agree and will suggest that that -- you'11 be seeing this again because there will be a hearing, at least one hearing before you on the actual sale of the public way. So don't think that this will be the last that you see of it. But really where's the public purpose here? For -- I mean, the city manages to allow restaurants to have patios in the public sidewalk without taking away from the public, so I hope that you will think -- I mean, this -- this looks as though this is something you don't really have to think about a whole lot. But I think that in fact
you should and that you're quite capable of doing a very good job at critiquing this and thinking about what's really in the public interest in this.

Thank you.
STEVEN COHEN: Ms. Hoffman, is it Hoffman?

HEATHER HOFFMAN: Yes.
STEVEN COHEN: Before you sit down, I just wanted to ask you, you refer to the loss of public space.

HEATHER HOFFMAN: Yeah.
STEVEN COHEN: I guess I'd just like to know what exactly are you referring to? Are you referring to the space on top of the garage in some way?

HEATHER HOFFMAN: Yes.
STEVEN COHEN: And what do you mean when you say that there was a loss of that

## public space?

HUGH RUSSELL: About half of it was taken.

HEATHER HOFFMAN: They built a building on it.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: About 40 percent.

HUGH RUSSELL: Google built a building on what had been an open space for 20 or 25 years. The City Council gave them permission to do that as a way of doing -HEATHER HOFFMAN: Without having public hearings on it as required by law. STEVEN COHEN: But the space we've seen on the plan showing public space --

HUGH RUSSELL: It used to be bigger. HEATHER HOFFMAN: It used to be an acre and now it is truncated tremendously with an ugly wall next to it. Not that I'm
bitter you understand. But please go up there. You'll be astonished at what Boston Properties has done when forced. You can be part of making them do much better than they have and to do as well as the things they've done well.

Thanks.
PAMELA WINTERS: Now, I haven't been on that roof. What's on -- what was on the roof? Was it a green roof?

HUGH RUSSELL: It was a beautiful garden. And it still is. It's a smaller beautiful garden.

PAMELA WINTERS: So you took what, 40 percent did you say?

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: We11, just for the record if --

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Briefly.

So the MXD District had requirements associated with open space. There was a modification to the open space requirement that allowed for a connector, a two-story connector to be built between the Four and Six?

DAVID STEWART: Four and five. ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Four and
five.
DAVID STEWART: Right here.
ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: So that
two-story connector goes through an area that previously which is the top of the roof, and previously it was all part of a rooftop garden. This, this was modified. There were a series of negotiated payments and delivery of other open space, including other portions of the MXD District, but it was -- and it proceeded -- the City Council voted
inconsistent with the Disposition Ordinance to deal with it on an expedited basis. So the characterization of illegal activity is really way off and unfair to the City Council and for those who participated. There was a vote as allowed for under the Disposition Ordinance to allow to proceed in a certain manner and that vote was taken and that's how it was disposed.

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay, thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Is there anyone else who wishes to speak on the proposed rezoning? (No Response.)

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, I see no one who wishes to speak at this time.

STEVEN COHEN: Mr. Chair, can I just ask a couple of questions? HUGH RUSSELL: Sure.

STEVEN COHEN: Several of the
provisions I think of parking and FAR are specifically limited to the multi-family development within the district. A couple of others are not; the loading requirements and the change in the open space requirements and I guess the fast food are not limited to multi-family, and I'm just wondering whether, whether there are any other potential repercussions of those changes elsewhere in this district other than the cut-through that you've already mentioned for Third Street? In other words, are there any unintended consequences of that -- of the proposed change?

## DAVID STEWART: I don't believe

 there are, because everything we've limited, with the exception of the fast food and retail, everything is limited to the Ames Street District which is the smaller subsetof the MXD.
STEVEN COHEN: That's the entire block?

DAVID STEWART: That's correct.
STEVEN COHEN: But are there any
other, you know, potential changes resulting from the change in the loading or anything else or is it really on1y affecting this multi-family project right here?

DAVID STEWART: It really on1y
affects the multi-family. I guess in theory somebody who has an existing loading dock within the Ames Street subdistrict could go and have more capacity for future density which they don't have, but that's about it.

Does that answer your question?
STEVEN COHEN: I think so.
ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Yes, I
mean, I suppose -- I understand the question.

I think it's an appropriate inquiry. I think the changes are limited to that district.

The -- obviously some of them on their face.
The lot area per dwelling unit density applies and the FAR change applies to the multi-family residential as well. So in the future could an existing building be converted to residential? I suppose this could have implication if one of the office buildings some day sought to become a residential building, they could avail themselves of the reduced parking and presumably perhaps the loading requirements as well. But beyond that it's hard to envision -- it's limited to the district, and given the open space requirements, there really are no other opportunities I think for modifications.

STEVEN COHEN: Actually, I have one
other question. Whatever happened to that steel you had already ordered?

