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## PROCEEDINGS

(Seated Members: Hugh Russe11, H. Theodore Cohen, Steven Winter, Tom Sieniewicz, Steven Cohen.)

HUGH RUSSELL: With a quorum being present. Are you giving the update?

LIZA PADEN: We can do the update at the end and see if Brian's able to make it between now and the rest of the other General Business items.

HUGH RUSSELL: That's fine.
LIZA PADEN: So for the Board of Zoning Appeal cases I did get some -- I was contacted by a couple of the board members on some of the cases, and one of them is for the Bailey and Sage at 5 Cambridge Center. So this is a restaurant that's proposed not in the food court but in an area, I think, that they're recapturing inside the lobby where
they've done some reconstruction to the ground floor. It's a sandwich and deli take-out operation.

Are there any other questions I can answer for you?

HUGH RUSSELL: It's the venue
online, it seems appropriate for an innovation center.

LIZA PADEN: Okay.
The other question that people had was for the signage at One Kendal1 Square. So at One Kenda11 Square -- I don't know how many people are familiar with it, One Kendall Square is a group of buildings at -- that used to be the old woven hose factory. And they have a substantial courtyard area. I'd like to pass around photographs which will show you where this sign is proposed to be.

The sign exceeds the regulations for
internally illuminated signage by, I think that they're going to have either 46 or 48 inches, and internal illumination is limited to 30 inches. Where they're proposing to put the sign, and it is only one sign that they're proposing to have -- yes, that's the one. Is on a piece of railing. It's a substantial railing that is on the building. This is the same building that has -- used to have the furniture store in it. So there are some of the retail area's below grade, some of it is above grade. It's actually inside courtyard, and there was a lot of discussion on whether or not it was actually visible from either Hampshire Street or Cardinal Medeiros. I said it wasn't, but ISD overruled me and told them they had to get a variance from the sign ordinance. So here they are. I think it's a case that could be
left to the Board of Zoning Appeal. And as the person who reviews signs for the city, I don't think it's a negative precedent. But I would be happy to send a comment if you think otherwise.
H. THEODORE COHEN: So the size is otherwise okay --

LIZA PADEN: Yes.
H. THEODORE COHEN: -- it's just too big for an illuminated sign?

LIZA PADEN: Internally illuminated.
The sign could be that big if they would have a goose neck light on it. But -- and if it had no illumination, it would be no problem. But because it's internally illuminated, one of the dimensions has to be 30 inches or less.

STEVEN COHEN: I'm sure there's a good rationale for that.

LIZA PADEN: Yes. You have to start
somewhere.
HUGH RUSSELL: I think the rationale is that for a sign on the face of a building that's illuminated, 30-inch high letters are really sufficient everywhere in the city pretty much. This is a different sign because it's really a logo that's at the height, and the letters are actually very modest in size.

STEVEN COHEN: But to say that 30 inches was a max, that's one thing, but, you know, you could do more than 30 inches. If I understood you correctly, you know, if it were externally illuminated or back lit --

LIZA PADEN: Yes.
STEVEN COHEN: -- or something.
H. THEODORE COHEN: I think it would look worse with an external goose neck.

STEVEN COHEN: Yes, I agree. You know, internally illuminated there's good design and bad design.

LIZA PADEN: Yes.
So are there any comments for that one?
STEVEN COHEN: This looks like good design.

HUGH RUSSELL: I think we should send that comment to them.

LIZA PADEN: Okay.
HUGH RUSSELL: And also your comment that it's barely visible or not visible from the public way.

LIZA PADEN: Okay.
(Nur Seated.)
LIZA PADEN: Were there any other
cases on the agenda? I didn't get a printouts for you, but I could answer questions.
(No Response.)
LIZA PADEN: The transcripts that have come in are for February 4th and February 11th and they were certified and accurate.

HUGH RUSSELL: Is there a motion to approve those transcripts?

STEVEN COHEN: So moved.
HUGH RUSSELL: Second.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Second.

HUGH RUSSELL: Tom's hand was up
first.
On the motion, all those in favor?
(Raising hands.)
HUGH RUSSELL: A11 members voting to approve.

LIZA PADEN: Do you want to move to the update?

HUGH RUSSELL: We can do that or we
can do the Kendall Street.
LIZA PADEN: I'm here to the end of the meeting so it makes no difference to me.

HUGH RUSSELL: Let's take Kendal1
Square business first then.
LIZA PADEN: Okay. So in one of the materials in your packages is for the Kendall Square Corporation, which is currently seeking to lease the ground floor of the Genzyme building. The Genzyme building at Cambridge Research Park was designed with retail space on the ground floor which has, for whatever reason, not been rented out aggressively. They -- this space that they're proposing to use previously had the Segway tourist office. And the proponent now is the office for the Kendall Square Corporation, and they're here to answer any questions that you have. I know that there's
some concern of having a ground floor office use, but this association, one of the things that people think about is that it would be great for them to have some ground floor visibility in this location. So they're here to answer any questions you might have. And what we need for this is the usual finding from the Planning Board that this is an appropriate use in the Special Permit No. 141.

HUGH RUSSELL: So, as I was riding up the elevator yesterday morning or was it today? To my office, somebody said, you know, is the Harvard Square business Association on the third floor? And because I - - they're on the third floor of the building that I'm on the fourth floor of.

And I thought, you know, it would be better
if the Harvard Square Business Association
were also in a storefront somewhere in Harvard Square. So, I think this is a -potentially a pretty good idea. I mean, this is not a prime retail district. We want to have active ground floor uses, and I think these people might actually accomplish that.
(Winters Seated.)
HUGH RUSSELL: Steve.
STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, I concur.
Do we have a microphone here?
LIZA PADEN: You're on.
STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, I concur and also the Kendal1 Square Association does such terrific work marketing and building confidence in Kendall Square so that we've helped them out with this and they ought to be on the ground floor. That's exactly where they should be.

LIZA PADEN: Okay.

HUGH RUSSELL: So do we need to have
a motion to approve this use in this location?

LIZA PADEN: Yes, please.
HUGH RUSSELL: Are there any more comments?
(No Response.)
HUGH RUSSELL: And would someone
like to make such a motion?
STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, I move that we mark as appropriate use within Special Permit 141, the ground floor housing of the Kendal1 Square Association.

STEVEN COHEN: Second.
HUGH RUSSELL: No discussion?
(No Response.)
HUGH RUSSELL: On the motion, all
those in favor?
(Raising hands.)

HUGH RUSSELL: Al1 members are
voting in favor.
LIZA PADEN: Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Brian, do you want to give us an update?

BRIAN MURPHY: Sure. I will give you a brief update of coming attractions. Obviously we're here tonight.

We're here next week, April 8th, where we'11 have a public hearing on 75 New Street as well as the Lutz Petition that's likely to come back. BZA antenna 47 Oxford, 30 Mellen Street, BZA antenna at 238 Main Street, and the Kendall voting.

April 29th will be at the Central
Square Senior Center. And as of now we have a tentative date for that to be the public hearing 40 Thorndike Street, the courthouse. However, I do know that there are ongoing
discussions and at that time it may move and in which case we'11 talk about Kendall Square issues.

May 6th we're going to have the PUD procedure Zoning Amendment as well as Planning Board 290 for 1-3 Langdon Street, 15 Richdale Avenue, bicycle parking Special Permit, and Planning Board 291 for Bellis Circle.

And then May is a light month, only two meetings. May 20th we've got General Business 57 JFK Street which has a June 2 deadline.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.
So we have eight minutes before we can take up a Richdale Avenue. So there's a matter under General Discussion that we might have in those eight minutes.

AHMED NUR: Did everyone get the

## traffic on the Richdale?

HUGH RUSSELL: I got an e-mail.
PAMELA WINTERS: I didn't get a hard
copy.
AHMED NUR: I got an e-mail.
PAMELA WINTERS: Thanks, Liza.
LIZA PADEN: Sure.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Liza, do you
have an update perhaps on the status of any buildings that are going up? Not going up?

LIZA PADEN: Going up and not going up? Let me think. I know I'm looking at a lot of Building Permit notifications, but I can't think of anything in particular off the top of my head.
H. THEODORE COHEN: There's a new sign at the Porter Square Hotel site.

LIZA PADEN: We11, they're under construction.
H. THEODORE COHEN: I know they're under construction.

LIZA PADEN: Yes. This is a revision page and then this is a letter from the neighborhood.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Thank you.
(Whereupon, a discussion was held off the record.)

HUGH RUSSELL: So you may remember at the end of our Norris Street discussion last time Mr. Kim came up and said that we had not done reviewing the proper plan, and as a result of that, Ted said that he was just letting us know that if there was a problem, we would consider it. And so, Mr. Kim was correct, we were reviewing revision 4 documents. We had approved revision 3 documents. And in the difference
between the two plans was not a substantive change of what was happening to the building, but there was a graphic change as to some areas was shown on a different level on the revision floor plans as opposed to the revision 3 plans. And one that occurs twice. So these are triplex units, and there was a floor above the main floor level and one set of plans had occurred on the third level and the other set of plans that occurred on the second level, but it was where it was going to be. It's to view it differently.

So I spent an hour figuring that out after the meeting, sent an e-mail to all of you and to Liza saying that the -- the assumptions we had been making about this, what the scope of changes were during our discussion hadn't changed. So that, so then I think we then -- we haven't filed that
decision yet, have we?
LIZA PADEN: It's not a decision.
It was a memo to Inspectional Services.
HUGH RUSSELL: Has that been taken care of then?

LIZA PADEN: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: So it is for the time being off of our plate?

LIZA PADEN: It's off of your plate, yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.
So we have two minutes.
Oh, this actually brings me to a
question. The reason for the timing in our current schedule was as a courtesy to Bill

Tibbs whose job did not permit him to get here at seven o'clock. I'm wondering if we should slightly rethink the timing of things.

LIZA PADEN: Okay.

HUGH RUSSELL: Because occasionally, as tonight, we whip right through the things at the front. We might want to think whether the first case should be advertised for, you know, slightly an earlier time so that we don't have that down time.

LIZA PADEN: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: I'm not going to
preclude, I'm just asking you to think about it.

## LIZA PADEN: Yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: Ahmed.
AHMED NUR: We have three new
members so perhaps we should bring it back to the table and vote to see if we can make it, all of us. I mean, I can.

HUGH RUSSELL: Is there anybody here who can't be here at this time?

STEVEN COHEN: Seven o'clock would
be fine.
HUGH RUSSELL: We're comfortable
with that? I'd like to start earlier but I don't think we'11 end any earlier.

A11 right, we've now consumed the time and we are now taking up 15-33 Richdale Avenue, Planning Board case 284. We heard this case. There was a lot of comment.

There's a substantially different design back to us that reuses virtually the entire existing building.

So our job tonight is to hear what's being proposed, hear from people who might want to speak on this, and to see if the project as it now constitutes -- as constituted, meets the specific criteria in the Ordinance for approval.

I've been increasingly frustrated over the last few months that when we have these
public hearings, people don't understand what we're trying to do and what we're trying to find out in the public hearing, and so we get
a lot of testimony about the way the Zoning Ordinance should have been written and that's not terribly helpful to us because when we're -- we have three or four different kinds of things we do. But when we're granting permits, we're taking a set of rules and that are written in the Ordinance and we're saying does this project meet these rules? And the state law says if the project meet -- satisfies the rules in our opinion, we're obliged to give the permit. So I'm going to probably make this speech, maybe it wil1 get better from time to time, but it's concerns me that we spend a great deal of time hearing testimony and we don't have enough time left to discuss things properly
ourselves. And so I -- that's a dilemma that we have because we're volunteers, just as you people are volunteering your time to come here and talk to us. And so, I don't know how we avoid this point.

Who is going to present this?
Mr. Hope. Welcome.
ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Good evening,
Mr. Chair, members of the Planning Board.
For the record, attorney Sean Hope, Hope Legal Offices in Cambridge. I'm here tonight on behalf of the Petitioner, Hathaway Partners, LLC. And the owners and the manager of the LLC are here tonight as well, Mr. Rob and Sam Wolfe. We have project architects Mr. Joel Bargmann from bh\&a and also Cindy Lee from his office as well.

