



CITY OF CAMBRIDGE BY MASSACHUSETTS

RECEIVED BY CITY CLERK
JUN 25 12 32 PM '80
PLANNING BOARD

CITY HALL ANNEX, 57 INMAN ST., CAMBRIDGE 02139

June 24, 1980

NOTICE OF DECISION

In reference to the petition of C.P. REALTY TRUST for a Special Permit to allow a mixed-use development containing 64 dwelling units and office and retail use through conversion of existing buildings and new construction on the premises located at 2067-2095 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS, the petition has been GRANTED with the following conditions:

1. The dwelling unit abutting 31 Hadley Street in the proposed seven unit carriagehouse shall be eliminated. One parking space shall also be eliminated and additional landscaping provided.
2. Two parking spaces in the center parking area shall be eliminated and additional landscaping shall be provided.
3. The dwelling unit abutting 84 Orchard Street shall be eliminated with such area to be used as open space.
4. The proposed penthouse shall be scaled down in size at the Hadley Street and Massachusetts Avenue side.
5. The proposed Hadley Street carriagehouse building shall be constructed with a pitched roof.
6. The loading dock arrangement shall be redesigned, Hadley Street shall remain at its existing width, and the proposed curb cut onto Hadley Street shall not exceed minimum zoning requirements.
7. Only those zoning violations shown on the original site plan shall be allowed, except as amended by the decision.

A copy of this decision has been filed with the Office of the City Clerk on June 20, 1980. Appeals, if any, shall be made pursuant to Section 17, Chapter 40A, Massachusetts General Laws and shall be filed within twenty days after the date of filing of such notice (6/20/80) in the Office of the City Clerk.

Elizabeth R. McCarthy
Elizabeth R. McCarthy
Secretary to the Planning Board

Case No. PB-6



CITY OF CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS
PLANNING BOARD

CITY HALL ANNEX, 57 INMAN STREET, CAMBRIDGE 02139

June 5, 1980

CASE NO.: PB-6
PREMISES: 2067-2095 Massachusetts Avenue
ZONING DISTRICT: Business C and Residence B
PETITIONER: C. P. Realty Trust (Conal C. Doyle)
APPLICATION DATE: April 25, 1980
DATE OF HEARING: May 20, 1980
PETITION: Multi-Family special permit for 44 dwelling units, Article 4.000, Section 4.25. Townhouse special permit for 20 dwelling units, Article 11.000, Section 11.12
DATE OF PLANNING BOARD DECISION: June 3, 1980

THE HEARING

At the May 20, 1980 public hearing the Board heard Conal Doyle, the applicant, explain his proposal to develop the Henderson Carriage site to Residential, Office, and Retail use.

The project would include 36 Residential units within the Henderson Carriage building and 8 penthouse units. The existing rear buildings would be converted to 13 carriagehouse units and a new 7-unit carriagehouse would be located along Hadley Street. The remaining portion of the Henderson Carriage building would be used as follows: 25% office use, 10% retail use, and 10% storage. A total of 110 parking spaces would be provided beneath the carriagehouse units and under a decking. The decking would be landscaped and provides much of the required usable open space.

Mr. Doyle explained that the Henderson Carriage building and much of the lot is located within a Business C district and the remaining lot area is zoned Residence B. He stated that the business zone would allow him to develop strictly office use if he chose to do so. He also stated that office use would generate twice as much traffic flow as residential use. Therefore, he is proposing a mix of residential office use and some retail. The living units in the Henderson Carriage building would be marketed as professional residential units which could be used as both living and office space. All of the residential units on the site would be sold as condominiums. Mr. Bruner, architect for the developer of Gelardin,

Bruner, and Cott, Inc., explained that the retail use would be carriage trade including such stores as the China Fair or an antique store. Mr. Doyle stated that a restaurant would not be included with the exception of a deli or similar use. The size of the retail spaces or smaller offices would be approximately four to five thousand square feet.

Questions concerning the traffic impact on the surrounding neighborhood were directed to Mr. Doyle. He stated that no traffic survey had been done but based on guidelines used by the city, office use generates more traffic flow than residential use. He stated that the traffic issue would be addressed in the UDAG procedure. This also will address the problem of traffic on Hadley Street.

Mr. Al Gowan, 80 Orchard Street, presented slides of his back yard which abuts the rear building and parking lot on the Henderson Carriage site. Mr. Gowan stated that the proposed plans indicate that the rear carriagehouse adjacent to his property and his neighbor Mrs. Kendall will totally obscure the sunlight from Mrs. Kendall's yard between 1:00 p.m. and 5:00 p.m. and from his yard as well. Mr. Gowan also stated that this plan does not address the scale and needs of the neighborhood.