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: You see
the Building 19 is going out of business?
They didn't do well with it.
HUGH RUSSELL: So I would like to
weigh in on the question of fast food. I sat on the committee called the Harvard Square Advisory Committee with Pebble Gifford and a number of other very fine folks, and the committee actually still exists, we just don't have anything to function in the city anymore. But -- and the staff manages that situation admirably but not forcing us to come and actually talk to each other when there's nothing to talk about. But anyway, Pebble was concerned 30 years ago about the changes that were happening at Harvard Square, and the changes that were happening
kind of nationally to retail with a consolidation of retail to many national retailers that meant that when you were, when you saw a, you know, CVS, you didn't know what state you were in. And other things you probably didn't know what country you were in. And she was -- did not want that to happen to Harvard Square. So, the Fast Order Food Ordinance was a response to that desire to try to run counter to the sort of mega business trends, and I think it succeeded. It's pretty strange and bizarre, and as Mr. Rafferty's examples show, it's, it's very difficult to administer and business that would get submit impossible to administer as it appears to an outside observer would be rationa1. The person in charge of that, our Commissioner of Buildings, is imminently a fair and rational man. So that's why I say
it's impossible.
So I think we could take this on as a task to try to make this clear, but it actually kind of works. It doesn't appear to impose an enormous burden. And so the suggestion here where there is a cap, to raise that cap so that it's no longer a restraint on the commercial activity here, but still allows for a review of the kinds of establishments that are happening and their impacts. It seems not unreasonable. I have no reason to think that, and I guess the -we're talking about the Ames Street District having eight such --

DAVID STEWART: That's correct.
HUGH RUSSELL: And if you add the quadrangle, it's 15 . Yes, you might run up against that some day. I mean, if Clover is fast food -- they're really not very fast I
have to tell you. It's very fast to order the food. Right. It's really a strange place in many ways. But kids there with, you know, cellphones that take your order and little belts with money things on them that -- like at a carnival that give you your change. But they're happy to explain the menu. Just a little unusual to some of us. But I'11 just warn you don't try to eat a Clover sandwich in a moving car. Clover wrap or whatever it is. But they're very interesting food and I'm glad that it's going to be available in Kendall Square because I'm sure that there are many -- it's a popular place in Harvard Square and I think it will be popular in Kendall Square.

Anyway, I would suggest that we
recommend adoption of that and comment to the
Council that it doesn't appear that this part
of the Ordinance is broken, therefore, we're not proposing to fix it. And so the idea of having a cap, we don't, we don't really know where that came from, but if there's a cap, that doesn't appear to limit the ability to provide suitable establishments for the public. That seems to be the right thing to do here. I was going to go on to the other things.

STEVEN COHEN: Could I comment on the fast food before you go on to the next topic?

HUGH RUSSELL: Sure.
STEVEN COHEN: And as you point out, times have changed and Pebble's concerns of 30 years ago may not prevail today. On the other hand I remember, and Jeff, maybe you could perhaps help me with this, I think it was in the Central Square Zoning, we talked
about the concept of chain stores and the concern there is not fast food per se, but you know, mass produced stores with, you know, universal colors and branding. And that's what we were trying to avoid, not the use per se, really, but the sort of, you know, bland, you know, commercial branding. And I wonder whether that concept wouldn't be more appropriate to hear, you know, rather than the focus on fast food per se. ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY:

Mr. Chairman, just to point out, the petition merely speaks to the cap. Harvard Square, and I agree I always credit Ms. Gifford, I jokingly refer to her as the Godmother of the Fast Food Ordinance she shepherded it and championed it and it has worked we11. But it's worth noting there's no cap in Harvard Square. You go through the Special Permit
process and you apply for it.
The cap came about in Central Square in the '80s when Central Square action plan was done and Mr. Barron and others really felt that we were seeing way too much fast food of the type that doesn't really exist today, and that's where the notion of the cap. How it wound out at three in the MXD District, I have no idea. But I think the timing of the Central Square cap and the adoption the MXD Zoning is close enough in time that it's representative of that. But those are the only two places where the cap exists. I think the issue about the Ordinance itself -- and I mean, I think the Ordinance has a very valid purpose and it addresses one of the criteria is need and things do get evaluated as to whether or not, you know, you know, you need three coffee shops on the same
block. I mean that's what the BZA hashes out when they hear Special Permit.

STEVEN COHEN: Frankly, Jim, from my
personal perspective I would let the market determine what the need is. By raising this other issue of chain stores, I'm really more concerned about I guess in part it's an aesthetic issue, but it's more than aesthetic. It's either presence of chain stores have an impact on the perception of an entire neighborhood or district. And I don't think, again, Jeff, you're going to have to help me, I don't think that proposed regulation of chain stores sort of prohibited those stores so much as it regulated the sort of signage and storefront and perception of those uses.