This is an application that was before the Planning Board, as the Chair said, back
in 2013. At that time the project was a lot larger and more dense than the application that you're going to hear tonight. That application included demolition of a substantial portion of the building to convert it into residential units, multi-family residential units. Now there's been a dramatic shift, and I believe in a positive direction. The current proposal seeks to utilize the existing building, applying for an adaptive reuse Special Permit under Section 5.28.2. The progress that's been made over the last six months has been a result of numerous neighborhood meetings between the neighborhood, many who are here tonight as well as the owner. Part of the success I believe with the dialogue had to do with from the stewardship of Mayor David Maher. In late December communications had
broken down over the initial proposal, and he helped engage the neighborhood. He went to site visits and met with the neighbors and also met with the owners individually and myself and opened up a dialogue that I believe has borne fruit to the project that you're going to see tonight. Even though I know the Board is familiar with the site, just briefly, so this site is located at 15-33 Richdale. It's in the section between Upland Road and Walden Street. As you can see, the site is about an acre in size. The site is currently improved by an existing one- and two-story building that is underutilized in terms of office and warehouse uses. The current proposal seeks to establish 46 dwelling units. The initial proposal had 54 units. There is also 46 parking spaces. The parking is in two
sections. There are 19 internal spaces that are in the rear of the building facing the railroad tracks of the commuter rail, and then 27 exterior spaces. There is an existing curb cut, which will be utilized to access the parking garage. As you can see, the site abuts the commuter rail train station. I think it's also important to note for the Board that the site is approximately 800 feet from a major transit hub of Porter Square which takes commuters in to on the Red Line to Boston and to Alewife. Also the commuter rail can transport occupants to the building or anyone to outside of the -outside of Cambridge.

So this proposal as I said, is 46 units and it seeks to utilize the existing building. Different in the previous proposal this application is applying for an adaptive
reuse Special Permit, and that's significant because 5.28.2 2 has certain allowances that allows us to develop the building the way we want to. Specifically 5.28.2 has three allowances which I think are important.

One, they allow for conforming
additions to the building. And for a non-conforming structures the code has a limitation on it what you can add. 5.2-the adaptive use provisions specifically allow for conforming additions.

The second piece is the setbacks. Normally the setbacks are a formula based on the height and dimensions. 5.28 allows for the setbacks to be calculated by the existing footprint of the building. Additionally that adaptive reuse section also allows for the Planning Board to waive or to modify the open space. Right now the site is almost
completely impervious, and so by reducing or waiving the open space requirement we are allowed to satisfy that as well.

Additionally the project is over 50,000 square feet, and so it triggers the project we use Special Permit. There is a number of design criteria. How the project complies with that design criteria is more actively described in the written materials, but the project does satisfy those criterias. And in summary those criterias are in part to make sure that the project is compatible with the existing neighborhood. It looks at sewer and water infrastructure as one example to make sure that the proposed development can be handled by the existing infrastructure. It also talks about traffic, parking, and also privacy for neighboring abutters. So I won't go into those details, but how the project
meets those qualifications is in there.
And then under the Residence $\mathrm{C}-1 \mathrm{~A}$ in No. 3, there are Residence C-1A has a specific footnote, footnote $L$ that allows the Planning Board to reduce the rear and side yard setbacks. Because we're utilizing the existing building, we're not creating new setbacks, but the conforming -- the addition on top has to also meet the setbacks. And because of the extensive length and depth of the building, if you take the calculation, you really have no buildable footprint to add a conforming addition. So we are requesting that the Planning Board also specifically reduce -- and the reduction is allowed to reduce it up to 10 feet. We don't need 10 feet on every side, but just for the record, I wanted to be clear that we are applying for that.

And then the last two are more procedura1. Any project that's over 12 units and is in a certain district has to apply for the Multi-family Special Permit, and we listed that on the application. And also a Special Permit -- the General Special Permit criteria.

I would just like to update the Board, when we were last here in September, we had just started the Cambridge Historical

Commission's review and at that point we didn't have a current proposal. So we had four meetings at the Cambridge Historic

Commission. Recently as March 6th the Cambridge Historic Commission granted a Certificate of Appropriateness. They had actually initiated a landmark study back in September -- oh, you have it in the file as well?

## PAMELA WINTERS: Right.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: And so as the Board is familiar, part of that Certificate of Appropriateness is to review the design, the materials used, the fenestration, all of that was reviewed by the Cambridge Historical Commission. There are a few additions to the rear of the structure which Mr. Bargmann can walk you through that, that were proposed to be demolished. They were not part of the central structure. That was approved as well. And also in terms of the review, they looked at the parking lot, the landscaping, every exterior future is going to be reviewed.

There is also a follow-up review with the Cambridge Historical Commission so as the progress goes through and there are any changes that are made, they would have a
level of review, too, which I think provides
a level of confidence for the neighbors as well that there aren't going to be any material changes that won't have that level of review.

And lastly, part of the four months that we spent in dialogue with the neighbors had to do with the Memo of Understanding that we submitted and should have in your file. As counsel for the owners, I wasn't part of every negotiation or meeting, but as best as possible, I tried to counsel my clients to try to draft this memo in a way that would attach itself to the Planning Board Special Permit. We tried to eliminate as many issues that aren't part of the Planning Board's purview, and as best as is possible, tried to reference requirements that are already within the criteria. So I think we've done
that. I can say that the memo was done in good faith between the neighbors and the owner, and these are all commitments or agreements that we can live with. Obviously the Planning Board has the right to review and adopt as many, but we strongly recommend that they would take those into account in any decision that you would make on the project.

Now I can turn it over to Joel Bargmann to walk you through the plans.

JOEL BARGMANN: Thank you. My name is Joel Bargmann, with the firm is bh+a and I also for going through the traffic and the parking and some of the dimensional criteria have Cindy Lee is also from our office here tonight.

## I just wanted to start with the survey

site plan that Sean was referencing. It's
approximately an acre site. This is the existing building. This line right there is the break in the building between what is a two-story and a one-story building. And then at this end is an existing parking lot.

As you'11 see, we're using virtually the entire existing building, say, of this little addition, and we're using the existing paved parking lot as it's currently configured.

These are just some photographs of the neighborhood.

This is looking west down Richdale, the one-story and the two-story building. There's a roll-up door there that will be removed and a panel inserted.

One of the conditions of the Historic
Commission is how is that to be designed?
And that's signage for the project, and that
will be brought back to the Historic
Commission for final review.
Across the street we have a couple of properties, Two Cambridge Terrace. Three is down here. This is on Richdale looking towards the east where you see the two-story building. And I have this in because a lot of folks don't understand, hadn't understood that the car repair shop which is here, is a separate ownership and a separate property.

There is this existing third story on the building which we are reusing. And then this is the edge of this building coming into what was the Payne Elevator. So you can see how the property extends out to the west.

This is the new proposed site plan. So the outboard line is what was the profile of the existing building, including this which
was a subsequent addition which we're
maintaining. This is the existing parking lot. There's a very minor modification. The curb cut's quite wide. We're proposing to reduce the area of the curb cut. It will assist drainage down Richdale Avenue which now flows into the site, and there's also as part of the proposal, I have the full engineering drawings if you'd like to see them. There's an underground retention basin. It's a coal tech system, modular compartments, and that's maintaining the storm water from the driveway, parking lot, and the building in compliance with Mass. storm water regulations that require us to maintain the storm water runoff from a storm on the site.

The proposal, as I mentioned, there is a one-story element and Sean said there's an addition on the top. So we're literally
keeping the existing building and then adding a one-story above the one-story section.

Further down there's a two-story building, and we're adding that same footprint of an addition on top of the two-story addition. Due to the height of the one-story building, we're able to get some inter floor areas, what we call mezzanines. So there's an apartment here, and then there's a little mezzanine loft. And then as you can imagine, part of the parking for this project is being accommodated in the existing building. And the existing building has a wild array of columns, and it's a very high ceiling space, so it's a very inefficient use for that for parking. So we have a little bit of inter floor space above a portion of the parking garage which is this zone as those apartments are serviced from the top floor in sort of
duplex units.
Do you know the setback dimensions as well?

CINDY LEE: So my name is Cindy Lee. This color diagram shows the proposed design. The blue are residential areas and the darker green is where we are parking in the garage area. And then the lighter green is the bicycle area. And the bicycle area are allowed to be excluded in the GFA calculation. The parking area is the first 15 spaces that also allow to be excluded. So the chart up above shows you the breakdown.

There is an existing mezzanine, that overlooks the first floor and that's what this little plan on the left is showing.

On the second floor the blue is
residential area that we're introducing in the existing structure. And the yellow is
the inter floor area on the bottom plan that Joel was pointing out that we're utilizing the high bay space. And then on the upper part is the second floor addition over the existing first floor. It's -- all of it is residential.

And here's a third floor plan. Again, that blue section is an existing floor area, and the yellow is new residential addition.

To show you the setback. So on the front yard of the building is right at the property line as well as on the west side, there's a party wall with the garage building. On the east side where the existing parking lot is, we are -- I don't remember the number.

JOEL BARGMANN: Six feet plus.
CINDY LEE: We're meeting the
setback. While on the backside the property
line varies from five feet to like 20 feet But the addition -- the addition on both section of the building is set back one bay.

So that as you can see, it's almost like a 45, so that shadows do not, we are not introducing new shadow that the existing building isn't already putting on the site.

As far as the bicycle plan, we are accommodating the required 48 long-term bicycles in the garage area, and this plan was reviewed with Traffic Department this morning. They have a recommendation letter. So, and we are meeting the access requirement of five feet by the restructuring existing columns.

And the signage was all worked out with Traffic Department.

JOEL BARGMANN: So I think just the back and forth of that was in the last couple
weeks we've reconfigured the garage and the -- actually some of the existing structures have been reconfigured to get the 22-foot drive aisle and this five-foot clearance so that there's no special request on the parking. That's all fully compliant as far as we understand.

So, we have as Sean mentioned, been to the Historic Commission. And I was just going to walk through how the project has developed. But just to get to the quick conclusion, as you can see there's a series of -- there's a continuous rooftop, but it's sort of a slate of hand. There's a setback, very slight, and a drop in the roof between units so that in our estimation it breaks down the scale of that rooftop element. And I understand that there's differing opinions about that, but we had settled. And what was
approved was a series of smaller scale elements that actually happen to be modular with the building below. So it's based on the basis of the building. These existing windows -- I do have a sample if anybody's interested. And I do have the approved color. These are replacement aluminum metal windows. They're single home -- they are the same configuration as currently there with divided lights. And the same thing happens here. These are existing windows that are being replaced with similar metal windows. Some of the changes that are going into place you'11 see at this end of the building, for example, there's a loading dock and a high window which is shown in elevation here. And over time there was originally a window in this location, but the facade had been altered. What we're doing is proposing to
bring back the window that was here, and because those windows are actually quite high off the ground and the units are very deep inside the building as you saw from the floor plans, we discussed and agreed with the Historic Commission that we could lower the windowsills along this facade so that the window is not at six feet, but the windowsill would be at three feet.

Incidentally, we don't have to do it on this side of the building because of the high base space is sufficiently high, we can put a new floor in the existing building and thus you raise your viewing point for the interior apartments, and from the inside that will be a three-foot si11 but from the outside it will stay five-foot, six at this end and over at six at the other end so that folks can't see into those apartments, but you can see
out readily. Otherwise they'd be quite high above your head.

And then the buildings's going through a rigorous restoration. You could see the sills, the brickwork, etcetera, in quite bad shape. The foundation needs repair. The eave line, as you see, is in really poor shape. So all of that is being restored.

The front entry, that oddly enough is -- the stucco is original, but the door is not and we're able to find -- we were also able to find in the archives at UMass the original design of the door which we're replacing into the design.