Six people testified in favor of this proposal and approximately twenty-five others indicated by show of hands that they supported the proposal. Those who testified in favor included: Stan Wallerstein, 162 Pearl St.; Brendan Fitzgerald, 24 Russell St.; Gus Turni, 8 Russell St.; Mr. Beck, 2100 Massachusetts Avenue; Elizabeth Bouchard, 10 Russell St.; and Bob Hazlett, 20 Russell St.

Four people testified in opposition to some aspect of the proposal. These included: Mr. Gowan and Mrs. Kendall, as stated above, Christopher McAuliffe, 1 Regent St., who was concerned over the traffic and parking aspect of the plan, Claire Growden, 57 Orchard St., who stated that the entire neighborhood should be considered when addressing problems such as traffic.

One person spoke in opposition to the entire proposal. Mr. Stephen Gay, 31 Regent St., stated that there were too many existing violations therefore he opposed the proposal.

Other Comments

The Board received two letters regarding this development proposal. One from Mr. Al Gowan, who testified in opposition at the hearing. Mr. Gowan suggested conditions to ensure that the sunlight to his yard is not blocked and that screening is provided. The other letter received was from Lauren Preston of the Cambridge Traffic Department. Mr. Preston stated that the parking design was adequate and suggested that end spaces be widened. He also stated that the loading bays as shown on the plan would not work and recommended that Hadley Street be kept at a uniform width.

FINDINGS

After hearing the evidence above and considering staff review, the Board makes the following findings:

1. In accordance with Section 10.43 of the Zoning Ordinance concerning criteria for granting special permits, the Board finds that:

- a. The proposed development will not meet the dimensional requirements of this ordinance;
 - b. The parking arrangement and point of ingress and egress appears to be adequate for the type of uses proposed. However, the loading bay arrangement (as presented with application materials) is inadequate and would most likely create a hazard. The Hadley Street curb cut also exceeds the permitted width. In addition, no visitor parking is proposed;
 - c. The proposed development generally would not adversely affect adjacent properties and would improve an existing unoccupied blighted site. However, the Board finds that certain aspects of the development proposal (as presented with application materials) unnecessarily encroach on some of the abutting properties and neighborhood in general. Specifically, the Board finds that: the Hadley Street carriagehouses are located too close to the abutting lot (31 Hadley Street) at the eastern corner of the site, the additional height of building #3 and dwelling unit at the northeastern corner of such building would infringe upon the privacy of the abutting property owners (80-82 and 84 Orchard St.), and that the view of the penthouse, when viewed from a point southeasterly of the proposed site and looking in a north-westerly direction, is visually obtrusive; and
 - d. Except as mentioned above, the proposed development would not be detrimental to occupants of the proposed use nor to the citizens of the City and that the development does not derogate from the intent and purpose of the ordinance.
2. In accordance with Section 10.464 of the Zoning Ordinance concerning additional criteria for approval of townhouses, the Board finds that:
 - a. Tree removal is to be minimized to the maximum extent feasible;
 - b. The location, arrangement, and landscaping of open space is satisfactory; and
 - c. That on-site parking will be adequately screened and does not substantially detract from the use and enjoyment of either the proposed development or neighboring properties.
 3. However, the Board further finds that based upon the criteria listed in Section 10.464, 2 and 4 respectively, that:
 - a. The proposed construction of the carriagehouse building along Hadley Street would more sensitively relate to the existing built environment with a pitched roof rather than the proposed flat roof; and
 - b. Hadley Street should be maintained at its existing width to ensure adequate access.
 4. The Board finds that the proposed development will not comply with the dimensional requirements of this ordinance. Given the proposed development and its mix of uses, the Board finds that the proposal is approxi-

mately 80,000 square feet under the required lot area given the proposed construction (see Table A) and 91,000 square feet in excess of permitted gross floor area (see Table B). However, the impact of the above figures are significantly minimized when an all office use is compared to the proposed development. In this case, the proposed development is approximately 34,500sq.ft. more than what would be permitted (total proposed gross floor area minus maximum permitted gross floor area of an all office use, 175,405 sq.ft. -140,887 sq.ft. = 34,500 approx.). In any event, the Board finds that the proposed development should be reduced in terms of gross floor area. Such a reduction would bring the proposal more nearly in conformance with permitted requirements and would address some of the aforementioned problem areas as well.