Do I recall that correctly?
JEFF ROBERTS: I'11 just try to
cover that briefly. Jeff Roberts, again.
The -- as Hugh mentioned, the, you
know, fast order food regulations were put in place largely as a response to national chains. I think for a long time the whole notion of fast food was kind of synonymous with chains, and that was the approach that was taken. One of the approaches that some cities more recently have adopted is a formula business approach -- regulation. And the key -- well, one of the key issues is that, you know, Zoning can't regulate based on ownership. You can't say if you have two identical uses, you can't say well you're a national chain and you're a local business, therefore, the national chain is not allowed and the local business is allowed. But one of the things that cities have implemented largely through looking at the design of an
establishment is to say that if you have a particular type of branding, facade design, interior design that's similar across a large number of establishments around the country, that the municipality, the municipality through its Zoning can regulate that either through, you know, some cities have taken to restricting those types of uses, some have imposed design review requirements or other types of review requirements. And, you know, that's -- I think it's a much more complicated question. We did talk about it in Central Square. We talked about it with the Board a little bit. And if I recall the conversation was mixed in terms of people's feelings about, you know, what the effect that would be on, on the overall environment as well as on the ability for, you know, to have the businesses there, some kind of
formula businesses or businesses that people like and that are, you know, contribute positively to mix of uses in an area. So it was a very complex issue and, you know, you're right to point out that there are alternative approaches to this, but I think that it requires more study and more discussion with the Board, and probably something as I think Hugh brought up is that we could take on in kind of a larger level than just on the specific Zoning Petition. HUGH RUSSELL: I mean, from a technical point of view we can't introduce that into this petition because it spans the scope of the petition.

STEVEN COHEN: In reviewing Special
Permit or is it not a -- it is a Special
Permit for the fast food?
ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Yes.

## HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

STEVEN COHEN: In reviewing such a Special Permit do we have authority to review the, you know, the signage, the formulaic elements of a use?

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: It's one
of the criteria. There are about under
11-point something. They're about six or eight of them, but one about is character and context and it covers biodegradables. It covers a percentage of food and all that. But there is a provision that talks about fitting into the -- I can't put my finger on -- fitting into the local context.

STEVEN COHEN: If there was a proposal for a Dunkin' Donuts, I mean would we be within our rights to approve it subject to a condition as to, you know, how the branding is done on a street?

HUGH RUSSELL: To answer that first is we don't do that.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: You don't do that.

HUGH RUSSELL: The Zoning Board does that.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: The Zoning Board does that.

HUGH RUSSELL: So I bet you didn't know that there was a Dunkin' Donuts on the corner of --

STEVEN COHEN: Harvard Square.
HUGH RUSSELL: -- of Eliot Street.
STEVEN COHEN: Well, that's the sort of thing that I'm thinking of.

HUGH RUSSELL: But I think that was -- I think Pebble had cut that deal before it hit the Zoning Board that it wasn't going to look like a Dunkin' Donuts.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: You are of course referring to the Eliot Street Cafe? HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Which has in its BZA Special Permit a condition on the size of the lettering for under which the words "Dunkin' Donuts" can apply. And Pebble has been so vigilant over the years that when they put up a temporary sign and they're selling coolattas for the month in July for 99 cents, there's generally a call placed to ISD that such a sign violates. So that the operator has -- knows now. But yes, that's one of the more --

AHMED NUR: They're also sole parties and bananas and apples.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: I would comment on this particular thing is I'm trying to think
aren't there any formula businesses in the Boston Properties buildings in this entire district? There's Legal Seafood, but after Legal Seafood started a half a mile away and they're just trying to be nationa1. But I mean there's -- there's a scenario that's characterized by the kind of marketing and retail space I think that we're looking for. I don't know how that happened, but, you know --

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Probably largely because for the longest time there was little in the way of retail. There was the bookstore, Quantum Books, and the MIT Coop. And that was it for a long, long time for retail there, for better or for worse. So I think part of the focus on active uses, the introduction of restaurants, the Chipotle use. The food court, I did learn more about,
it is an interesting thing. The Ordinance describes if it's not visible from the public way, like within the Marriott Hotel, not the Marriott Residence Inn, there's actually a Starbucks, but that Starbucks doesn't have any exterior signage and it's internal to the hotel, so that didn't require a fast food Special Permit. It's an accessory use to the hotel. And I've since learned apparently that's how the food court -- there's a handful of food uses tucked in behind the entrance to the T that is not visible from the public way, does not have any external signage, which is one of the criteria for determining whether it's a principal use or not subject to the Special Permit. So -- but there is this emerging understanding or need of how to improve upon retail. And as you're seeing in the PUD districts and the rezonings
at University Park, I was actually -- I would think of it as you struggled with the earlier case, you actually imposed requirements upon property owners and permit holders to develop marketing plans in conjunction with the economic development office and submit those updates annually to you to see what's happening on the retail front. And we, I would say with what we've seen in terms of retail in Eastern Cambridge, there has been -- I do think people get it in terms of that we're not seeing McDonald's or Burger King. We're seeing uses that are hopefully somewhat organic. And Clover certainly is a prime example of something like that. So I think there's an increased awareness/understanding of what good retail is and particularly what this type of fast food is.