So this is the new elevation. You can see now we've replaced those windows. We brought the windowsills down. That's the existing -- I mean, the former historic original entry. The restored windows. And
then the addition on the top. As Cindy mentioned, those are all set back approximately 20 feet from the edge of the building. They do have balconies, but the balconies themselves are set back 10 feet from the edge of the building. So as you're actually walking down the street, I think the perception is negligible.

The back side of the building, there's a very tiny addition here that's wood frame that we're taking off. And then this addition here is this piece, which is masonry with a shingled, asphalt shingled siding above. What we're doing is slicing that building at the windows, putting new roof on it, purging that and that becomes the bike storage area that Cindy mentioned.

And then on the back over time the windows had been filled in with brick from
the back of the, the bakery use, and we're proposing that those windows be reinstated.

So you see now this is an elevation.
These are those windows that are here on the rear facade and those are being reclaimed. And then these windows, similar to the front, are having the windowsills dropped so that they're in a more appropriate relationship to the inside.

This is the parking garage. And these are those windows that we're using the upper portion of the parking garage for the inter floor mezzanines.

And I don't need to go through this in detail, but this was submitted to the Historic Commission that showed in detail the existing condition on the front versus the proposed condition. The existing condition on the rear facade -- I'm sorry, here, which
includes a smokestack that's rusted and has a deteriorating foundation. We're stil1 looking at attempting to restore this, but preliminary results were that there was not able to be restored.

There's a fire escape that's coming off partly because it's not a great means of egress from the building, but more importantly that fire escape exits out into the railroad easement which is not any longer 1 egal.

So I do have some other drawings if anybody's curious about what the windows look 1ike. The civil engineering drawings. And as I mentioned, I have a sample of the window and I have a sample of the metal siding that's been approved if any folks are interested in that.

Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: The plans don't show apartment layouts. Could you explain their sizes, their number of bedrooms, their break down?

JOEL BARGMANN: We11, I don't have a breakdown. They're 46 apartments. They're roughly one-third one bedrooms, one-third, two, and one-third three, although it's not quite equal that way but it's close to that. And the layout is because we have this sort of very strong basis stem and structural system in the existing building, and we have a very deep space, there's some interesting challenges, but this is the one-bedroom apartment. You come in and you can see this is the raised floor. It gives you a nice windowsill on the inside but maintains the exterior appearance. There's a stair up that takes you to the mezzanine, which in a
one-story apartment is an open mezzanine.
This is how we're using the garage space. They are either one-bedroom or two-bedroom or three-bedroom units depending on how large of a space they have on the roof. This is the new addition on the roof, so it gives you a kitchen, living room, dining room, and a stair down that takes you to two bedrooms that use that bulk of the existing garage. So we're trying to take sort of a bakery building that wasn't designed to be a housing project and find a way to reduce the scale of it so that it can be used appropriate1y.

And then this is another interesting --
this is the rooftop unit over the two-story building. The two-story building is over 100 feet, over 120 foot deep. So you're now taking out the corner in the middle and you
have a floor that's really quite deep. And what we're doing is using the upper floor as a living space where there can be a lot of nice light, patio, and then put a new stair in and using that deeper space on the second floor as the bedroom space, because along with the bedroom you can conveniently put a master bath and a nice walk-in closet and some storage area to use some of this extra space below.

So I don't know if that helps answer your question.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Hugh, just I note in the actual application for the Special Permit as opposed to the plans, it says that there are 14 one-bedrooms, 24 two-bedrooms and 8 three-bedrooms.

HUGH RUSSELL: That doesn't seem to total 46.

## JOEL BARGMANN: Yeah, okay.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: It
does. But not thirds.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. There's a mixture of one-, two-, and three-bedroom units and there's a substantial number of each.

AHMED NUR: The balcony there that you showed, what facade is that? Where is that facing?

JOEL BARGMANN: One balcony faces
due south and the other one faces north.
They're just --
HUGH RUSSELL: One faces the street and the other faces the railway.

AHMED NUR: Okay.
HUGH RUSSELL: Is there more to your presentation?

AHMED NUR: I have one more
question. I'm sorry.
HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
AHMED NUR: You mentioned the loft in some of this area, and is there any separate -- in this mezzanine level there's no private entrance to a particular apartment, just that that mezzanine -everything is from the -- it's all one place? It's all one apartment?

JOEL BARGMANN: Yes.
AHMED NUR: You're not selling it as separate?

STEVEN COHEN: Joe1, the penthouses are all clad in metal panels of some sort? JOEL BARGMANN: That's correct.

This was the planning -- we had a number of different colors that we discussed with the Historic Commission and we opted for a very 1ight color for a number of reasons:

One, is it doesn't conflict with the green that's part of the existing building. It felt light on the roof. And that some of the other colors using a hunter green or a black or a grey, seemed to call more attention to the penthouse.

And then the final reason is that when this particular color is shown outside, it's quite nice in that it reflects the color that it's adjacent to. So on a sunny day it looks very much different than on a cloudy day. And we think that that's -- and I think the folks that were reviewing that design liked that idea that it was sort of, took on a hue that changed with the weather.

## HUGH RUSSELL: It's in general is

when a building is subject to Historical
Commission review, we tend to back off on the questions that the Historical Commission has
gone over because we appreciate their review as being very thorough and very thoughtful. It's nice to know, but we will not try to second guess the Historical Commission.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Can I ask about
something that maybe the Historical
Commission may not have looked at which is locations of condensers and mechanical
equipment? How is that detailed?
JOEL BARGMANN: They did not
overlook that detai1.
TOM SIENIEWICZ: Okay.
JOEL BARGMANN: What's proposed is a
series of condensers that go on the middle of the building above where the corridor is and I believe the agreement that you have says that they would not be any higher than four feet.
H. THEODORE COHEN: And the window
frames, are they green or are they --
JOEL BARGMANN: In the new addition
they would be silver, but in the existing building they will be green. So all the existing will be green and then up there there's silver. The consensus is that these blueish windows were changed over time so we've got to an agreement to unify the base as a green color.

PAMELA WINTERS: Did you have some more samples, sir, for the windows?

JOEL BARGMANN: I brought the color sample of the window if you'd like to see it. PAMELA WINTERS: I would.

Also just a very minor, this is just a silly detai1, but so you have Hathaway Lofts and the writing Hathaway, is that, was that from the original --

JOEL BARGMANN: It's from the
original bakery, and that's actually the one element that we're bringing back to the historic society because we did not have full details of that. And how we're treating that pane1, there was some question about the coloration of it and so we'11 be bringing that forward not only to them but also for signage permit.

PAMELA WINTERS: I really like the original Hathaway, you know, it gives a nice little historic touch to the building.

JOEL BARGMANN: Right.
PAMELA WINTERS: I like that.
JOEL BARGMANN: Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: If there are no more questions by the Board, then should we go to pub1ic comments?

There is a sign-up sheet. And if you didn't sign up, that's all right, you can
still speak.
JEFF ROBERTS: I don't think anybody signed up so you can just ask.

HUGH RUSSELL: Would anyone like to speak?

Yes, Ma'am. Please come forward to the podium, give your name, spel1 your name so that it will be right in the record, and be aware of our three-minute time limit.

MARIAN FOSTER: My name is Marian
Foster and I live at 75 Richdale right up the street from No. 33. So I'm speaking not to descent to the project. I'm very excited about the memorandum of understanding we've hammered out and how it's going forward. But I speak to high1ight a concern that is expressed in the agreement we have arrived at in item No. 7 regarding the effect of the 15-33 Richdale Avenue project on the sanitary
sewer of that street. The increase in wastewater generation from the existing office building, which is at least one half warehouse, to the output of a building with 46 residential units is a quantum leap. The City of Cambridge will have to be absolutely certain that the present ten inch, I think it's ten inch, but I'm not sure, designated sewer pipe is adequate to this new volume. Or if not, increase the line's capacity. No one wants to experience a future sewer backup at 75 Richdale has had to deal with that in the past. And I know -- I mentioned this last time we met, and $I$ know that the city engineer is going to be working with the project manager, so, but $I$ just wanted to highlight it.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you. Does anyone else wish to speak?

Okay, yes, sir.
OLIVER RADFORD: Hi. Oliver
Radford, Radford, at 24 Cambridge Terrace.
I've been one of the most strong advocates for the neighborhood on this project and I'm very pleased to let you know that, you know, we have reached this agreement with the developer. Personally I'm quite excited about the project and where it's gotten to at this point. I think that support and enthusiasm is shared by many people in the neighborhood, perhaps not every single one, and there are a fewer lingering concerns as Ms. Foster pointed out, but I just wanted to speak in support of the project and to ask you to grant the Special Permits that the project needs. And also somehow find a way of incorporating that agreement that we have reached with the developers.

So, thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.
Does anyone else wish to speak?

## PEGGY PHILLIPS: Hi. Peggy

Phillips. I'm at 33 Richdale right next-door -- I mean I'm at 75 Richdale. It was just something that I've been following this for a long time like all my neighbors and, you know, very pleased to see how things are turning out, but something that came to mind tonight watching this, we have some nice trees in our sidewalk and maybe that was -and they were put there before I lived at 75 Richdale. I don't know if that was something that the city did or a developer did, but I just want to make a comment that the trees add a lot and there's no trees in what we're looking at for this long stretch of building.

So maybe while all this developing,
construction is going on, if that can be something that whoever would be responsible thinks about maybe planting some trees in the sidewalk there.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.
Yes, sir.
CHRIS LUTZ: Hello, my name is Chris Lutz, L-u-t-z. I live at 75 Richdale Avenue and I wanted to second what 01iver Radford had to say about the project. I'm very happy with the outcome, and -- but I also had a question about -- I believe somebody brought this up to me in the last couple of days, if you walk down Richdale Avenue now, the electric wires are very prominent and I suspect -- are they buried in the new project or are they still up on the poles?

JOEL BARGMANN: We're investigating
whether we can work with NStar to get them
buried.
CHRIS LUTZ: Because you couldn't see them in the renderings.

JOEL BARGMANN: The goal is to -- we don't have an agreement with them yet.

CHRIS LUTZ: I see. Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Does anyone else wish to speak?
(No Response.)
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, I see no one. Sue, you've sent us a memo with
recommendations. You want to high1ight that for us?

SUSAN CLIPPINGER: I think the
1etter's pretty self-explanatory and we had communicated back in September as wel1. One of the areas of most concern has been automobile parking and trying to make sure that there's some flexibility in how the
parking is managed, so that the cars that are owned by the people in the building are actually in the garage and there's work that was done between the proponent and the community to address this issue. So I think that's been we11 addressed and we had, you know, we have a couple of sentences in here just speaking to that.

And you know, that's really, you know, the major issue that's been raised. Site plan issues are resolved, and as usual we're recommending some TDM measures to encourage the use of transit. Standard stuff that we do, so I think there's nothing special here. HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Can you help me understand how the neighborhood agreement that specifies if they're condominiums, we have to have one space per
unit deeded matches with the active management as a pool in your memo?

SUSAN CLIPPINGER: It doesn't. This is a rental project.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: We11,
we don't approve rental or condo.
SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Yes.
CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: So....
Okay, just to be clear those are conflicting provisions?

SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Yes.
CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Okay.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Excuse me.

PAMELA WINTERS: I'm not
understanding that I don't think.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, so what Sue has recommended is that to get the most people in the garage you shouldn't have, shouldn't have one assigned space for every unit because
some people don't have cars, other people might like to have a second car. If you manage it, you can -- you're very likely to be able to accommodate everybody with a car in the garage.

PAMELA WINTERS: Yeah.
HUGH RUSSELL: So, in the
neighborhood agreement it says: Should it be converted to a condominium, that each unit would get a deeded space which is different. And as Sue said --

PAMELA WINTERS: Oh, I see. HUGH RUSSELL: -- a different
concept. And I can't remember a decision where we've put a contingency that says if this is changed to a condominium, something has to happen. And I don't think we're comfortable probably with making that part of our decision.

## CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Right.

They're the same use for our purposes.
They're both housing. It's just forms of ownership that change.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right.
And so, Jeff?
JEFF ROBERTS: Mr. Chair, I could
try to provide some clarity on that issue.
So the Zoning is generally silent on whether a project is owner-occupied or rented or for a residential project it really makes no difference, that's why the Planning Board generally in their decision does not, is not making a comment on that. One of the issues that we discussed with the Board previously is this question of whether condo units need to have a space deeded to them. And that's, that can sometimes arise as an issue just because of conformity. So if a -- if the
building as it's built, as it's proposed now, conforms to Zoning because it has 46 parking spaces and 46 dwelling units, Zoning doesn't say anything about who has to park in those spaces, it just says they have to have that number of spaces for that many units. If the units were then sold individually, in order to make sure each unit conforms, they may end up needing to sell parking space -- a parking space with each unit so that they're not selling a -- they're not creating a new non-conformity by selling a unit that doesn't have parking. Now, again, it doesn't mean that the, that those cars have to park in those spaces. It just means that they're -those units need to remain conforming to the Zoning. Sometimes a condo organization or an association could come up with some creative mechanisms to make sure that if somebody has
a parking -- if one condo has a parking space but they're not parking a car there, somebody else could have the space and they have a financial arrangement that works that all out. There is a way to work that out. But as you said, the ownership itself and the title and everything is a separate matter that generally doesn't come up with the Planning Board or the Zoning. HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.
H. THEODORE COHEN: I'm sorry -HUGH RUSSELL: Ted.
H. THEODORE COHEN: -- just a
question: What are bicycle sharrows?
HUGH RUSSELL: That's what Wikipedia is for.
H. THEODORE COHEN: I did not look.

SUSAN CLIPPINGER: When we don't have sufficient space for a regular bike
thing with a line on either side, we have used a sharrow which is a chevron, a double chevron with a symbol of a bike. So if you drive Broadway here passed Prospect going toward Kendall Square, you'11 see that along the edge of the parking, there's been -those have been installed to try to de-mark that area for bikes and give information to both drivers and bikes that that activity will exist.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: And Wikipedia says
that it comes from the notion of shared use street for bicycles and cars. So that's what share and the arrow, share bicycle.
H. THEODORE COHEN: I've learned something new.

HUGH RUSSELL: Any other questions?
(No Response.)

## HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

So have people reviewed the application and specifically the suggested findings that are -- appear on pages 4 and $16 ?$ I've read them. I did not find anything in them that I felt was incorrect. I think they demonstrate that the project meets the criteria for granting the permits that are sought. And my own view is that we could vote favorably on this petition.

Are there other comments by members of the Board?

Perhaps, we need to perhaps go through -- there's been a request that we incorporate the neighborhood petition, neighborhood agreement in our thing -- we don't -- I think many of the points are points that would normally fall under our decision, some of them are not. And I think
we should be clear just for example we're not going to make a condition to find a home for circular wash basin even though that may be desirable. And I assume it is because you people have been thinking about it and got it here.

I think the difficulty with not
including important agreements here is how is this agreement enforced? Putting things that are Zoning matters, planning matters into our decision, it means that the enforcement can be undertaken by the city.

So, in this list, item 1 would be our in our decision.

Item 2 would be in our decision. And we reference the specific drawings that we've got tonight. That's the way we do it.

And three is something that is true, but I don't think we will generally reflect
it and rely upon the Historical Commission. And we understand Historical Commission has -- do they have jurisdiction or do we have to create jurisdiction for them in our decision?

JEFF ROBERTS: It's my
understanding, Mr. Chair, that the Cambridge Historical Commission has issued a

Certificate of Appropriateness so they did have that jurisdiction and have acted within that jurisdiction. And if there's any continuing design or any review that needs to take place, that that will be reflected in their Certificate of Appropriateness.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.
The height of the rooftop mechanical
equipment, it says kind of a -- it's a
complicated thing. I don't see any reason
not to include that in our decision. I think
it's well thought out. Noise Ordinance we usually reference.

Parking, the conditions from Sue. Sue I think has covered that in her recommendations except for the condominium sentence which I think we're -- I take that as in a sense to be a statement of the last sentence about condominiums is a statement of how people believe should it be converted to a condo, that's what will happen. So that's why it's written. It's recognized here so that both parties agree. Understand that this is the way it's done. And as Jeff said, you can end up with a secondary market within the building to accomplish what Sue wants to have happen.

JEFF ROBERTS: Mr. Chair, there was also one -- I think there was a provision in that agreement that I wanted to point out
which similarly deals with lease terms between the rental. I don't have it in front of me, but I'm remembering, that is in one of the --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yes.
JOEL BARGMANN: It's in No. 7.
CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: No. 6.
It's that building leases will contain a provision that will require tenants owning a vehicle to purchase parking space on-site. JEFF ROBERTS: Right. And I think it's similarly just as the Planning Board is not typically involved in condo sale agreements, they're typically not -- there's no mechanism for enforcement of the terms of a lease between the landlord and the tenant. So while I think it's very reasonable and typical to include, as Sue recommended, monitoring provisions and other
transportation management provisions that can be monitored, enforced between the city and the building owner, intervening in the leases between the building owner and the tenants is something that is not really enforceable for the Board.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: So,
Jeff, just to be clear, then, it would be your recommendation that we include the provision of Sue's memo -- provisions of Sue's memo in lieu of No. 6 in the community agreement in our conditions?

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes. I believe that's a more enforceable way to include that provision.
H. THEODORE COHEN: I also think that tenants can't purchase parking spaces. The most they could do would be to lease them. And unless and until the building were
condominiumized, there would be nothing that an individual can purchase. I think it does make more sense to include what Traffic and Parking had recommended to us.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, I think in the -- what would be useful in the descriptive section of the decision to highlight this as an issue that's important to sort of take the -- Sue's written conclusion to put in the decision the reasons for getting to that in which, you know, the goal of getting everybody who lives there who has a car park on-site. I think that's -it's not a condition, but it's a description of the thinking. And that's good that the decision be clear.

STEVEN WINTER: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: So it seems the city
engineer has not come down on the sewer yet
and now I'm moving on to 7 ; is that correct?
I think the sewer can take a lot of
stuff. Hundreds of apartments can be served by a sewer. So, if that's what's out there, I mean who knows how many blocks it's serving, how it works. That's a network question.

STEVEN WINTER: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: So I don't believe we have to condition that to say you've got to deal with what the city engineer tells you to do, because he has the authority to do that.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: She.
HUGH RUSSELL: She.
CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: She.
JEFF ROBERTS: It could be included but it would be a matter of -- just a matter of general construction review as well.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right, because the --
> the city engineer won't sign off on the project if she believes they're not adequate -- (inaudible).

STEVEN WINTER: That's correct.
HUGH RUSSELL: So that's the --
okay. And there's already been a determination that the water main needs to be upgraded. Storm management plan. I think that ends up in our decision.

Wash basin and the agreement to -- of the owner to put landmark status is probably not something we would put in our decision. Although I think --

AHMED NUR: No, but one thing that comes into mind is there was one of the reliefs they're asking for is to narrow the curb cut because water is running into the site. And I wondered if there was an issue with a catch basin to catch the water I
suppose. I don't know what it does to the sidewalk. Are we going to raise the sidewalk in order to divert water from there?
(Inaudible). Currently in their drawings it shows a sil1 of a sort. I'm not sure if that's temporary or not. But just bringing it out that based on the relief they're asking for if that's something that the Public Works or the management --

HUGH RUSSELL: We11, I think they have to exclude this street order from their site otherwise their on-site system will be overwhelmed. And I don't know how they're planning to do it. Maybe -- do you know the answer to that?

AHMED NUR: Are you raising the sidewalk to divert water?

JOEL BARGMANN: Wel1, there's just a curb is being extended around it because
right now it's about 40 -foot wide curb cut which is wider than it's needed. So we want to bring it down to what is more typical curb cut. And what that would do is you just, it just narrows down where the sidewalk slopes down and goes back up. It's, you know.

AHMED NUR: So basically by you shrinking it, it reduces the length of the water?

JOEL BARGMANN: Well, it keeps the water from going on to the sidewalk in that corner.

HUGH RUSSELL: And I think Sue had a comment and then we'11 ask you, Sue.

SUSAN CLIPPINGER: There's a
standard design for a city curb cut. Where the sidewalk goes flat across at the sidewalk level and the sidewalk dips down at the curb edge and that's standard throughout the city
in order to maintain good pedestrian
environment. So no matter how wide this curb cut is, the water's not going to easily go around the corner in the lot because that treatment would be required by DPW.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: And just a point of clarification, the curb cut is not part of any relief we're asking for tonight. The curb cut is a separate process that would have to be approved by the City Council. We're showing a modified curb cut, but that's not part of what we're asking for relief this evening.

AHMED NUR: That clarifies, thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, are there any other matters we need to discuss?

Pam.
PAMELA WINTERS: Hugh, yes, a person
who spoke earlier mentioned trees and it is a rather long line there of sidewalk, and I'm wondering if we could install tree wells or if that's part of the -- is that part of the -- I don't know, part -- I don't know how other members of the Board feel about it, but I certainly would think that would be a nice thing to do. But I don't know if we can mandate that.

## HUGH RUSSELL: I think we can

certainly mandate that they try. Because it's not their property, it's the city's property --

PAMELA WINTERS: Right.
HUGH RUSSELL: -- the city has to look at that. I don't know what the width of the sidewalk is and whether there's sufficient width to maintain proper, you know, access in putting trees or not. But I
don't think it's any different down at Payne Elevator, so I think we would ask them to explore that.

PAMELA WINTERS: Take a look at it, yeah.

HUGH RUSSELL: And attempt to do that.

PAMELA WINTERS: I'm seeing maybe a little no down there? Are the sidewalks too narrow?

ADAM SHULMAN: We'11 look at it. I think it is.

PAMELA WINTERS: It would be lovely to have some trees there.

STUART DASH: We can look at that.
PAMELA WINTERS: It you could look at that, that would be great.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, sir.
ARTHUR WOLFSON: I'm Arthur Wolfson,

33 Richdale. And actually 33 and some years back when the street was redone, we had the option of trees or no trees. And I have to say it was my decision not to have trees at that time. The reasons were that the
lighting was on the same side of the street and a lot of people were commenting that the trees would block out the light in that area. So I consulted the city electrician to see if they would put them on the other side of the street. At that time they were not willing to do that with the lighting. So that and the drainage issues with leaves and so forth, the decision was not to put trees in. So that's how come there are no trees there now, but it's open, you know, for your decision.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.
PAMELA WINTERS: Thank you.
STEVEN COHEN: Mr. Chair, just two
things I think you let go unsaid.
First of all, with regard to the design, I think this was a tough building to work with, and I just want to compliment the architect and the owner and great flexibility and great creativity to make the plans work. And as far as the exterior appearance goes, I think that not only is this a great restoration of the historical building but it's stimulating sort of dynamic contrast between the brick below and the metal cladding above, I think is a great look and a great design. So first of a11, I wanted to compliment you on the design.

And secondly, procedurally, by whatever circuitous route we've arrived, we have arrived and this should be the poster child or poster project for the way development works in the city. The fact that we've
arrived at a point where both the developer and the neighborhood are pleased and optimistic and proud with the outcome, that doesn't happen all that often. As laudable I need to compliment both the development team and the neighborhood to do whatever you did to have arrived at this state. I think it's a great project and I congratulate all of you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Steve.
STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, I want to echo Steve's comments, both of them, and with an emphasis on the nod to the industrial use and origins of the architecture of this building is just superbly done. It captures exactly what we like about Cambridge. That we can look at this and remember that time way back that it's being reused and repurposed. So I think we really, we really
hit the nail on the head with this design. It's really nicely done.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: And I will make a comment that perhaps adds a certain symmetry to the deliberations. You started tonight with a description of what we do here and that we don't have the power to write the Zoning, that properly happens at City

Council, and we follow that Zoning. And the way this comment will appear to be symmetrical is this: That the neighbors and the developer worked very hard to craft a set of agreements. And the parsing that we did here as a Board, I don't want anybody to be alarmed that we're pulling this apart. And it would be with great reluctance that I would tamper with any of this at a11, but the importance of what the discussion was to be very, very clear about what city staff could
enforce within this agreement. And so it is proper that the Board spend sometime going through it.

