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## PROCEEDINGS

HUGH RUSSELL: Good evening. This is a meeting of the Cambridge Planning Board.

And I guess we should have an announcement about what's going to happen this evening first from someone who knows.

BRIAN MURPHY: Sure.
Just to let people know, unfortunately because of unexpected conflicts we will not have full quorums for either the 10 Essex Street hearing or the 75 New Street hearing. Because of that, each Petitioner has decided that they would want to exercise their legal right to go before a full hearing of the Board. So both of those hearings are going to be postponed unfortunately.

The 10 Essex Street hearing wil1 be next week, February 18th, and 75 New Street will be March 4th.

| 1 | And, again, my apologies for the lack |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | of notice. This was -- happened very late |
| 3 | and I'm sorry for all involved. And we will |
| 4 | reschedule. |
| 5 | JAMES WILLIAMSON: Who is it that |
| 6 | can't be here? |
| 7 | STEVEN WINTER: That's not relevant. |
| 8 | JAMES WILLIAMSON: Of course it is. |
| 9 | It's a public body. |
| 10 | LIZA PADEN: The people who aren't |
| 11 | here -- |
| 12 | HUGH RUSSELL: Are the ones that |
| 13 | can't be here. |
| 14 | LIZA PADEN: -- are the members who |
| 15 | can't be here. |
| 16 | STEVEN WINTER: I'm sorry, the |
| 17 | second date was March 18th? |
| 18 | BRIAN MURPHY: Sure. If you like, I |
| 19 | can just -- | more -- I'11 send out notice.

BRIAN MURPHY: Just for the people who are here, 10 Essex Street will be February 18th, a week from today. And 75 New Street will be March 4th.

STEVEN WINTER: Thank you.
BRIAN MURPHY: And I think unfortunately based on the New Street hearing, if I were to predict March snow, I would say March 4th is a good bet since that will be the fourth time that has been scheduled.

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay.
HUGH RUSSELL: We11, we can do a few things tonight.

LIZA PADEN: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: And does that constitute your update?

BRIAN MURPHY: I can give you another update, also. On February 18th we'11 have 10 Essex Street. As well as for general business, the Norris Street cooling tower design change, a BZA sign variance request, and PUD procedure amendment proposals and basement height proposals.

For March 4th we'11 have the Chun Petition, 75 New Street, as well as the courthouse. And March 18th we will have 15 Richdale Avenue on as well for public hearing.

HUGH RUSSELL: Liza forwarded a letter on 40 Norris Street that was addressed to the Mayor. I think you did. I got it. Yes.

And I was just wondering, I assume that went to the Inspectional Services Department --

| 1 | LIZA PADEN: Yes. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | JAMES WILLIAMSON: I don't |
| 3 | understand not being willing to say who is |
| 4 | not here. What is it, a big secret? |
| 5 | HUGH RUSSELL: James -- |
| 6 | JAMES WILLIAMSON: I'm sorry, but |
| 7 | this is a public -- |
| 8 | HUGH RUSSELL: James, you're out of |
| 9 | order. |
| 10 | JAMES WILLIAMSON: -- body and no |
| 11 | one is willing to say who's not here. |
| 12 | HUGH RUSSELL: James, you're out of |
| 13 | order. |
| 14 | JAMES WILLIAMSON: Yeah, I know for |
| 15 | a reason. |
| 16 | HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. |
| 17 | LIZA PADEN: Yes. The e-mail that |
| 18 | you got, the letter that you got was also |
| 19 | sent to Inspectional Services. So there's a |

discussion going on between Inspectional
Services and myself to clarify exactly what has been reviewed by ISD, the inspector's review, both for the gross floor area and where the gross floor area of the units and not the units and that sort of thing. I'm hoping all those questions will be in a coherent statement for next Tuesday.

HUGH RUSSELL: Great, that's what I was hoping.

LIZA PADEN: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: So that -- because that's not really on our plate but where people are obviously concerned about that.

LIZA PADEN: Right.
HUGH RUSSELL: So, and next is the BZA cases.

LIZA PADEN: Okay, so there is one applicant who is here for 286 Concord Avenue
and this -- right? 286 Concord Avenue. And this is a telecommunications antenna which has bounced back and forth between the BZA and staff review as well as Historical Commission review, and they've been asked to come back to the Planning Board to show you what the proposal is. And I will let Susan Roberts explain what the situation is.

ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: Hello. My
name is Susan Roberts and I've got some things to give you that we filed with the Planning Board today, including a cover 1etter and --

HUGH RUSSELL: This is the one we looked at before and we didn't like?

ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: Yeah.
DAVID FORD: You've never seen this before. This is brand new.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right, but the case
has been before us.
DAVID FORD: Right, exactly, yes.
We'11 explain how we got back here.
BRIAN MURPHY: While we're getting
set up, just to let people know who are coming in late, 10 Essex Street hearing has been postponed as has the 75 New Street hearing.

ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: Perhaps
I'11 give you a minute or two to look at the cover letter which explains why we're here somewhat, and then photo sims that my colleague David passed out to you.

Once, again, because I think the mic wasn't on when I said it before, my name is Susan Roberts. I'm an attorney for AT\&T and I'm here with David Ford from Centerline Communications. As you know, we have been to the Planning Board before. We filed an
application for a Special Permit back in July or July 31st actually, and we were here at the Board in August. We've also reviewed the designs with planning staff. We have had two meetings with the BZA. And the BZA also has not liked what we have proposed.

We have gone back to the drawing board significantly and what we have come up with is a design that we think and hope everyone will feel is pleasing and quite in character with the neighborhood.

So what we've done just to sort of run through a little bit -- and by the way, why we're here is hopefully to get your recommendation to the Board of Zoning Appeal because we have a hearing before them on February 27th. So our hope was to get a sense of your opinion of the design that hopefully will be positive and that you could
transmit a recommendation to the Board that is, you know, I don't know, a recommendation that's positive with an explanation of why hopefully you like this.

You may recall that we originally filed a design that showed 12 antennas. In order to reduce the scope, the size, the bulk of our facility design, we've now reduced the antenna count to six. So we've got, you know, we've significantly reduced them. We've also reduced them in height. Our normal antennas are eight feet. These are four feet. And what we've also done is we've taken careful note of what is on other rooftops in the neighborhood in terms of chimneys and so forth. And so our presentation tonight is to not only show you our design for this particular house, but also to show you other houses in the
neighborhood with similar looking chimneys as well as a facility that Verizon has around the corner on Walden Street about less than a third of a mile away, that looks very similar to this with the faux chimneys.

So I'm going to give this over to
David. He's gonna run you through the previous design so you would be able to see like where we started, where we've been, and now where we are in the case.

DAVID FORD: Thank you.
So as we explained, we don't expect you guys to remember every design we've taken forth since seeing you guys in August, but this is -- there's been four designs. The fourth is in front of you right now. I'm going to start with the first one.

This was the one that was seen back in August by the Board. And I believe the
consensus was that the Board was split. Half of you kind of liked it and half of you didn't want anything to do with it. And we took that recommendation to the BZA who then told us to push back and redesign.

So the physical design is a 10 -foot tall rooftop penthouse, there's two of them, there's going to be four chimneys eight-foot tall that Susan explained. And this was our first design here. So just basically crude rooftop penthouse as you can see in these photo sims. No windows on the penthouse, it's just straight facade.

This is design No. 2. Same style penthouse, same 10 feet, but we added windows to the front of it and kind of characteristics -- styling characteristics to make it blend a little more after we got comments from the BZA. So this is No. 2.

| 1 | You guys have not seen this design. It's |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | still very similar to design No. 1. |
| 3 | ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: Can you see |
| 4 | them? Do you want us to pass them? |
| 5 | STEVEN COHEN: We're good. |
| 6 | H. THEODORE COHEN: Are 1, 2 and 3 |
| 7 | off the table now? |
| 8 | ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: Off the |
| 9 | table. |
| 10 | DAVID FORD: Yes, yes. |
| 11 | No. 4 is what we're bringing back to |
| 12 | the BZA on $2 / 27$. |
| 13 | PAMELA WINTERS: Oh, okay. |
| 14 | DAVID FORD: So this is No. 3. |
| 15 | HUGH RUSSELL: But there's 4A, 4B, |
| 16 | 4C. |
| 17 | DAVID FORD: Right, exactly. We'11 |
| 18 | get to that. |
| 19 | So this is No. 3. We dropped antenna |

height from eight feet to six feet which created the penthouse to drop from 10 feet to eight feet. This is an eight-foot penthouse. We made it a more of an octagon characteristic to blend even more, add in more windows in all four sides, trying to make the character to blend with the building. I personally like this one, but again, the BZA told us to revise, come back. They said that adding another six feet and width of these wide penthouses has created too much of an obstruction on top of the building. This is No. 3.