HUGH RUSSELL: So I'd like to go on
to the open space.
I think the intention of the
requirements that are in the Ordinance now is to sort of make sure that there is a distributed system of open space throughout the entire MXD District. And I think, and that there are, as this diagram shows just a portion of it, there is a distributed open space. There is distributed open space. There are places in the -- that could be better connections, and a lot of that is the street frontage which sometimes is a little harsh. The streets are getting rebuilt, and I hope that that will help with that ultimately as the plans of Broadway is changing, the unfriendly frontage of the hote1, I think is going to get more friendly for pedestrians. And so I think it would be nice to, you know, have a -- it's sort of
like each time you did a new building or did a -- made a significant change, if you would sort of, if update an open space master plan to see how what you're doing ties in with everything else. Now, is that a Zoning requirement? Is that something that can actually happen under Chapter 19? But it seems to me that's what ought to be done and that we -- just as my colleague here pointed out, oh, there's some space outside the building frontage that now what's going to happen to that? And it happens at both ends of that block. And under what context would that be done? Probably the Chapter 19 review I would think would be the place to do it because that really, I think largely that's probably a staff function -JEFF ROBERTS: Yes. HUGH RUSSELL: -- of looking at
those kinds of open space things.
TOM SIENIEWICZ: I like that
approach. We're in effect I think creating one large block here in which we're using kind of lot-1ike descriptions, Zoning descriptions. So we're saying consider it one large block, the open space system will be aggregated and applied to development across the block. FAR, we're taking the same approach. So I think that that's consistent with the spirit of what the proponent is bringing forward to us in a Zoning Amendment here to look at the open space every time there's a major building, let's reevaluate the block wide open space. It's at play. I think that makes sense. It's consistent with the spirit of what we're looking at tonight. BRIAN MURPHY: It also ties in with the work that we're doing now with the ECKOS

Community, the East Cambridge Kendal1 Open
Space Committee that Tom and Stuart have been working on. We have an RFP out right now for a competition coordinator to try to look at really the entire -- who will then put in place a jury and to reach out to a number of different folks for a competition just to really look at the entire network of open space in that area. And that's -HUGH RUSSELL: And that will be a public study of what the public realm will do, but also take into account the private open spaces.

STUART DASH: Al1 the private and public open spaces as a full network.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. So maybe putting a requirement that this petitioner, this entity do this, may or may not -- more like a cooperation and a presentation of what
the status of it is. I don't know whether that's something that needs to go into the Zoning or not, but maybe we should think about that and let the Council think about that.

STUART DASH: It's not that had to do as part of their work in any way, but we'11 be looking at the whole network as well.

HUGH RUSSELL: Are there other points that people want to bring up?

AHMED NUR: Yes. I'm just curious about Heather's comments with regarding to the public alleyway and the cantilever over this alleyway. And also the loading dock. I don't know, it appears just from looking at this alleyway, maybe it's what 20, 18 feet wide? If you put a loading dock in there, I don't know how a tracker trailer 40 -footer
can go in there. And J.F.K., and I noticed it in Harvard Square, that there's these little loading docks tucked away and none of these trucks can really turn around or make a turn so they end up double parking on the street. And it goes down to one lane and the bicycles will not have a chance to go by because of the trucks are unloading on Ames Street, and just one of the concerns.

## HUGH RUSSELL: It does look like

it's wider than 18 feet. It might be 25 to
30 feet wide which may help. Also, I would think that in the design review of the building, the Traffic and Parking, Transportation Department will be looking at the kind of the templative moves of vehicles as you will be because it's obviously got to work for you.

The other comment I would make is there
may be a requirement for four vehicles there, but I would be surprised to find four vehicles there very often. That helps you with your turning radii a lot. So it's -- so I think a lot of what you're talking about is really going to be part of the design review. TOM SIENIEWICZ: So there hasn't been any comments about the parking. I really applaud this approach of sharing the parking. There's, I don't know, I had a wonderful adjective but I don't recall now, but a symbiotic relationship your businesses use it during the day and the residents use it at night. And so it prevents the city from being choked with excess parking because you're designating one per absolutely. So I like the economy of that and it's consistent with this notion that we're kind of sharing the resources of the development block wide.

Ms. Hoffman's comment about
unrestricted or unlimited -- I guess I'm sympathetic to that notion, but I didn't see that language specifically in the amendment as I've got -- or the proposal as I've got it forward. I would just a caution to staff that those semantics are in fact important and the precedent would not go unnoticed, not that there's anything the various contemplated here. It's just something that we should be mindful of when we would draft the actual Zoning Amendment that isn't put in those terms that it's un1imited FAR.