I do want to say on the record that I absolutely endorse all of the measures that are outlined in this memorandum, and I think fellow board members probably do as well, but I just want to be very clear that there's a limited amount of power that city staff properly has to enforce some letters and measures in this, in this agreement. And so that's what we're doing, rather than tampering with something that obviously was hard won and I echo my fellow board members in saying that it's really impressive in what you guys were able to pull off.

Thank you.
STEVE PERRY: I just have a quick question. All of this is great and I'm
thrilled with the project as well. The question I have is -- I'm Steve Perry. I live at 24 Cambridge Terrace. If you can consider mandating in your decision that the developer try to think about street trees, I guess I'm just sort of following up on Tom's comment, it would be nice if you could mandate the developer to try to pursue the items that you feel uncomfortable in our agreement with, because we certainly don't want to ask you to put your neck out in an uncomfortable way given your mandate and jurisdiction, but we -- and we understand that mandating someone to try is limited, but I think, I think all of the things that we've got in there that you feel uncomfortable with certainly have arguably the same merit of street trees.

Thanks.

## HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.

In listening to Tom, I think I find myself in full agreement with that, that we described it as, you know, we were comfortable with the entire agreement but not all the pieces of it are appropriately found in the Zoning decision. And so 90 percent is but there might be 10 percent of things which just don't fit into the context of a decision that we can place. That doesn't mean that we don't hope that they're all taken care of. And I guess I feel reasonably confident that they all will be taken care of because you have agreements to do it and these things are not unreasonable. I think they're going to happen. There's tremendous show of determination, and to my mind good faith on both sides of what used to be both side and what now is --

## CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY:

Mr. Chair?
HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I might go one step further and say I'm not only reasonably confident, I don't see anything in here except for the ownership issues we discussed with regard to parking that isn't enforced by one city department or commission or another.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right.
CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: So whether it's our purview or DPW's or the Historic Commission, the city will be involved in the enforcement of this agreement in some form.
H. THEODORE COHEN: And if I could just follow up on that, sorry.

HUGH RUSSELL: We have a bunch of
lawyers here.
H. THEODORE COHEN: I'm in agreement with everything that's been said, but you know, I think the Board would be inappropriate for us to tel1 another independent agency of the city what it should or shouldn't do, and to tell it you have to enforce something. That's their duty to do. And, you know, I don't want to tel1 the DPW or the Water Department what they should be doing or what they should require because that's not our jurisdiction, that's theirs.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: However, street trees in the public realm is our -- is something that we have interest in and I think we properly can meddle in. And I'm really uncomfortable with the term mandating anybody to do anything, but I for one agree with my fellow board members that street
trees probably would improve this condition. I don't live on this street. There's been obviously some really careful thought about that in the past, and I guess there's another discussion that should be ongoing. I would encourage to see whether it's possible to get some street trees put in on that long stretch of sidewalk. I think it would help both the building and the public environment.

PAMELA WINTERS: Absolutely.
AHMED NUR: Mr. Chairman, speaking of recommendation and mandates to the city, looking at this power lines on that tiny, over that tiny sidewalk, trees are going to grow into it. I think there's a huge potential problems with trees and power lines overhead anyway. You know, I don't know how else to say other than how do we tag into -actually maybe the city should amend itself
by burying all our power lines. But this should be a great opportunity to look at this particular road here.

HUGH RUSSELL: Unfortunately if we bury the power lines, they're underground and they become -- to make barriers to plan planting street trees. And so you can't get away with those linear features. Maybe it's possible to, you know, if you've got enough room, you can say this zone for trees, this zone for conduits. And dealing with the utility companies these days is extraordinarily difficult. I don't have to tel1 you that. We've shared the same kind of experiences that I have. So and I think that's, again, something we can't mandate even though it would be nice if you could get trees and get wires down. And if wires are up there, I think you're probably correct, it
may make it very difficult.
AHMED NUR: (Inaudible.)
HUGH RUSSELL: It's a complicated
issue. And let's not try to solve it tonight but let's ask people to try to figure out if it's possible.

PAMELA WINTERS: Hugh, I just wanted to make one comment on that. We have a ton of -- I live on Orchard Street which is not too far from here. We have a ton of wires, they're so ugly, going down our street. And we also have a ton of trees. And what happens is every year or two the city comes by and they trim the trees so that they don't get in the way of the wires or the wires don't, you know, interfere. They're very good about it actually. And so there is a way of sort of getting around that. And, you know, I'm sure the city will look and see if
it is possible to plant trees there. And if the sidewalk's are, you know, wide enough and so forth, I'm sure they'11 take a good look at it.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Can we move to a decision?

STEVEN WINTER: Sure.
HUGH RUSSELL: So, I think we're
looking for a motion to grant the relief with making findings. Someone want to attempt that motion?

I mean, the findings are -- have been set out in the application.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I'11
attempt. And I'm counting on my fellow board members to chime in here if I miss anything.

I move that we approve the Special
Permit for the relief sought as detailed in pages 4 through 16 of the application with
the additional conditions as detailed in Sue Clippinger's memorandum of April 1st, and incorporating items $1,2,4$, and 5 of the agreement between the proponent and the community, also dated Apri1 1st, and addressed to Chairman Russell.

HUGH RUSSELL: Is there a second to that motion?
H. THEODORE COHEN: Second.

HUGH RUSSELL: Ted.
A discussion on the motion?
(No Response.)
HUGH RUSSELL: A11 those in favor of the motion?
(Raising hands).
HUGH RUSSELL: A11 members voting in favor.

Great, thank you very much.
(A short recess was taken.)

## HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, let's get

started on our next agenda item.
So the purpose of this segment is actually for us to discuss the substance of what we've heard from people and not to take additional testimony. That we can, we want to take additional testimony, but I think it's time for us to buckle down. And I will try to summarize where I think we're at. There's a report that Jeff prepared that we got a while ago, but there's a concern in Cambridge Highlands about the townhouse developments that have occurred, particularly down at the end of Newman Street, and there's a desire to have more control over that process. The proposal was to change the Zoning to make it impossible to go to townhouses. Now other suggestions that the staff has brought forward are -- range from,
and many people were unhappy with the idea of creating a lot of non-conformity in the hearings, at the same time wanting more control over any future development particularly down the street.

So some of the options that were put forward to get more control that wouldn't create non-conformity was to deal with just the ability to build townhouses.

One proposal to make townhouses not permitted in some kind of Overlay Zone.

Another proposal, which is actually the one that makes more sense to me, is to lower the threshold for review of townhouse developments so that if anybody wants to build a townhouse in this district, it has to come to us for a Special Permit under the review of townhouses that we would conduct if it were six units.

## STEVEN WINTER: I like that.

HUGH RUSSELL: I think that way we
can get the development to address some of the critical issues about cutting through the relationship to the parts of the land that are in Industry B.

Mandating a review, also is a somewhat of a disincentive, and so if there are a couple other lots in the district, I believe they could have a townhouse, a structure on them because of the size of them. One might feel forced to come to this terrible place and listen to us and listen to the neighbors, you might just decide it wasn't worth it and that might be a good outcome from many points of view.

So that's how I remember it. I don't know what else people want to say. STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair?

## HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

STEVEN WINTER: Could we, a little more carefully than define the kind of review, this includes design review; is that correct?

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. There is an existing design review provision that gets triggered when this district there are six townhouses and to simply extend that trigger down to two since one townhouse isn't a townhouse, it's a house.

STEVEN COHEN: But, you know, two townhouses is just a side-by-side house which is, you know, a common sort of standard form of housing in Cambridge.

HUGH RUSSELL: Oh, yeah, I mean townhouses are common, too.

STEVEN COHEN: Yes. And, you know, and then, you know, instead of attaching
them, you know, you just built, as we talked about last time, you know, two or three standalone houses, freestanding houses on a lot, and then that wouldn't be subject to review. But somehow or another by attaching them, they cross some sort of aesthetic or policy and intensity. Your red line that un1ess it's a response -- I agree with you in general as that this is the proper way to deal with it, but it seems funny sort of thing to treating townhouses as a totally different animal.

HUGH RUSSELL: We11, if you want the deep history here. STEVEN COHEN: Deep? HUGH RUSSELL: Deep history, Fred Cohen was a member of this body for 29 years, and among other things he was a developer of townhouses. He believed in townhouses. He
thought it was a -- that in many places they were an excellent way to build. And at the time this application came in, it was something that we termed the Arlington Pill Box, which Arlington termed the Cambridge Pill Box. But they were buildings with 10 or 12 or 15 units, square things --

STEVEN COHEN: A big cube, yeah.
HUGH RUSSELL: It was a product of the 70s.

PAMELA WINTERS: Ugly.
HUGH RUSSELL: The city tried to encourage people that instead of building those buildings, to build townhouse structures and they did it by giving incentives, giving density bonuses, setback relief, all of which was conditioned upon our review. Then over time we decided that we didn't want to give those incentives anymore,
that they were -- the people now got the message that townhouses were appropriate things to do. And in fact they were perhaps pretty new in some places where they shouldn't be. So the incentive was removed, but the design review got left behind.

So that's sort of how it -- why it's --
it is that way. I mean we could certainly, I think, I think we might be able to say if you're putting more than $X$ many units on a lot --

STEVEN COHEN: Exactly, that's what I was going.

HUGH RUSSELL: You know, no matter what the form is it should be reviewed. That would think that's a legal question.

STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, would we be saying this about this particular neighborhood or are we thinking more global?

## HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

STEVEN WINTER: Just this
neighborhood?
HUGH RUSSELL: Just this
neighborhood because it is one of -- every neighborhood is different. I mean, every neighborhood is unique. But this neighborhood feature is that there are a lot of individual houses, some of which now are two-family houses, and it's a very consistent pattern. And it's a nice pattern. It's a nice neighborhood.

PAMELA WINTERS: It is.
HUGH RUSSELL: And people are concerned that it stay that way.
H. THEODORE COHEN: But I would like to say that -- I agree, it's a very nice neighborhood. But I think the townhouses that have been built there are really very
consistent with the rest of the neighborhood and fit in very nicely with the rest of the neighborhood. And so, you know, I'm not opposed to the concept of there being, you know, a point of review, but I don't think, you know, townhouses are bad per se. And I don't think the ones that have been built in this neighborhood are bad for the neighborhood either.

PAMELA WINTERS: Well, I have to say something because I was really involved with this a number of years ago. There is a street, I think it's called Holworthy Street down where the large Star Market is. You know down near Belmont, down in that area? That have large backyards? And so years ago I know that that's a Res B neighborhood, and years ago in the 90s there was a big, there were a lot of townhouses being built in Res $B$
neighborhoods. And they were filling in backyards. And they were taking away the green space in the city. And people were really upset about it and so we all got together -- I shouldn't say we, a group of neighbors got together and from all over the city and talked to City Councillors and we rezoned townhouse development for Res B neighborhoods. So if you get a large, you know, like a large backyard space and you want to start filling it up and -- with townhouses, that's where -- when it becomes problematic I think.
H. THEODORE COHEN: I'm not
disagreeing with you or disagreeing about the appropriateness of townhouses in other places in the city. I'm just saying that having different through this neighborhood -PAMELA WINTERS: Right.
H. THEODORE COHEN: -- several times
now, I think the townhouses that are built there are really quite appropriate to the rest of the neighborhood. And, you know, I'm opposed to the Zoning Petition that would make so much of the rest of the neighborhood non-conforming, but I'm not, you know, opposed to staff trying to come up with some other mechanism to, you know, give at least a review provision to townhouses or as Steve suggests, rather than it not being the format, but the number of units on a lot. STEVEN COHEN: And, you know, if we're talking about number of units, whether they be townhouses or otherwise, my gut is that two units on a lot or two attached townhouses is, is such a traditional form in Cambridge that if we were to have a threshold, I would think that it would be
three rather than two.
HUGH RUSSELL: Jeff.
JEFF ROBERTS: Mr. Chair, I can just
add one point on that, on that last
discussion, if you recal1 in Residence B
there already is an existing provision
requiring a Planning Board Special Permit for a lot with more than one structure on it if that structure is set back behind 75 feet from the front of the lot line. So an alternative form of development to townhouse development could be separate structures on a lot in certain cases would also trigger a Planning Board review. Oh, and also that any -- because it's a Residence B, any development of three or more units would have to be a townhouse-style development. That's the only allowed development style for a, for
a project where at least three units are in
the same building.
AHMED NUR: Mr. Chair, this brings
to mind, we have that issue actually on
Cottage Street. Do you remember that? We had those deep yards where the house is just a small, the Irish immigrants built their houses up on the High Street on Cottage, they were flooded yards that now became land and developers started to build things. That's 75 feet away from the main road kind of brought this back to my memory. But we have dealt with this individually as they come in a Special Permit.

STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, the only, the only way that I'm thinking about this is to, how do we add those safeguards to protect the fabric of the neighborhood without putting other dwellings in non-conforming
status. But do you feel that we can, we can
truly with a design review or other mandated processes, that we can truly meet the concerns that were brought forth by folks in the neighborhood?

HUGH RUSSELL: I think we can do a lot around the design of these structures. There was a lot of, a lot of people who were talking about traffic, and to -- and what I got was kind of the message that, you know, one more unit is one more car and it's going to come and go several times a day. Ten more units is ten more cars, and that's a concern. I mean, I think the present level of traffic is a concern. It's a very long dead end. So design review may not satisfy that part of the equation, but it's -- so that's your answer.

STEVEN WINTER: Oh, okay.
And Jeff, may I ask a question of you?

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes.
STEVEN WINTER: Loomis Street -- is
Loomis Street -- I'm sorry, is Loomis Street included in any of the existing plans we have for this area with recommendations? As we know, Loomis stops at where those, in my old Google Earth photo, those barriers are, and where the seven townhouses are now, the driveway that goes back there, so it's not, it is not a road. Are there any existing guidelines and plans that we have that says we don't want to make Loomis a through street somewhere else? We don't want to connect it through the industrial zone. We don't want additional traffic. Is there a way we can ensure that?

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes. In fact, there is the Concord/Alewife planning study which we've been looking at on a few different
cases that have come before the Board recently exactly that. That the plan for the Cambridge Highlands neighborhood is to retain the, sort of the independence of that neighborhood from the rest of the quadrangle by not allowing through traffic to extend from Loomis Street. It does recommend improved bicycle/pedestrian connections, particularly ways to get -- to approve the access to car plans and to ultimately to the T station if that's possible for people living in the Highlands neighborhood. But traffic is meant to be kept separate. STEVEN WINTER: Thank you. HUGH RUSSELL: So, are we at a point where we want to kind of summarize a recommendation to make to the Council and that would be that we do not recommend changing the neighborhood to Residence A-2
because of the non-conformity question primarily? That we do recommend that any development of more than two units on one lot be subject to a Special Permit by this Board using the design review standards.

STEVEN WINTER: With the public hearings.

HUGH RUSSELL: Public hearings.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Did you say more than two units?

PAMELA WINTERS: Right.
HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, I did. I
thought that was correct.
STEVEN COHEN: That's it exactly.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Perfect.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Good.
HUGH RUSSELL: A11 right, so I'11
move that myself that we --
MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: None of us
to speak? Mr. Chairman, as the Petitioner may I ask one question for clarity? HUGH RUSSELL: Sure. MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to make a distinction between is there any difference between being able to build a townhouse versus a two-family house, you know, in our current Zoning in terms of setbacks or FAR or any other considerations of the design? Is there any difference? Because you can consider some building to be two-family house or maybe call that a townhouse, I don't know exactly what the technical distinction there is, but if a developer were to come in, call it one or the other, is there any implication as to the design or any restrictions around that building?

Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: I know the density is the same. I'm almost certain the setbacks are at this point the same. The height is the same.

JEFF ROBERTS: I believe that if it were designed in a townhouse style, a two-unit structure could still be considered a two family. It's a matter of -- there are dimensional requirements and then there's a use requirement, sort of the use classification. So a building, a structure with two dwelling units in it could be considered a two-family dwelling, which is one type of use. If it were a townhouse development, it would generally be more than two units that are attached along, along a party wall. So the, the distinction between a two-unit townhouse and a two-family dwelling may be a moot difference. But as
you mentioned, Mr. Chair, the dimensional requirements in either case are the same. STEVEN COHEN: I think perhaps by
calling it a townhouse, you can more readily subdivide it into two lots owned in fee.

JEFF ROBERTS: Actually, yes, that is correct. That's one of the remaining advantages of townhouse -- of the townhouse ordinance is it does allow the lot to be -the lot itself to be divided along the party wall of the building where normally that would create a setback nonconformity.

HUGH RUSSELL: Whereas if it were a two-family house, you would make it a condominium and you could do a legal, proper language, make the rights similar.

Okay. So would anyone like to second the motion I made?

STEVEN WINTER: Second.

## HUGH RUSSELL: Any discussion on

that motion?
(No Response.)
HUGH RUSSELL: A11 those in favor?
(Raising hands.)
HUGH RUSSELL: And all members are voting in favor.

Jeff will write that up and send it out to the Council.

Thank you for coming.
And I think we'll go on to the next
item on our agenda which is the discussion of the any comments we might want to make on the Town Gown reports that have been submitted to us.

Jeff, I asked you to write something
up. You haven't done it so far. Was it the Town Gown that I asked you to orient us on?

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes, I believe that
request was made so I'11 do my best.
So the, you know, I thought I'd frame a little bit of what the sort of where the Town Gown process fits within the larger purview of the, of the Cambridge Planning Board and planning within the city in general. It was first, first instituted, put in place in 1639 back when there were issues of student housing encroaching on sheep grazing land.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Were you on that Board?

JEFF ROBERTS: It actually has been around a long time and it, you know, predates when Planning Board engaged in much more frequent project review of developments by the universities, or in many cases we've seen recently, rezoning efforts and new planning efforts having to do with their land holdings. And so in some cases the Town Gown
has gone from being sort of the only real opportunity to check in on universities' planning to being really just one in a much broader set of interactions between the Planning Board and the universities, and even in some cases between the City Counci1 and the universities.

It was put in place to look at overall
planning issues. It was triggered by some specific issues, but was framed as a way to have a kind of regular look at, you know, the broad view of what the institutions are doing with their campuses and where they might be going in the future. It says in the, in the report that initiated the Town Gown process, that the Planning Board would conduct them annually and at a pub1ic meeting and would submit any recommendations to the City

Council. And it hasn't been always been the
case that the Planning Board has submitted recommendations to the City Council, and in some cases there aren't any particular recommendations to make. But that's one consideration for the, for the Board.

Another consideration is what kinds of issues or topics might you like to see the universities address in the following year, because as you're aware, we actually reach out to them -- or the CDD staff reaches out fairly early compared to the when the meeting is actually held. I think we reach out to them in the fall, and then their reports are due at the end of the year and then there's about a month to review those reports. So now is a good time or sometime before the fall is a good time to put some thoughts down as to what we would like to tell them to prepare in their reports for the following
year.
So those are two considerations that the Planning Board could think about of ways to respond to the reports and ways that what you've heard this year can be carried forward.

HUGH RUSSELL: So we're given a homework assignment. And my understanding is that one member got partway through doing it which was Steve who has already forgotten, but I think -- so I think we probably should go around if people have comments they want to make either about the process or about the specific things that are in the reports, issues that might be addressed, just throw it open for that discussion.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: We11, I like the process. There's a neighboring community here that requires Town Gown reports every
five years in the form of an institutional master plan, and by contrast our yearly conversation with the institutions that we share our city with means that we have a richer dialogue with those institutions because we do touch base with them annually in a public form. And so I like the way that the city has this set up a lot. So that's one editorial comment on the process.

And I'm delighted to hear that in fact the conversations are ongoing at staff level, you know, that appears for three to six months. I mean that is great. The dialogue is really, really important and in a fundamental of good planning. Relative to the specifics of the Ordinance, the specifics of the reports that we reviewed this year or that were presented to us this year. I for one, I hope my fellow board members
understand this, I was the Planning Board member that was assigned to the Net Zero subcommittee for the city, and so there is a representation from Harvard and MIT on that subcommittee, so they are aware of the broad and interest that we saw here in our own hearings when that Zoning Petition came before us. But nonetheless, I would make a plea to this institution to not just formally participate in that conversation, but to potentially lead that conversation. After a11, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology is just that, it's a school of science and technology. One would expect that any issues of energy that they might want to lead a discussion in that rather than -- I'm not going to editorialize on -they are participating. And similarly Harvard has very publicly stated that their
future lies in a really good and rich relationship to and a leading relationship on issues of sustainability. And, again, I would make a plea with our neighbors on the other side of the city to also lead that discussion. So I thought that the reports necessarily because they're drafted by institutions were not as strident in that issue than perhaps they could be in private. One other observation I did very much appreciate the thoroughness of the MIT presentation and report which delineated the need, and their wonderful chart for building renovation as it related to their particular mission, and I think that sometimes gets lost here at the city that these institutions have very specific educational missions, you know, and they're not here to serve our city necessarily a primary mission. They are
citizens here in a way and I very much appreciated the way that MIT built the case for the alterations in their campus relative to the way in which it had the support or mission -- I very much appreciated that transparency and that spirit and reciprocate an openness essentially for the city.

So those are my feelings. I'm sorry I did not draft that in a long e-mail and you've had to tolerate a long speech tonight.

Thank you.
STEVEN WINTER: You want to go to, Ahmed, and we'11 just go right down the table?

HUGH RUSSELL: Sure.
AHMED NUR: Unfortunately I missed the last Town Gown but I do, I agree with everything you said. We're very lucky to have Harvard and MIT in the City of

Cambridge. I think that the one thing that I would wish in a way is to see the future, and thank you for the history of the Town Gown dating back to 1639. Some of us have kids here, and I have two daughters now at the Rindge High and so, you know, we're talking about college. Where do you want to go? And Harvard is not in their agenda neither is MIT and, you know, they live down the street from us. I said, Why not? They're like, it's hard to get in. They said there's two or three kids accepted to Harvard from the Rindge High which is right next-door. And so if we're going to invest, these institutions are here at our footsteps, you would think that maybe in the form of the public's hearing, you know, you talk about maybe to keep reaching out to the community. I know that both Harvard and MIT have offices of
community relations, but I would like to see that number grow for our children here in Cambridge locally.

STEVEN WINTER: I think, Ahmed, that Harvard provides I believe five scholarships to Cambridge Rindge and so there's a big interplay there that goes on. You know, frankly I think most kids that grow up in Cambridge don't want to go to Harvard because it's too close to home.

AHMED NUR: Ours is literally on the corner.

STEVEN WINTER: And I want to start by saying that for me the Town Gown dialogue is a -- it's a civil dialogue between the City of Cambridge and very important institutions in that city. And I have to tell you, when I first came to town years ago, that was not a civil dialogue. It was,
it was, it was repugnant to watch. Actually, it was the citizens haranguing the institutions and railing against, you know, things that had nothing to do with the institutions, you know? Let's expand the boundaries of Sardinia and Harvard, why can't you do that? And it was just, it was just deplorable. We -- that's a hard won victory. So there's a part of that, I don't want to give that up. That's really important that we, that that's a civil dialogue between this Board and the universities and I like that.

Now for me the proposed forward view that the universities' giving me, that's for me that's the most important thing. Where they want it to go, what their development strategies are just in a very general sense. And I think that the folks -- that the universities come to the table now not
feeling that everything is quoted, everything is written down, you know, I have to be very careful about what I say. I think that it's able to -- the universities are able to say well, this is kind of the way we like to think about our development over the next five or ten or so years. And that for me is very valuable because it just gets, it goes into the mix, into the way I'm thinking about Cambridge and thinking about development and thinking about the universities and that way when things come up on the agenda that involve the universities, I feel like that I'm prepared to deal with it.