And this is No. 4 what you have in front of you.

And so again, we dropped the antenna count -- our antenna size rather from eight to six and now down to four. And this allows us to have six-foot instead of the originally

10, down to eight, and now we're down to six foot. And instead of a faux penthouse, we're doing individual chimneys. And it's worth noting that this rooftop right now as it is has two existing chimneys on the rooftop. They're actually black due to the tarring that's around them. There's two existing chimneys. The landlord has agreed to allow us, since they serve no purpose to the building anymore, they allowed us to remove the chimneys and replace those chimneys with faux chimneys. So then what we're going to do is the two existing chimneys that are black currently on the roof, the plan is to remove those so they're no longer visible from the ground and replace them with faux chimneys, and that's why we gave you guys the color options.

So we have red or painted to match
brick. We have black because black's existing. And we also have the grey here, the building facade and that's what's shown right there.

ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: If I might just add, a clarification, we are removing one chimney, the other where it is still part of the heating system, so we're cutting it down to two feet so it won't be visible.

DAVID FORD: It won't be visible.
ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: So that's, so it's essentially like we're cutting it, we're removing it, but we're actually technically not.

The other thing I wanted to add is that there's associated equipment with these antennas called remote radio head units. They're gonna be 27 of these, but we have convinced our RF engineers that they belong
in the basement. So they won't be seen from the roof.

DAVID FORD: Which is not easy to do.

ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: Yes. We have done a lot of persuading internally to come up with this design. So hopefully if you have comments or questions, we would welcome them and hopefully you will like our plan.

DAVID FORD: And as Susan pointed out earlier, just to reference this real quick, all the existing chimneys in the neighborhood, just to point out a few -- so we have, let's see, one right here which is right next-door. There's one on the photo location 1, and then this one here. And these were also taken around the neighborhood. Chimneys here, chimneys there.

| 1 | And the photo simulations that are in front |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | of you you could see the chimneys as well. |
| 3 | ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: So there |
| 4 | are flat roofs with chimneys, which is kind |
| 5 | of unusual. Of course there are a lot of |
| 6 | pitched roofs, but there are a number of flat |
| 7 | roof multi-family buildings. |
| 8 | PAMELA WINTERS: What color are |
| 9 | those chimneys? |
| 10 | DAVID FORD: Those are -- they're |
| 11 | red or matched brick. |
| 12 | ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: Most of |
| 13 | them in the neighborhood are brick. |
| 14 | DAVID FORD: The only ones -- the |
| 15 | only black ones we've seen are on this |
| 16 | rooftop -- |
| 17 | PAMELA WINTERS: That particular |
| 18 | rooftop. |
| 19 | DAVID FORD: -- which is why we gave |


| 1 | you the black option. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | PAMELA WINTERS: Yes, thank you. |
| 3 | STEVEN COHEN: So there's a |
| 4 | reference to a proposed condenser? |
| 5 | DAVID FORD: Yes. |
| 6 | STEVEN COHEN: Is that part of your |
| 7 | application? |
| 8 | DAVID FORD: Yes, it is. We have |
| 9 | the two proposed. And I'm going to put these |
| 10 | back up here. I believe you can see just the |
| 11 | tip of the condensers. |
| 12 | STEVEN COHEN: What are the |
| 13 | condensers for? |
| 14 | DAVID FORD: To cool the equipment. |
| 15 | STEVEN COHEN: Is that standard? |
| 16 | DAVID FORD: Yes, standard. Every |
| 17 | single site has that, yes. |
| 18 | So if you look at the photo 3C, you see |
| 19 | it a proposed condenser type 2 just sticking |

over the roof line maybe less than a foot.
You can barely see them, it's beige. As you can see, right next to that is the, is a chimney.