HUGH RUSSELL: A7though I think we basically had two ways of regulating density. One is sort of either district-wide with a cap by district, and people create their own districts, by creating PUDs in certain parts of the city. And the other way is by saying,
okay, you've got a lot that's this big. You can have this much on it. And there's some parts that are actually fairly bizarre.

Like, there's a 35 -acre lot in Harvard Square that has, you know, 120 buildings of Harvard University on it. And, you know, they have these amazing spreadsheets when they try to do a building to try to deal with that, they've, you know, they probably -- they're regulated in the wrong mechanism.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Right. HUGH RUSSELL: But in general -- so this one, the MXD District was in this land you can build so much building. And if you run the numbers, you end up with a certain density. And then we decided it was worth increasing the amount of housing. And so if you were to look at the overall lander and the overall, you know, amount of building
permitted, it's not un1imited.
TOM SIENIEWICZ: It's not uni imited. HUGH RUSSELL: And it's probably not
a lot different than four. I don't know what it is. I doubt if it's over five. It might be under four because of just, you know, if you look at the whole district.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: We11, to that point, the --

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: It has to do with definition, you're right. But what defines a lot? And then some of these parcels are wholly owned entities and others have separate owners, so it doesn't really change the massing, if you will. Title has impact. So I think this is more akin to University Park and some of the PUDs where it's almost district-wide FAR as opposed to

## lot FAR.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. And you
consider a master plan and so -- I mean, this is our chance to say no, there shouldn't be a 26 - or 22-story building at this location. So in a way that's -- if we think that's a terrible idea, and I don't think we do think it's a terrible idea, it's been considered in the Kendall Square planning and it's consistent with the planning guidelines that are proposed for that district. So -- but that's really, I mean, now is where we're saying -- because it's already 250-foot height limit. We're just saying now there's going to be a building there that's going to be that tall across the street from another one which should have been it.

Sorry I'm wandering. Was there more that you wanted to say?

## I think --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Are you done?

## TOM SIENIEWICZ: I'm done.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Okay.
So I'm thinking about the parking and I of course in general applaud the idea that lower ownership and driving is an important thing to encourage in the city. I am struggling with the idea that we're decoupling a parking minimum from a specific proposal. And in this -- going so far below what we have generally approved in the city as a number of spaces per unit when we don't know the mix of units, is difficult for me to understand except for the fact that it's a minimum. The Planning Board, when you come back for your Article 19 Permit, could potentially say you have to do more than that. And by approving
the minimum, we're saying that you don't then have to go back to the BZA for a Special Permit to reduce it below the one.

I'm also, I guess, somewhat skeptical on the sharing of parking particularly at this location between residential uses and non-residential uses in that I think you're going to see a lot of car owners in this location who do not routinely move their cars every day. Who for whom the garage is car storage for weekend use and, therefore, they're not going to be vacating those spaces during the day for office users. Which may be fine, but it may require that the ratio of spaces from office to residential be tweaked to the extent leases allow such tweaking. I should be very clear, I'm really happy at the idea of trying to make this all fit within the existing parking envelope. I really like
that, and I think it can be done. The only part of this I'm not totally a hundred percent on board with is the idea of going all the way down to 0.5 as a minimum and then having to push back up and say, no, we really think you belong at 0.8 . 0.5 feels really low. So I'm not sure what the right number there is. I -- and like I said, and the right number to me really depends on what that mix of units is. So I agree with the idea that it should be low enough that you don't, you don't have to go to the BZA to go lower, but I don't want it to be so low that you're saying hey, we lowered it to 0.5 why are you making us go to 0.8 ? So that's, that's the tension I'm dealing with there. STEVEN COHEN: Can I --

HUGH RUSSELL: So I think as you, as
you said in the beginning, the real thing we
have to look at is when the proposal comes in, we need to look at -- we need to study this, we've got this garage, here are the people the uses that are using that garage, here's the time, here's how it all fits together, and the garage works or it doesn't.

And then we might find there -- how many spaces with in the garage?

DAVID STEWART: 844.
HUGH RUSSELL: 844.
So you might find that there are a
couple hundred spaces that don't fit or you might find that, you know, some people have to park across the street in the other garage. We don't know sitting here, you probably know now what the present circumstances are of the -- of what's happening with the garage right now. So I think that's the real key step is that
analysis.
CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I
totally agree with that. And, therefore, I'm comfortable with saying okay, probably lowering it some makes sense, but what I don't want to get into is tension between essentially us and your lenders between how many spaces, you know, you're allowed to get away with under the Zoning as a minimum and us pushing to do more and, you know, your financiers and your current office tenants saying, well, we don't want to give up spaces. So I just want to keep that -- the delta between the minimum where we're saying is okay under Zoning and how much we're really likely to approve as small as possible to minimize that tension in everybody's expectations.

