



RECEIVED BY  
OFFICE OF CITY CLERK

CITY OF CAMBRIDGE MASSACHUSETTS  
JUL 31 11 24 AM '79  
**PLANNING BOARD**

CITY HALL ANNEX, 57 INMAN STREET, CAMBRIDGE 02139

PUD DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL DETERMINATION

CASE NO. PB-1

PETITION: Special Permit for a Planned Unit Development

PROJECT: Riverfront Office Park

APPLICANT: Riverfront Office Park Associates, a joint venture of George Macomber, Darvel Realty Trust and a group of principals of The Codman Company, Inc.

DISTRICT: PUD-3

DEVELOPMENT PARCEL LOCATION: 67-111 Main Street

APPLICATION DATE: June 5, 1979

FIRST PUBLIC HEARING: July 10, 1979

DATE OF PLANNING BOARD DETERMINATION: July 24, 1979

FINDINGS

1. At the public hearing Larry Bianchi, representing the applicant, and representatives of Cambridge Seven Associates, Inc., architects for the applicant, summarized the Development Proposal. The project would contain two office towers, a horizontal parking garage, and a ground floor retail arcade. It would be developed in two phases, with the taller of the two towers (containing retail on the ground floor, 3 levels of parking and 14 floors of office space) and a surface parking lot being constructed during the first phase.
2. Three persons attending the hearing asked questions about the proposal. Robert LaTremouille, 67 Highland Avenue, Cambridge and Herbert Jacobs, representing the Electronics Corporation of America, asked questions concerning access to and egress from the project and about traffic patterns in that part of Cambridge. These questions were addressed by Norman A. Abend, traffic consultant for the applicant. Arthur Obermeyer, a trustee of Technology Realty Trust, owners of the abutting Moleculon building, expressed concern about the possible impacts of the proposed construction on their building and asked that safeguards be provided to prevent damage to the structure. His concerns were addressed by George Macomber of the development team and Jack Joseph, one of the architects.

3. The Planning Board has received no other testimony concerning the Development Proposal.
4. The potential problems of access and egress to the parcel which were of concern to the Board at the pre-application conference have been dealt with adequately in the Development Proposal.
5. The Planning Board is apprehensive about the extent to which the proposal encourages automobile useage. The Ordinance's parking requirements would be exceeded by nearly 200 spaces. This location is well served by public transportation. Furthermore, we are now at a point in history when the long-term trend of ever-increasing automobile travel may be reversing.
6. The Board is also concerned with the nature of the Main Street edge of the project since this site is located along one of the major approaches to the City from Boston. It is not clear that there is sufficient room to permit a reasonable amount of landscaping along the front edge of the project. The developer should provide and maintain landscaping of the Main Street sidewalk area.
7. The design of the surface parking lot is critical to the image the project and of the entrance to the City. Though this is intended as a temporary lot, it may have a longer lifetime than now contemplated. The landscaping information provided in the Development Proposal is insufficient.
8. The project should be designed to permit smooth and comfortable pedestrian travel between the Riverfront and Kendall Square along the Broad Canal in the future. The first phase development should not create barriers that will be difficult to remove when such travel patterns develop.
9. Several aspects of Phase II of the project are troublesome, among them the additional parking spaces, the service entrance on Main Street, the size and nature of the pedestrian pathway along the Broad Canal and the uncertain timing of that phase of development. The Development Proposal as submitted contains less detailed information about the second phase of the project than about the first phase. The Board does not feel that it is now appropriate to attach conditions on the second phase of the project or to request additional details at this time since conditions existing in two or three years may dictate other changes.
10. It appears likely that the proposed development will satisfy all of the criteria of Section 12.353 of the Ordinance, provided that the modifications requested by the Board in this report are made.