One of the things that I think we can
do better here is to figure out we11, what can we -- when we hear things that the universities are doing, what can we do to help them and to support them? For instance,
one of the things that I heard about was this terrific challenge, \$12 million challenge fund, for sustainability. You know, the revolving loan fund 300 project with an investment of $\$ 12$ million. And I suspect that Harvard University could do better with an investment pool of $\$ 12$ million to fund a really successful program. And maybe that's something we could ask them to do. We could say, gee, we think you ought to do this for this department of sustainability, it's such a terrific piece. And there were some other things that I just wanted to mention, which I like being a part of the dialogue where Harvard might say we're doing some Kennedy School expansion, and that let's me begin to think about well, let's make sure that the pedestrian access to the park doesn't change it. It really helps me to position myself
and to position my thinking. So for me the most valuable part of that dialogue is about planning and development issues.
H. THEODORE COHEN: We11, I really
enjoy the process and I look forward to getting the reports every year and, you know, just reading them because I learn so much about the different schools and what they've been doing. I think the first couple of years that I was on the Board and the first ones I went to were civil but there was large, large crowds of public who were pretty vocal about things they did not like.

Developments that they had questions about. And I think it was mostly aimed at Harvard at the time, because I think they were doing a lot of building in the city at the time. You know, that's slowed down. They're not building that much. What they've been doing
is renovations and things totally within the campus, and so I think that getting so civil but they're pretty quiet now. I think it would be interesting if the public, I don't know that they need to get riled up, but I think it's an opportunity for the public to talk to the universities that I don't think they ever have another opportunity to do. You know, it's always in the context here of development and building. But I think we live with the universities here, and unless you're somehow part of them or have a kid who's going to one of them, we don't interact with them and we just see the buildings and we think well, I can't go in there or we shouldn't go in there. So I think having this opportunity to all get together is great.

You know, in the past number of years
they've not -- MIT's obviously doing a lot and they've been coming to us repeatedly, so hearing what they had to say at the Town Gown report wasn't that interesting in terms of their development plans. I think in the past couple of years there have been a lot about their activities to be green and, you know, how they're going to comply with LEEDs and with other environmental issues, and I think that's great, and we have to keep hearing about that. I think the past couple of years they were going off in that direction so much that they weren't talking about the actual buildings that they were planning to do. I think it is good for us to hear from them. I do still have one issue with Harvard that they keep sidestepping every year which I really like to know what they plan to do with the site on the corner of Everett and

Mass. Ave. They talk about it a little bit when we hold their feet to the fire but really don't give you very good answers. And it's been empty for a number of years now. They must have some plans for it, and I think it would be nice to know what those plans actually are.

But I, you know, I really enjoy the process and hearing what they and, you know, what the public has to say. And I would like it if the public got a little bit more riled up let's say.

HUGH RUSSELL: So various things
that have been flashing through my mind. The -- Cambridge was established, as I understand it, to be the capital of the colony safely up river from pirates and other people who might be coming to attack Boston.

STEVEN WINTER: That's great.

HUGH RUSSELL: And then a colonial minister in Charlestown died, left his considerable amount of money and a number of books for the purpose of forming a college. And in fullness of time, I think it was about two years, the general court accepted that to create that new town, which was our name at the time Newton, they named Cambridge in honor of the institution that John Harvard went to and that the college be established. It was then from 1638 to the early 1819 the state school. It was -- it was a public school. And so that's sort of, you know -and it was small. It was a small college. And until really President Eliot showed up in 1861, I think it was when he became President, I may have the numbers wrong, but in the 40 years that he was president, the university developed a number of graduate
tools, its population of undergraduates went from 100 to 150 to nearly a thousand undergraduates. He was the man who was presiding over the creation of the institution.

MIT was founded sometime in that period over in Boston and they moved to Cambridge in I believe 1916. So that's sort of flashing, all these sort of deep history and all the different kinds of relationships.

So the 1970s it was fairly adversarial. And at some point I realized, you know, Harvard isn't a bad thing for the City of Cambridge even though I was supposed to think that. That there were great advantages to having Harvard, and it took me a while longer to understand that the same thing was true of MIT, only because I didn't know.

Harvard did something very smart in the

80s. They started issuing the Harvard
Gazette which was sort of an in-house newspaper that, you know, it was about one-third job openings and one-third lecture schedule and one-third short articles on nifty things that were happening.

I came to understand Harvard, which I attended as a student for six-and-a-half years, but I only knew little tiny pieces of Harvard as a student. And so one thing I've enjoyed over the last five years is getting to know MIT better.

I think MIT probably has -- Harvard's Gazette is no longer a print publication. It shows up on my desktop on my computer every morning with three interesting little articles and links to a bunch of things that might be happening. And you understand when you read this, the incredible variety of
things that are going on. And I don't have that same knowledge from MIT except through who knows, the Media Lab or we discover what the Media Lab is doing. We know a tiny fraction of what the Media Lab is doing actually.

And so the point of this is I think that having us on the Planning Board, understanding how these institutions really work and what their strengths are and to some extent what the weaknesses that they have about their institutional structure leading to how they interact to the city. And I draw your attention to Lesley College and the Art Institute of Boston which they basically bailed out and took over ten years ago and, you know, determined to bring here to

Cambridge. And you' 11 remember some fairly intense hearings about their building program
which is now under construction. And by that time we learned quite a bit about Lesley. And Lesley's fascinating. They also bailed out Episcopal and Divinity School depending on which era you remember. And they've done it in a way that has preserved a tremendous architectural asset in that campus. Also made that campus more useful. Also solved housing problems for their students. You know, so understanding how that institution works here helped us I think. We could buy into the notion that it was a great opportunity to bring 800 art students to Porter Square. We don't -- none of us quite know how dramatic that, how important that's going to be, but it's going to be, it's going to make a huge difference in Porter Square to have those, those additional people with that focus there. And so we're in a position now
where we've got richer and richer kinds of connections.

So I got an e-mail from MIT saying their doing this process of master planning concepts for the area that was rezoned, try to -- it was called the Gateway Project. So I just opted into that and went to some meetings and got some materials. And it was a very interesting process because they had two tracks. They had the internal track and the external track. And you would recognize many of the people from the external track from people who have come to our meetings.

And they'11 come back, you know, as things get more developed, but understanding that how that can work allows us also to make connections to other kinds of activities.

So I think we progressed enormously as the Town Gown process is now is a piece, it's
sort of a statistical collection. It's a time to sit down, but it's such a small part of what's going on now. I guess I'11 make one other comment.

MIT owns a lot on School Street. It came before the Zoning Board as I was on the Zoning Board 35 years ago, and I put it in a Town Gown report questions every year for the 1ast 15 years: What are you going to do about this lot? And finally I went to a City Council meeting over the MIT rezoning, and Councillor Simmons said: If you want my vote, you've got to do five things, and one of them is solve that. Do something about that lot. Now something's happening. We can't always accomplish through the Town Gown process the outcomes that are happening, but I'm just rambling.

Pam.

## PAMELA WINTERS: I really enjoy

listening to your ramblings, and now I know why I'm not getting the Harvard Gazette any more in the mail. I didn't know why. I really enjoyed reading it by the way.

There's so many lectures and things going on daily at Harvard, it's amazing. So I have a couple of things.

First of all, you know, I really enjoy reading the Town Gown reports just to see, you know, what properties they own, what they're going to be doing in the future, what they're going to be building, what everybody else has said basically. I also agree with Ted. I have this is in my notes, too. I'm dying to find out what's going to happen to the stores on the corner of Everett and Mass. Ave. I lived on Chauncy Street for 20 years and so that's, you know, I still, I think
that little barber shop is still
self-contained and still I think he still
owns that little niche there. But, anyway, you know, Harvard they could leave it that way for 50 years. And you don't think that's going to happen, Hugh?

HUGH RUSSELL: They said in response to a question at the hearing there's a huge environmental problem. They're working to clean it up. They're not there yet.

PAMELA WINTERS: Oh.
HUGH RUSSELL: That's what's been
going on.
PAMELA WINTERS: There was a
cleaners there; right?
HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
PAMELA WINTERS: Oh.
HUGH RUSSELL: They're getting it
clean so they can move forward.

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay, good.
HUGH RUSSELL: And they can't, I
believe, they don't know how long it's going to take.

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay, all right. I forgot about the cleaners that was there.

So the other thing that we have been also hounding MIT about for years is more graduate school housing. And I was so pleased to hear that MIT is now planning to build more graduate school housing. I think they said for 600 or 700 more students, I believe. Did they say that?

HUGH RUSSELL: They issued a report that says that's the need.

PAMELA WINTERS: Oh, I thought they said they were really dedicated to building it, but maybe I misunderstood.

HUGH RUSSELL: There was a report of
a committee that was --
PAMELA WINTERS: Okay.
HUGH RUSSELL: -- so my own opinion
is that that's the report they can't just ignore.

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay. I hope not. We've been nagging them, you know, for years about that.

And then my last comment has not much maybe to do with anything, but I do know that I think I mentioned it last time, that the Fogg Museum has been under construction for a number of years, and it would be just delightful if Harvard opened up, you know, had a big opening and opened it up to the city. I know myself, I've had to take many detours and it's been, you know, a lot of construction and in particularly for the neighbors around there, too. I mean, it's
been very messy. And, anyway, it would be really lovely to have some kind of wonderful opening for the Fogg. I really think it deserves it. And I'm personally looking forward to the opening and seeing what Renzo Piano did and those are my comments.

Thank you.
STEVEN COHEN: We11, I don't think you need to hear that there's another member of the Planning Board that values the Town Gown process, but I would make a suggestion. You know, we're talking about four academic institutions. They're very different institutions. They have different building real estate issues that presented to the city and to this Board. And my suggestion is that instead of hearing from all four schools on one evening and then having the opportunity to discuss our thoughts weeks or months
later, I would suggest the possibility of hearing from one institution at a time and having the discussion about that institution immediately after the presentation so that, you know, perhaps instead of talking about, you know, the generalities of Town Gown, we could talk more specifically about the issues raised in that institution's presentation to the Board. I think it would be a more useful process for us. I think it would be more useful for the institution. It certainly would be more useful for those members of the public who are interested in getting the issues raised in connection with that institution. So, you know, it's a great process. I think it could be substantially improved by breaking it up that way.

PAMELA WINTERS: Steve, I don't know
whether you know this or not but we did that
for many years.
STEVEN COHEN: Oh, really? I didn't
know that.
PAMELA WINTERS: Yes.
STEVEN COHEN: Sometimes the old ways....

HUGH RUSSELL: And I think we found that by -- it was consuming so much of our time on our agenda that it was better to put it all in one night.

STEVEN COHEN: You know, I hear you, but, you know, the fact that we heard it all in one night, I mean, I don't know about the rest of you, and you all may be much more competent at this night, but I don't remember the specifics of the presentations. And I certainly I think my contributions, my thoughts, to the extent that they were of any value would have been of greater value if I
could have presented them in a -- in response immediately after the presentation. And, you know, I think we could still limit the times of the presentations so it doesn't eat up an undo proportion of our time and energy here. But, you know, I just don't think we should go through the motions. I think we should try to design these processes so that they're really useful, and I just think the way we did it this year, and this is my first and on1y time going through the Town Gown, it was interesting, $I$ enjoyed it, but $I$ just didn't think it was as useful as it might have been. CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I would echo what Steve said. I find it hard to recall this process of dialogue when it consists of hearing presentations in a hurry in one night, hearing comments from really one or two members of the public, and then
two months later having us discuss what we remember of it. I think the concept of the Town Gown report is enormously valuable. I think the reports are valuable.

I did appreciate MIT's matrix of need and mission and all of those. There were a lot of good things that were there, but I don't think it lends itself to discussion when we don't get around to discussing it until so much time is removed.