STEVEN COHEN: Could I follow up on
that for a moment because I'm a little bit confused. There is somehow or another my microphone is being pulled away. I mean, there was reference to sharing between residential and office uses and, you know, sort of the description of the proposal, but in fact, that concept isn't in the actual proposed Zoning Ordinance. Zoning Ordinance simply says that there will be 0.5 spaces per unit, and I imagine those are not shared spaces, therefore, those are dedicated spaces and, therefore, to the extent that any sharing could be organized and coordinated, that would be above and beyond the 0.5 per space, per unit. So I'm -- I guess I have two things.

First of a11, I mean that makes sense to me and it means that to the extent that there's demand for more parking spaces, you
know, from the residential uses. You might well be able to provide them through some sort of sharing mechanism. However, that would be, I think, outside the Zoning, because the Zoning is simply saying that all you have to do is provide the 0.5 per unit and there is no mechanism in there for the sharing per se. So I --

HUGH RUSSELL: Let's pose that as a question. Is the other parts of parking in the MXD Ordinance? Are there parking sharing? How is it done?

## ATTORNEY MADELEINE TIMIN: It's

Madeleine Timin. It's done on a pooled parking basis. So the garages are all available. It's not on-site parking so it's -- you' 11 have each block within the MXD has a parking garage within it so that each of the users in that block or in that lot
parcel share. So that's, I think the term shared probably -- we were probably use it as more of a garage is shared by multiple buildings as opposed to a specific space is shared, you park here nine to five, you park here five to eight, you know. It's more just the idea that it's pooled parking in general in the district. So by virtue of the fact that the uses are counter-cyclical, the reduced parking requirement works.

HUGH RUSSELL: So I'm going to -that means when you come for your permit, you're going to have a little sheet that says we have an 843 car garage and so many spaces are allocated to each of the seven buildings or eight buildings, and this is how each one of them -- how the allocation is in conformance with whatever regulations are there. And so you believe that there are 120
spaces in that garage now that aren't, that aren't allocated under Zoning for anybody else.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Wel1 --
HUGH RUSSELL: If you didn't think that, then you're in trouble.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: -- the only caveat on that is perhaps not in that garage. I think we would provide, as required by our Building Permit, Special Permits submittal, we will do a Zoning analysis of the range of land uses in the district based largely on square footage, restaurants by seating, and demonstrate that the parking supply that exists can meet the Zoning requirements for all of the office buildings there as well as the 0.5 requirement for 125 units within the parking -- within the parking supply in the

MXD District. So it could turn out that some people who currently park in this garage are relocated to another garage, or that residents in this building may be parking in one of the other two garages. But the parking analysis from a Zoning perspective is collective. A single parking supply based on a build out of the district. And the confidence exists that we -- within the, within the Zoning requirements associated with the existing MXD District, we have capacity to allow for a 0.5 ratio to meet the parking demand that we required here.

It's a different question as Mr. Cohen raised, is that within the operation of the garage or is there going to be shared parking and where is that parking going to go and where would those spaces be? The Zoning minimum, and I get the point Ms. Connolly
made, that as you know, will be a collaborative exercise with the Traffic Department ultimately when we do our TIS about what's the right supply and how that gets handled.

STEVEN COHEN: But, Jim, are you then saying that -- I'm stil1 not a hundred percent sure that I understand. You're saying that there will not be dedicated spaces for the residential --

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: I don't know if that determination has been made.

DAVID STEWART: That's correct, we won't leave a spot that's completely dedicated to a residential because when they're not there, he can't use the space. So we're -- I'd say the parking garage, quote, industry is moving away from dedicated as for specific uses because it's much more
efficient to use the spaces for and share them amongst as many uses as you can in a mixed use context.

STEVEN COHEN: But it also means that if demand exceeds Zoning or exceeds expectations, that a residential owner who thought he had a space in the garage might get there and the garage is full or an office user might have the same experience. So because there is no dedicated spaces for them.

DAVID STEWART: We11, the way we tend to deal with that is that people that have a right to park in the garage, whether they are residential parker or a commercial parker, will never be denied access to the garage. So we wouldn't exceed our Zoning minimum. We wouldn't exceed our permit, but we would always be able to accommodate them.

## ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Another

way to look at it, you see it in a retail shopping center, not that we have that many of them here, but the square footage is based on the number of seats. If you get three restaurants with varying capacity, you still have a single parking supply. So if you get one popular retailer, you don't segregate his customers and say well, you only get to park in that aisle because they park down the next aisle and Trader Joe's parks in the third aisle. You base it on the square footage, but there isn't assigned parking. You have to have a Zoning minimum number of spaces to meet what's required. That's kind of a parking management issue as to dedicated spaces, and people pay premiums to have dedicated spaces. We have HOV spaces that get dedicated. So there's a whole range of
things, but yeah, it's not a unique situation in parking supplies to have non-dedicated spaces particularly in mixed use settings. STEVEN COHEN: I get it. Just when we're reducing the requirement fairly aggressively, we increase the risk that the demand may in fact exceed the requirement and, you know, I'm just, you know, a little bit concerned what happens in that scenario.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: It's a parking management issue strictly, and that's where I believe the details lie and you work them out. At least this Planning Board member sharing a parking resource for mixed uses from daytime to nighttime, is something to be memorialized in the Zoning. It makes -- it's common sense. And it will keep our city from getting choked with parking garages.