Based on the information which the Board has received in the Development Proposal this project is expected

- a) to conform with general development controls;
- b) to conform with development controls for the PUD-3 district;

- c) to conform with current City plans and development guidelines for East Cambridge; and
- d) to provide benefits to the City which will outweigh adverse effects.
  - (i) Some site design adjustments must be made as specified below.
  - (ii) Potential traffic flow and safety problems will be alleviated by the proposed access/egress arrangements and by the programmed public roadway improvements.
  - (iii) Utilities and other public works are adequate.
  - (iv) Negligible impact on existing public facilities is expected.
  - (v) Positive fiscal impact is anticipated (Revenue:cost ratio will be approximately 6:1).

The Board will make a final evaluation of compliance with these criteria prior to approving a Final Development Plan for this project.

#### DETERMINATION

The Planning Board conditionally approves the Development Proposal as it pertains to the first phase of the Riverfront Office Park. The Board conditionally approves the second phase of the project at a programmatic/schematic level only. Final issuance of a special permit for this planned unit development will authorize the eventual development of a second office tower containing approximately 260,000 square feet of office, retail and mechanical service space and a parking structure of sufficient size to serve the completed project. However, the Board intends to require Planning Board review and approval of the second phase site plan, including access/egress and service arrangements and landscaping details, at a later date prior to the issuance of any building permits. The scope of this later submittal and the procedure for future site plan review and approval will be specified in the Planning Board's decision on the Final Development Plan.

The applicant is invited to submit a Final Development Plan containing more detailed information concerning the first phase of the Riverfront Office Park project. This plan shall be submitted no later than September 7, 1979. The Final Development Plan shall contain the modifications listed below.

#### REQUIRED MODIFICATIONS

1. Elaborations and modifications of the Development Proposal requested herein should be made for all aspects of the project intended to be constructed during the first phase. The Planning Board will not consider site plan details of the second phase at this time.
2. The Plan should include a detailed landscaping plan showing type, size and location of proposed plantings for all portions of the development parcel and for the area between the front edge of the development parcel and the Main Street curb.

3. The Plan should provide enough room for installing and maintaining a reasonable amount of landscaping along the Main Street frontage. While this could be accomplished by setting the building back from the street a few feet, the Board is not requiring that such a setback be provided. At a minimum, the applicant should provide drawings (plan and typical cross section) of the Main Street edge showing the relationship of curb, sidewalk, right-of-way boundary building edge, arcade edge, trees and other plantings and utilities and should indicate commitment to maintain the plantings.
4. The initial building should include space to provide sheltered, secure bike storage areas sufficient to accommodate at least 150 bicycles.
5. At least 20% of the parking spaces in the building and in the parking lot should be reduced in size to 7½' x 15' to accommodate compact cars only. The Board suggests that the front row of the lot be designated for compact spaces. The area of the lot leftover after this reduction should be landscaped.
6. Two parking spaces should be removed from each of the four long rows in the lot and the area used to provide a landscaped buffer between each group of eight spaces. A hedge, low fence or similar landscaped feature should be included in the landscaping plan to soften the front edge of the lot.
7. The Plan should include information concerning Conservation Commission review and the status of other necessary reviews by agencies with jurisdiction over the Broad Canal.
8. The Plan should provide detailed written and graphic information showing proposed facilities for bicycle users.
9. The Plan should include drawings showing the interior layout of the garage and the vertical and horizontal relationships of the garage ramp to the pedestrian walkway along the Canal.
10. Explain the proposed arrangements to prevent damage to the Moleculon Building during construction.
11. Correct area calculations on drawing A-7 and height threshold statements on page 20 of the Development Proposal.
12. Explain anticipated design features intended to conserve energy.
13. Revise Development Proposal statements, as appropriate to reflect any currently contemplated changes or new information relative to this project and to incorporate conditions or modifications required by the Planning Board.

This determination of CONDITIONAL APPROVAL under Section 12.352 of the Ordinance has been made by a majority vote of the Planning Board on July 24, 1979.

*Arthur C. Parris*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Arthur C. Parris  
Chairman

ATTEST: A true and correct copy of decision filed with the offices of the City Clerk on July 31, 1979 by Mary T. Flynn,  
Authorized Representative of the Cambridge Planning Board.