STEVEN COHEN: And the code requires a guardrail?

DAVID FORD: Right, yes. It's due to the accessing the roof that's attached there. We actually have similar guardrails that was approved by the BZA at 289 Brook7ine Street that was before this Board as well.

STEVEN COHEN: I'd certainly hate for you folks to do anything that would compromise the beauty and the architectural integrity of this building.

ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: Thank you.
DAVID FORD: And one thing to note real quick, as Suzie mentioned, 0.3 miles down the road as we continue down Walden is

| 1 | Masse's Hardware. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: Right. |
| 3 | DAVID FORD: And she has pictures. |
| 4 | ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: I have |
| 5 | pictures. They're not good. I took them |
| 6 | myself. |
| 7 | DAVID FORD: It's the existing of |
| 8 | the site. On the rooftop they have two faux |
| 9 | chimneys, exactly like what we're proposing. |
| 10 | It's only 0.3 miles away. |
| 11 | Very similar looking building, 286 |
| 12 | Concord Ave. |
| 13 | HUGH RUSSELL: So, I think these are |
| 14 | just fine. |
| 15 | PAMELA WINTERS: I would have to |
| 16 | second that. That would be my first choice |
| 17 | in terms of color. |
| 18 | DAVID FORD: Is brick? |
| 19 | PAMELA WINTERS: Yeah. |


| 1 | HUGH RUSSELL: Scale is appropriate. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | STEVEN COHEN: Yeah, it looks fine. |
| 3 | You know, to spend more of the city's time |
| 4 | reviewing this matter, I think it's fine. |
| 5 | Unfortunately we have a track record where |
| 6 | the BZA doesn't may much attention to what we |
| 7 | say in these matters, but nevertheless, we |
| 8 | think it's fine. |
| 9 | HUGH RUSSELL: We recommend that |
| 10 | they approve this? |
| 11 | STEVEN COHEN: So moved. |
| 12 | PAMELA WINTERS: In the brick color. |
| 13 | DAVID FORD: Okay. |
| 14 | H. THEODORE COHEN: Do we really |
| 15 | care about the color? |
| 16 | PAMELA WINTERS: I do. |
| 17 | H. THEODORE COHEN: I'm just |
| 18 | suggesting if the ZBA doesn't like brick and |
| 19 | want to go to black, do they have to come |


| 1 | back to us? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | STEVEN COHEN: No. |
| 3 | PAMELA WINTERS: No. |
| 4 | H. THEODORE COHEN: Whatever color |
| 5 | the ZBA settles upon, although our preference |
| 6 | is -- |
| 7 | PAMELA WINTERS: Is brick. |
| 8 | STEVEN COHEN: It would be nice to |
| 9 | have the brick color. |
| 10 | H. THEODORE COHEN: I just don't |
| 11 | want to do this again. |
| 12 | ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: I |
| 13 | appreciate your time. We appreciate your |
| 14 | time. We understand that these are -- |
| 15 | STEVEN WINTER: Talking about |
| 16 | telephone infrastructure. |
| 17 | I wanted to make a -- I wanted to send |
| 18 | a point to the BZA that I think is important, |
| 19 | and if my colleagues agree, I think it may be |

helpful to you when you go there, and that is that in creating the sense of place, and I know that's a plan, but in creating a sense of what Cambridge is and where we live, the devil is in the details. It's in all the little details that we see. And this detail is something that you've, you've spoken with the engineers. The functionality of the infrastructure has not been changed in any way. And it has a pleasing design. So those are the two things that we're -- that we want to come together. So the functionality is not hindered and the design is pleasing.

ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: If I just might comment on that. We actually are suffering some loss of, you know, the optimal facility that we would want there with the antennas. There's just no question about that. But the question, you know, for our
internal review was how much loss can you withstand, and we've pushed them to withstand as much as, you know, they could. And that's why we got this design. So....

STEVEN WINTER: Thank you for that. That's terrific.

ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: Thanks. STEVEN COHEN: I have one comment also. I think it's one of your competitors, apparently had taken a practice of hiring an architectural consultant as you put these things together. And, you know, compared to legal fees, hourly rates, you know, architectural rates are really pretty smal1. It might pay going through this, you know, process, which I'm sure is miserable for you guys, and isn't really wonderful for us either, it might pay to buy an hour or two of architectural time as you put these things

| 1 | together to make sure that it works from that |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | design perspective as well as from a |
| 3 | technical perspective for you. |
| 4 | DAVID FORD: Just to comment on |
| 5 | that, our firm does use Dewberry in Boston. |
| 6 | We call them our architectural and |
| 7 | engineering firm and they're actually one in |
| 8 | the same. |
| 9 | STEVEN COHEN: Well, you know, |
| 10 | engineers think differently than architects. |
| 11 | PAMELA WINTERS: They do. |
| 12 | ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: Thank you |
| 13 | for your time. |
| 14 | HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Thank you for |
| 15 | your presentation. Do you want to take a11 |
| 16 | these papers? |
| 17 | PAMELA WINTERS: Do you want the |
| 18 | paperwork? You can bring it to the BZA. |
| 19 | ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: Sure. |

PAMELA WINTERS: That would be great.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Are we -- is there anything else on the BZA? We should go on to the garage.

LIZA PADEN: This is the parking garage that is replacing the surface lot at 150 CambridgePark Drive. And this was the garage that was reviewed during the Special Permit process for 130 Cambridge Park Drive. I believe you received a development consultation form from me about the development, design development that was part of the residential portion of 130 CambridgePark Drive. But Roger and I looked at the changes proposed for the parking garage and felt that based on the discussion the Planning Board had during the public hearings, that we wanted to have Mr. McKinnon
bring it back to you and show you the changes. Probably the way to characterize this garage was this was the one with the green fins on it which some people liked them and some people didn't like them. So Mr. McKinnon's here and you have an architect now?

RICHARD McKINNON: Yes, I've
graduated from the Roger Boothe school of architecture. I've had 30 years of practice by the way.

Excuse me for going ahead without Jim Batchelor. We expected to be on about 8:30 or so. Jim's on his way over, but I think we can probably start it. It's fairly straight forward. As you probably remember when we were up here, our neighbor -- no, that's Jim Rafferty. I was talking about Jim Batchelor, he's from Arrowstreet, the architect.

PAMELA WINTERS: Oh, all right. Wrong one.

RICHARD McKINNON: As you probably recal1, our neighbor Hanover, was -- objected to the previous garage design that we had and as a result of their objections, they wind up appealing the permits. And as you know, along with me and the land owners, we're all defendants in this. I have to say in Hanover's defense, that they've agreed to withdraw the appeal and stop the litigation regardless of your decision tonight. But I still would hope that you'd go ahead and approve this because we think it's a better garage and we know it's very much what they want. They've invested $\$ 150$ million there next-door. And just very briefly let me just go through the pages.

The first page is the new garage that's
been designed by Arrowstreet. It's
substantially more expensive than the fins.
I guess we'11 call them fins on the next page. But that's the prior garage design that we had.

Here it is, looking at it as you come through the garage, walking passed the residential building. And then one of the discussions we had with Roger, and Roger may want to speak to it himself, was one of the materials we're going to -- we were going to use was hardie board. And I think Roger felt that hardie board just haven't had a lot of experience in the weather for a long period of time up here. So he asked us to look at a couple of others that were more durable. And one of the ones that we've come up with as an alternative, is Equitone. So if Roger and the Board feel that that's a step we ought to
take, then we would be prepared to take. STEVEN COHEN: Equitone? RICHARD McKINNON: Equitone. STEVEN COHEN: What is it? RICHARD McKINNON: It's a harder, denser fiber board. It's stronger than hardie board. Yeah, it's just -- it's got better, better performance in the field, you know? We just haven't been able to find a lot of pictures to be honest with you of hardie board in the New England winter for a long period of time. We've used it in other projects with sort of fingers crossed. This one is substantially strong -- substantially more expensive, too, I might add. But that's really the entire presentation.

We very much would like the Board's consideration and would ask that you approve the change in the design.