BRIAN MURPHY: It's also very much
in keeping with the K2 Committee's work that, you know, went through it and this is one of the recommendations in terms of trying to push people towards that shared parking and look at the lower ratios both in terms of what the experience is to the T station.

STUART DASH: And, Steve, it means that if they say they're going to provide spaces for that many, they'11 have to figure out how to provide --

STEVEN COHEN: Yes, yes, that's what he said and that's what I understand now. Somehow or other you'11 accommodate them, and you'11 park somewhere in the garage. HUGH RUSSELL: And I think, you know, arguably residential parking is a little different than commercial parking in that if you're bringing home, you know, two bags of groceries, you shouldn't have to walk
four blocks from the, you know, the other parking garage. So we might as a Board say, you have to manage it so that people who live in this building get to park in the garage that is close to this building.

My recommendation would be for the staff to communicate our discretion to the Traffic and Parking Department and to have them think about how they would be -- how they would want to evaluate parking and see if there's any language that's needed in the Ordinance to clarify what happens when you're evaluating that parking. It seems that, you know, we're assuming that the 0.5 per dwelling unit is -- that is a number that's dedicated in the sense of the calculation, but if -- that may or may not be the case. And, you know, we have -- I think we've dug into this issue and find that it's, there's a
lot of energy here on this issue, perhaps more than is deserved, but that's personally because everybody is an expert on parking. There are actually some real experts on this Board.

So is there anything else we want to add to this recommendation? Because it sounds like we want to forward this favorably to the City Council.

AHMED NUR: I think we do.
I just have -- this is my own personal,
I think, there's a little darkness in the Article 19 with regarding to micro apartment units. If those are considered units, what is the staff language -- what was the language in the Zoning with regard to low income housing, for example, that -- what is it, 10 or 15 percent normally? So micro -are those units counting as of --

HUGH RUSSELL: We11, the practice is that when you have affordable housing, the units that are affordable are distributed by size in the same way that overall --

AHMED NUR: It's by size?
HUGH RUSSELL: -- coincides. And there's a delicate negotiation about exactly which units are done, and every city does it differently.

AHMED NUR: Right.
HUGH RUSSELL: You know, the thing that's unsaid here is that there's increasing awareness that $\$ 3,000$ apartments don't serve even people who have some pretty good jobs. You have to sort of earn $\$ 110,000$ a year to afford a \$3,000 a month apartment if you're paying 30 percent of your income. If you're making $\$ 120,000$ a year -- and there are some of us who actually don't make that amount of
money, but we don't qualify for subsidized apartments by about a factor of two. So there's an increasing awareness in the city that there's a segment of the market that is priced out of new housing. And I don't think we can in this amendment address that.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: You know, Mr. Chairman, it might be worth noting if you're worried about the Board next year, Chairman of the Ordinance Committee suggested on that very point, he announced that this hearing that he is planning on filing an order to examine whether some flexibility can be given to the formula of distribution. Right now 20 percent of the units would be micro. Then 20 percent of your affordable units would be micro. And I think there was some -- he indicated a willingness to perhaps file an order that might create some
flexibility. So if the city, through its affordable housing department, had a targeted preferred number of units for affordable people, that there might be some flexibility. Because right now it's a rigid formula, as you know, and it's set -- particularly when you have a building this tall, I worked with a client once who was trying to preserve high units with expansive views and said I'11 actually give you a few more units affordable if I could have the top three floors. But the Ordinance doesn't allow for it. So it was a case of could we get bigger units or more units, so it's an interesting analysis, and I think there will be more to come by way of -- perhaps by the time we're ready to get a Building Permit there could be some new language, but I imagine the question -buildings of this size, because I don't think
when we adopted the Affordable Housing
Ordinance, buildings of this size, the
Twining size were probably in the thinking as to how to apply. We don't have many of those buildings, but I think we'11 see more on it.

PAMELA WINTERS: Jim, I was going to
ask a question about that, too, before you brought it up. How much, like for example, how much would an affordable apartment cost in this building roughly? Like, how much per month roughly?

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: We11, the good news about the affordables is that it's totally unrelated to the market race and the cost of construction, so it really is a function of earning power of households. So the disparity between the market rate unit and the affordable unit can be, you know, multiples of 70,80 percent. So a one-person
household and --
BRIAN MURPHY: Tenants pay 30
percent of their income on rent, and it can be, you know, it depends on where it falls where they are in the income. You know, typically ends up being around 55 or 60 percent of who the actual residents in the affordable units are. So it's, it is significantly below that 120,000 for a 3,000. PAMELA WINTERS: So this will also include middle income people?