I do -- to build on that, I do think that having the institutions in one room at one time could be valuable if they were to talk to each other as well as to us. And I don't know if the Town Gown report is the right place to do that. But I frankly, you know, I'd be interested in hearing what they all would ask each other as well as what we would ask them. There are a lot of, an
increasing number of places where these, the institutions meet each other. I happen to live at the intersection of Harvard and Lesley. And it's, I mean, it's an interesting and vibrant place, but you know, the Everett Street intersection that Harvard people think of as, you know, it's clearly owned by Harvard, it's right there. Lesley's pretty close to that building. And there may be some interesting discussions to be had about how those two communities interact or not in those areas.

I think -- I think Town Gown would be a lot more valuable if it was a dialogue, and I just didn't see that this year.

JOHN HAWKINSON: Mr. Chair, can I
have a brief process comment?
HUGH RUSSELL: Sure, go ahead.
JOHN HAWKINSON: The city did record
-- John Hawkinson -- the city did record video of the Town Gown meetings and unfortunately it's not available anywhere.

But I think if you can encourage staff to make it available in the future to you prior to your comments, that would be an excellent way, if it's not feasible to restructure the process, to space it out.

And secondly, last year you all did write comments in rather more detail than this year, I think. And those comments have not, to my knowledge, been circulated anywhere publicly. So I would encourage you both to consider reviewing them and to try to make them a little more available. Perhaps Harvard and MIT and Lesley and Cambridge College have asked or them and gotten them, but I think the general public has not. And I think it would be valuable both to the
public and to you in writing better comments in the future.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Could I add one thing?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
H. THEODORE COHEN: I found Hugh's comments and Steve's comments, you know, very interesting and they brought me back to one thing, which is that, you know, the schools seem very insular and not inviting to the public. And, you know, I've been living here in Cambridge for 40 plus years, right down the block from Harvard. My wife went to graduate school there, but yet I almost never did anything there. And you almost never use any of the facilities until recently when I retired. Now I walk through Harvard Yard
very frequently and I see the kiosks and I see all the listings of the lectures and the concerts and things and I go to those things now. But $I$ don't think most citizens of Cambridge do that.

So one thing was when MIT a couple years ago had an open, opened the campus to virtually everybody --

PAMELA WINTERS: It was great.
H. THEODORE COHEN: -- and said come
see the buildings. I thought that was great.
It was like once in every 50 years. I think if the schools can do it on some sort of regular basis, just invite the city in, just invite the public in to see the buildings, and that led me to maybe it's not appropriate, that maybe the Town Gown meetings could be held in a university building, you know, and maybe it moves from
-- every year from place to place. But to tell the public come see this Harvard auditorium. Come see this MIT building. You know, come be part of it, because we're all living together with it and, you know, I -you know, for example, I lived here for probably 30 plus years and I never knew that if I had a city library card, I could get into the Fogg and the other museums for free. I was, like, no one ever told me. You know? And Hugh's been reading the Gazette and so he's had this information. But those of us who don't have any direct ties with any of the universities, don't get this information and it's just not part of our lives. And, you know, I think it would be beneficial to everybody if we could merge a little bit better.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: So I probably make
up for your absence. I spend, I trespass on MIT and Harvard every time. MIT's got great bathrooms, for instance. I use all the time.

And I love -- I really appreciate the comments about oh, we have what kind of dialogue? Do you realize that the Town Gown who presented to us from MIT? It was the chief academic officer. The provost. It wasn't a planner or a VP of this or a VP of that. We had direct access to actually the guy. Right? He runs the place. Right? He wasn't reading from notes. He knew the planning issues back and forth. Right? And we didn't get to really enter into too much of a dialogue with him. So I would suggest actually, I know that people from Harvard are here, by contrast did some of the other institutions and presented their material that the concern about the way that the city
interacts with that institution was
represented pretty profoundly by that representation that night. But we didn't get into a conversation with them.

I would suggest that maybe we just make a two night thing; public testimony, presentations one night. And next night, which we do at Harvard the first night and then the second night we run down the street to MIT and have a discussion. That leaves the next year we'11 do it at Cambridge College and Lesley and something like that. But maybe there's a way in which we can't, you know, just take a special hearing on a Wednesday and just do it back-to-back and try to get a real conversation going. So that's it.

HUGH RUSSELL: Ahmed.
AHMED NUR: One thing that I forgot
to mention that Ted brought back my memory as well, is that MIT, I'd like to know what they want to do at the corner of Albany and Mass. Ave. You know, Mass. Avenue and the bridge is sort of the gateway to Cambridge when you come across. And sometimes I tend to lift my chin up as I'm coming back to Cambridge headed from Boston at the bridge and you see MIT real estate across the entire river.

Some strange looking buildings, you know, but then you come into Mass. Avenue and there's this beautiful structure of MIT on the right and dormitories and this structure that they have now. And all of a sudden you come down to the railroads and on the left-hand side is a parking lot, a surface parking lot, hard scape 38 vehicles. Do they really need to put a parking lot for 38 vehicles there? Literally it's just varying stripes. And all
the parking that they have, could they make this a green area while they decide what they want to do with that structure? Now that we're building a beautiful floating stone building across, I've mentioned that two years ago or three years ago the last time, and I haven't heard back from them but that's one thing I remember.

Quick comment with regard to having -HUGH RUSSELL: I just want to comment that my friend used to be in the theatre arts department at MIT. There were plans to put the theatre arts building on that parking lot five or ten years ago. Hopes and desires to do that. That seems like it might be a nice thing, particularly if there was a theatre.

AHMED NUR: Yes, even though there's an energy nuclear power plant right
next-door.
HUGH RUSSELL: It's a research
thing.
AHMED NUR: Is it?
HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
AHMED NUR: Second comment was the having the Town Gown on private party at Harvard and MIT. I don't know if that's a good idea because the public may not feel very safe to speak out of their mind and they might get escorted off the site if, you know, some thing of that sort. So I think it might be a good idea to have it on public property as opposed to private property. Tourism is one thing.

And the last thing, I have one question for you, Hugh. So with regards to -- Pam, you mentioned that long ago you had different institutions on hearings for the Town Gown.

Because I could imagine Harvard could probably take a few hours, possibly MIT, too, but Lesley, Cambridge College, I mean that --

PAMELA WINTERS: I think we did Lesley and Cambridge one night and then we did Harvard one night and then we did MIT one night.

Hugh, is that correct?
HUGH RUSSELL: I don't remember. I just remember it dragged on and on and on. And even though there was the opportunity for dialogue, there wasn't dialogue.

PAMELA WINTERS: It's true.
HUGH RUSSELL: I have to feel that my expectations about dialogue in this kind of form are fairly limited because it's -because it's such a public forum, because there's a very carefully prepared report by the larger institutions, that, you know, it's
hard to --
TOM SIENIEWICZ: Stray.
HUGH RUSSELL: -- stray too far from
that and it's full of statistics and maps and, you know, we all find things in it that are intriguing, but, you know, I'm just tired.

AHMED NUR: Okay, thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: But I think it's
interesting that those of us who have been here a little longer have -- are getting advice from the new people here that they want to look at some changes, they want to see if this could be a more effective process and I think that's something to really think about.

STEVEN COHEN: If I could just add,
and I don't want to persevere too long on the subject, but, you know, for instance, Tom,
you mentioned that it was great that the provost came. Well, you know, if we have something to say or to ask, it would be nice to be able to ask the provost. You know, need we ask the provost to come for two nights? There may be members of the public who are interested in MIT-oriented issues. It's great that they would come one night. Need we ask them to come for two nights? And if we have nothing to ask and if there isn't going to be a dialogue with a particular institution, so be it. You know, we have the opportunities. I just think that we would at least create the possibility for dialogue more readily if we did this more on a one institution at a time basis and could follow up, follow up a presentation with, you know, any questions or discussions that we might have. Enough of my perseverating.

## TOM SIENIEWICZ: My fellow Board

Members are much quicker off the hip and smarter than I am, so I appreciate a day or so to reflect on what I've seen and let it sink in and formulate something, you know, halfway intelligent to ask. It's hard to get a very, very dense report presented very professionally and then try to react critically. I know that's what we do every night, but given the nature of this dialogue, I would appreciate a little bit of distance between presentation and the conversation.

STEVEN COHEN: I think we got the written materials beforehand. PAMELA WINTERS: We did. HUGH RUSSELL: It's so dense.

So maybe we should try next year if we have on the first Tuesday of February, have the presentations. On the second Tuesday of

February have the discussion.
TOM SIENIEWICZ: Yes. CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: That's better.

HUGH RUSSELL: And be a sole purpose meeting.

PAMELA WINTERS: Hugh, I just wanted to mention one thing. I think the thing that prompted me in my thought about Harvard opening up the Fogg, I just have to say that I agree with Ted. I was so, like, just -what's the word I'm looking for? I was just so pleased with what MIT did at their 100 -was the 100th?

JOHN HAWKINSON: 150.
PAMELA WINTERS: It was amazing,
because there were so many kids and they had food and they had balloons and they had these little green bags that I still bring to the
beach with me. And they had -- everything was open and you could go anywhere at MIT. And it was such a -- you know, just a wonderful -- I couldn't even go to all the things that they had planned. The MIT museum. It was really wonderful and it was really just seen more of that happening maybe with the other universities would be a really good thing.

STEVEN COHEN: You know, Harvard has
was it Art First every spring? Which, gosh I've been going to for years. Is it formally open to the community?

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes.
STEVEN COHEN: I've been taking
advantage of it. And I don't know if you're aware of it.

PAMELA WINTERS: I should be aware of it, but I'm not.

STEVEN COHEN: Music throughout the university, the various buildings, and it's a wonderful couple of days. Two days or one day.

## UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: It's

 a weekend. Three-day weekend.PAMELA WINTERS: Maybe more advertising, I don't know. I don't know how I found out about the MIT thing, but I just know how impressed I was to see all the kids, you know, just learning about all these scientific inventions and stuff. So anyway, I'11 stop blabbing now.

HUGH RUSSELL: I guess I should have told you about the Harvard Baroque Chamber Orchestra at Memorial Church last weekend which was actually -- well, I found the text a little dry but as a celebration. And the chorus and orchestra, my husband was playing
in the orchestra.
PAMELA WINTERS: That's awesome.

HUGH RUSSELL: And they got a good
crowd. But it, you know, there are -there's always opportunities.

STEVEN COHEN: I just went to
something at the science center last night.
I mean, it's -- but you have to dig a little bit.

AHMED NUR: There's a jazz festival as well. The bands from Davis Square all the way to Memorial in the summertime.

HUGH RUSSELL: So, un1ess the staff, if they feel out of this discussion, they can write up a report to the Council?

JEFF ROBERTS: Sure. I'm trying to write and talk at the same time.

I want to try to recap some of the main things I heard in maybe 30 seconds.

There's great appreciation from the Board in having the Town Gown process. It's been, from my perspective, one of the things that's unusual about the process, is that unlike most Planning Board matters, it doesn't end in a decision or a vote to sort of close things off. So it's good to hear that the -- that there is value in having that type of discussion because it informs the Board's work on future projects. It informs other recommendations that the Board might be making to the Council. It also provides opportunities for the public to have a more of a relationship with the institutions to interact a bit more. It -that's something I picked up.

The one note that I think was made, the one key issue that was raised is that there may be opportunities for more dialogue
between the Board and the institutions, and that in the future we would look for some modifications to the process in order to allow that to happen.

I think that covers the main points. Those are the types of points you would want communicated to the Council?

AHMED NUR: Do we want to tour a MIT background?

JEFF ROBERTS: No. This is not an April Fool's. As an historical footnote, Charles Eliot was actually an MIT faculty member before he was approached to become faculty at Harvard. He wanted for a long time to merge the two institutions, and when that didn't happen, he put his efforts towards trying to turn Harvard a little bit more towards the model that MIT followed, the research university or the technological
university. It didn't quite get there.
PAMELA WINTERS: Jeff, you're good. HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. I believe we are adjourned.
(Whereupon, at 10:00 p.m., the
Planning Board Adjourned.)
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