## Roger?

ROGER BOOTHE: As Rich pointed out,
I was concerned about the hardie board particularly because it's in fairly vulnerable strips. I mean, we have seen it used where it's replicated and sort of clapboard type structure where the ends are tucked in to a more of a system. So I definitely feel that having this more durable material, it makes sense. And I do think this is a good change from the fins. The Board went back and forth about that and I think it was, you know, we were looking for something sort of experimenta1. But this is a pretty straight forward scheme in my view, so I think this is a reasonable change.
H. THEODORE COHEN: I just have a question. The pictures on page 4 here --

RICHARD McKINNON: Yes.

| 1 | H. THEODORE COHEN: -- they just -- |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | they don't relate to this proposed garage. |
| 3 | They're just examples of the material? |
| 4 | CLAES ANDREASEN: Correct. |
| 5 | RICHARD McKINNON: Excuse me, can |
| 6 | you say that again? |
| 7 | H. THEODORE COHEN: These pictures |
| 8 | on page 4 -- |
| 9 | RICHARD McKINNON: These are the |
| 10 | alternative, the Equitone that, you know, |
| 11 | we'd be prepare to use. These were drawn |
| 12 | with hardie board originally. |
| 13 | H. THEODORE COHEN: Right. |
| 14 | RICHARD McKINNON: And Roger asked |
| 15 | us to look at the other materials. |
| 16 | H. THEODORE COHEN: And so on the |
| 17 | proposal is the white and the grey both the |
| 18 | same material just different size and |
| 19 | different color? |

> RICHARD McKINNON: No, it's actually -- Claes, do you want to speak to that?

> This is Claes Andreasen from Arrowstreet.

CLAES ANDREASEN: So in general the concrete garage, exactly the same plan in essence. But what we propose is a series of screens or shades in a way out of the Equitone material that form the vertical band across the facade. The tan and then the darker color or the precast concrete and by texture.

STEVEN COHEN: So what's the residential portion? I've been assuming that that's hardie board on the residential building. That's still hardie board.

CLAES ANDREASEN: The residential building is primarily hardie board.

STEVEN COHEN: Yeah.
CLAES ANDREASEN: This application
on the garage is a sort of non-traditional application for hardie in which pieces that may not want to be exposed more and that was the basis for Roger's questions about it. Yeah, exactly. We sort of want to protect all the edges in hardie because it's more like wood in a way.

RICHARD McKINNON: That's the way we were using it.

CLAES ANDREASEN: The other is quite different.

STEVEN COHEN: Gotcha.
HUGH RUSSELL: So one of the things that's annoying about a precast parking garage is the portion of the open area. The spandrel has to be high enough to keep people safe, and then the bottom of it has to be a

| 1 | beam to carry it, things, so you end up with |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | openings that are, I don't know, maybe four |
| 3 | feet tall more or less. |
| 4 | CLAES ANDREASEN: It's in the |
| 5 | neighborhood of three and a half to four feet |
| 6 | tal1. |
| 7 | HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. |
| 8 | And so I find myself asking if the, |
| 9 | this big, this big square that's in the |
| 10 | middle of that, should that be the same light |
| 11 | color or should it be a darker color to give |
| 12 | another layer of kind of scale to the |
| 13 | building? In my own way I just colored it |
| 14 | up. I only have a pencil, but that's the |
| 15 | color. |
| 16 | RICHARD McKINNON: I see. |
| 17 | HUGH RUSSELL: But that might be too |
| 18 | dark. |
| 19 | PAMELA WINTERS: So here are the |



| 1 | CLAES ANDREASEN: And in a way what |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | we've tried to do is create this sort of |
| 3 | effect and -- |
| 4 | ROGER BOOTHE: We think this helps. |
| 5 | RICHARD McKINNON: We can go over |
| 6 | and have a follow-up administrative session |
| 7 | with Roger? |
| 8 | HUGH RUSSELL: (Inaudible) |
| 9 | RICHARD McKINNON: The answer is |
| 10 | yes. To be honest with you, we'd very much |
| 11 | would like to deliver this to Hanover because |
| 12 | there are a lot of law bills and lawsuits |
| 13 | behind all of this and get on with this. So |
| 14 | yes, the answer is yes. So. |
| 15 | STEVEN COHEN: You know, I'm curious |
| 16 | why doesn't this satisfy them? |
| 17 | PAMELA WINTERS: Yes, and why -- |
| 18 | STEVEN COHEN: And what was |
| 19 | objectionable that this fixes? |

HUGH RUSSELL: It's more expensive.
RICHARD McKINNON: Because we obviously were kind of captivated ourselves with this. But they just felt that they were not going to wear well over time, that they looked cheap, and it looked like a cheap fix for a garage, and they wanted something more traditional.