BRIAN MURPHY: No, this is not a middle income provision. But that is one of the ongoing issues that the City Council has pushed us to try to look at from a policy standpoint --

PAMELA WINTERS: I think that would be good.

BRIAN MURPHY: -- we're likely to be
going out with a nexus study to try to look at that issue and try to explore whether that's something, that ends up taking place. But it's clearly an ongoing issue because of the fact that there is such a significant gap between market and where things are. And, again, the nature of the economy that when you've got an entry level position at Google making 100 grand, you're looking in the housing market than some other people other.

PAMELA WINTERS: Good, thank you. HUGH RUSSELL: Wasn't there a memo from somebody that said there are a couple other citywide provisions that we recommend be folded into this?

JEFF ROBERTS: That might have been the Discovery Park memo.

HUGH RUSSELL: That was the
Discovery Park memo?

JEFF ROBERTS: Right. The points that are mentioned would actually be -because this is just a Zoning change, this isn't a project that's already been permitted. Other Zoning regulations would come into effect like the green building requirement.

HUGH RUSSELL: So, if in the wisdom
of the Council they change the affordability section in a year or so, I mean, might -hopefully the petitioner as point of view this building wouldn't catch it, but it might also be in a position and that's such a study to allow renegotiation of existing buildings. You know, you could imagine that, you know, a building that has affordable units now could come in and renegotiate the rental mix in a transition plan. At some point in the future that might be, might be worth doing, and
there might be a thousand screaming low income people in City Council chambers saying you're stealing our housing for yuppies and we don't want it.

IRAM FAROOQ: In the spirit of things coming down the pike, you discussed a lot of things that are broad and global like how do we think about open space as large projects progress or the middle income components. And those are all part of the larger K2 Zoning, and you all passed the MIT component, but there are three other remaining PUDs, including the MXD District that may be coming back to you in the coming year.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. And we, we felt that we needed to get the attention of the Boston Properties, because one of those districts is owned almost exclusively by

Boston Properties, and that we needed to work cooperatively with you to finalize those recommendations.

And I would just thank you for
reminding me, because I, you know, I think we hoped we would be working on that by now.

You can't do Zoning in the last six months of an odd number year in the city, but....

So, but we should put that on our agenda for next year to try to finish that piece of work with you. And the other piece in that was that with the CRA rethinking of what their role and function was, they obviously could be a partner and might be a very valuable partner in the DOT site of where there's a lot of land and an owner that we're trying to get into gear. So, but, you know, the -- so that's what I said, you know, we want three or four more of these apartment
buildings. That's the kind of -- that would be what we want to talk about. What do you want to do with your property? Are there places where you can see ways to, you know, make the city better and other ways that things you want to do that you can't do right now. The Coop building is an example of a building that people have identified as softer than say the Marriott Hotel. I mean, you know, so that discussion is important to conclude and we -- and now that we're approaching the end of the blackout period, you should get to it.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: So mindful of the hour, I have one question here since we have an expert in the room, and it actually relates to the economics of microunits. I mean, there's I think a perception that they would be highly profitable for a developer to
produce and, you know, giving up smal1
amounts of space for large amounts of rent.
But I'm sure that's a slightly naive view of that product. I mean, maybe you do make a lot of extra money. I don't know. I'd love to understand a little more about what the advantages are to a developer to making microunits or disadvantages.

DAVID STEWART: Yeah, I mean I can
offer from strictly an economic standpoint.
The tradeoff is you get more rent for the same amount of space because you can charge more on a per square foot basis. However, the build out is more expensive because any given size of area where you're building microunits, you're building more kitchens, more bathrooms, more plumbing, that sort of thing. So it becomes an economic tradeoff and what's the balancing point and from that
point of view. We're thinking of it obviously from the economic side, but more from the customer standpoint. So if there's a demand for this type of unit and the people that -- kids that are right out of school that want to work for Google, if they want units like this, then I'd love to build them some if we can make it work economically.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: So are we ready for a motion?

Okay, so we're looking for a motion to recommend this to the City Council with the discussion points that we've engaged in this evening essentially.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: So moved. HUGH RUSSELL: Second?

STEVEN COHEN: Second.
HUGH RUSSELL: Any discussion on the
motion?
Al1 those voting in favor of the motion?
(Raising hands.)
HUGH RUSSELL: A11 members voting in favor.

Is there any more business for us tonight?

BRIAN MURPHY: I don't think so.
HUGH RUSSELL: Then we are
adjourned.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { (Whereupon, at 9:35 p.m., the } \\
& \text { Planning Board Adjourned.) }
\end{aligned}
$$
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