STEVEN COHEN: And that's legal grounds for appeal?

RICHARD McKINNON: No, it isn't. In fact, they never showed up at the appeal, you know.

STEVEN COHEN: But that's what it was about?

RICHARD McKINNON: The actual grounds for appeal never really make it to an appeal in my experience in the last 30 years. Right, Mr. Assistant City Manager?

| 1 | Anyway, the answer is yes, we'd be |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | happy to make that change. |
| 3 | HUGH RUSSELL: So, our -- it's the |
| 4 | nature of our proceeding just advising the |
| 5 | staff what we think? |
| 6 | LIZA PADEN: Yes, please. |
| 7 | HUGH RUSSELL: Because the |
| 8 | responsibility is in the staff's hands. |
| 9 | So are there any other thoughts? |
| 10 | PAMELA WINTERS: I like your |
| 11 | thought, Hugh. |
| 12 | H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I like the |
| 13 | green banners but I think this is very |
| 14 | handsome. |
| 15 | RICHARD McKINNON: Thank you very |
| 16 | much. On both counts by the way. We like |
| 17 | the banners, too. |
| 18 | PAMELA WINTERS: I liked the |
| 19 | banners. |


| 1 | STEVEN COHEN: The banners were |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | lively. |
| 3 | HUGH RUSSELL: I like this better. |
| 4 | H. THEODORE COHEN: Am I correct |
| 5 | that there is provision in this garage in the |
| 6 | event the railroad bridge ever comes into |
| 7 | being? |
| 8 | RICHARD McKINNON: That's correct. |
| 9 | Absolutely. Yeah, the city has rights on all |
| 10 | three of our developments. The one that |
| 11 | Hanover is doing, you have rights on this |
| 12 | one, and then you have rights on the one up |
| 13 | and coming in with the -- the final one |
| 14 | coming up with the Summer Shack parking lots |
| 15 | are. So all of our property that runs along |
| 16 | the railroad tracks we're giving city the |
| 17 | rights to connect the pedestrian bridge where |
| 18 | you decide to connect it. But you're going |
| 19 | to have rights on all of our development |


| 1 | sites, yeah. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. |
| 3 | STEVEN COHEN: Looks good. |
| 4 | HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you very much. |
| 5 | RICHARD McKINNON: Thank you very, |
| 6 | very much. We're very happy to be done with |
| 7 | this. |
| 8 | Thank you. |
| 9 | STEVEN WINTER: Thank you, |
| 10 | Mr. Batchelor, for coming in. We appreciate |
| 11 | it. |
| 12 | JAMES BATCHELOR: Thanks for coming |
| 13 | everyone. |
| 14 | Roger. |
| 15 | HUGH RUSSELL: Is there any more |
| 16 | business before the Board tonight? |
| 17 | BRIAN MURPHY: Liza, we don't have |
| 18 | anything else, right? |
| 19 | LIZA PADEN: That's all I have. |



| 1 | ERRATA SHEET AND SIGNATURE INSTRUCTIONS |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | The original of the Errata Sheet has |
| 3 | been delivered to Community Development |
| 4 | Department. |
| 5 | When the Errata Sheet has been |
| 6 | completed and signed, a copy thereof should |
| 7 | be delivered to each party of record and the |
| 8 | ORIGINAL delivered to Community Development |
| 9 | Department to whom the original transcript |
| 10 | was delivered. |
| 11 | INSTRUCTIONS |
| 12 | After reading this volume of Planning Board, indicate any corrections or changes to |
| 13 | testimony and the reasons therefor on the Errata Sheet supplied to you and sign it. |
| 14 | NOT make marks or notations on the transcript volume itself. |
| 15 |  |
| 16 | REPLACE THIS PAGE OF THE TRANSCRIPT WITH THE |
| 17 | COMPLETED AND SIGNED ERRATA SHEET WHEN |
| 18 | RECEIVED. |
| 19 |  |
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