5. The Board also finds that the recommendations of the Traffic Department as contained in their letter to the Board dated May 20, 1980, should be included to insure that a safer loading dock arrangement is provided.
6. The development plan as submitted contains the following zoning violations which customarily would require a variance:

<u>Business C. Portion</u> <u>Violation</u>	<u>Permitted/Required</u>	<u>Proposed or Existing</u>
a. Gross floor area and lot area	as explained in Table A and B	as explained in Table A and B
b. Bldg. #1, front yard setback	77' minimum	54'*
c. Bldg #1, side yard setback	62' minimum	2'*
d. Raquetball court, side yard setback	62' minimum	2'
e. Bldg. #4, Hadley St., side yard setback (eastern side)	10' minimum	5'
f. Landscaping for driveway, mid open area (Section 11.164)	767 sq.ft. minimum	none at road level as required
g. Roof height. Bldg. #1	35' minimum	98' (height of historic tower)
h. minimum lot area per dwelling unit	1200 sq.ft. per d.u.	1,102 sq.ft.
i. Hadley St. curb cut	25.5' width max.	27'
j. Alteration to nonconforming structure (Section 8.22b), Buildings #1, 2, and 3		

Residence B Portion

- | | | |
|--|------|-----|
| a. Side yard setback at northeastern edge of Bldg. #3 | 7'6" | 4'* |
| b. Alteration to nonconforming structure (Section 8.22C), Bldg. #3 | | |

*these are related to existing structures

PLANNING BOARD DECISION

Subsequent to the May 20, 1980 hearing, the Planning Board and staff met with the petitioner at their regular meeting of June 3, 1980, to discuss site plan modifications.


Therefore, based on the information presented at the public hearing and at the above discussion, the Planning Board voted four to one (five members present) to GRANT a special permit with the following conditions:

1. That one unit in the proposed seven unit carriagehouse building along Hadley Street be eliminated. Specifically, the unit located in the far eastern corner of the site, abutting the lot at 31 Hadley Street, shall be omitted. In addition, there are two proposed parking spaces adjacent to the unit in question. The parking space adjacent to the side yard landscaping and cedar wood fence shall be eliminated. The other parking space heading in a westerly direction away from the fence shall be retained. The concrete deck shall either cover this latter space or it shall be open to the sky. Landscaping shall be provided in the now vacant areas (see #2 below). The remaining structure containing six carriagehouse units shall be situated in the location shown on the site plan (dated 4/23/80) presented as part of the application materials.
2. That two parking spaces be eliminated from the center parking area to the far northeast of such area. The last space in the row marked "23 spaces," and the last space in the row marked "26 spaces" (delineated on site plan dated 4/23/80 submitted with application materials) shall be removed. Instead, the developer shall provide an unbroken strip of minimum three inch (3") caliper trees running parallel to the proposed cedar wood fence from Bldg. #3 to Hadley Street.
3. That the petitioner shall eliminate one dwelling unit in Bldg. #3 at the northeast corner of the lot where it abuts the rear of the lot at 84 Orchard St. Such space shall alternatively be used as additional open decking or other open space (open to the sky). The brick wall at the rear of the lot at 84 Orchard St. shall remain at its present height and location or at a height and location that effectively screens the decking or other open space from abutting rear yards. Building #3 will have been reduced in total number of dwelling units from eight to seven, although the two parking spaces proposed under such unit shall remain.
4. That the penthouse shall be scaled down in size by 30' in length and 50' in width or a total of 1500 square feet. The portion of the penthouse to be removed shall be from the southern end of such (Hadley Street and Massachusetts Avenue side) so as to minimize the visual impact upon approaching the development from Porter Square.
5. That the Hadley St. carriagehouse building shall contain a pitched roof. The height of such structure shall not exceed 30' at the cornice line and the overall height shall not exceed 40'.
6. That the loading dock arrangement shall conform to the revised drawing submitted by the petitioner and received by the Community Development Department on 5/30/80 subject to final approval by the Traffic Department.

7. That Hadley Street shall remain at its existing width and the proposed curb cut onto Hadley Street shall not exceed 25.5' in width.
8. Under the authority granted by Section 4.25 and 11.125, the Planning Board may waive some of the zoning requirements customarily requiring a variance, other than a use variance. The final plans shall contain only those zoning violations cited in Finding #6 above, except as amended by the recommendations of this report and as stated below. The recommendations of this report call for the elimination of three parking spaces from the proposed 110 spaces (which meet minimum requirements). If the removal of the portion of the penthouse eliminates an additional dwelling unit, then the provided parking (107 spaces) will still conform to requirements. However, if the number of dwelling units (8) proposed for the penthouse remain, then the Board shall allow the development to contain one less parking space that otherwise would be required.
9. The petitioner shall submit a revised set of plans to the Community Development Department showing all required changes. Otherwise, the revised set of plans shall conform to those plans submitted in connection with the required application materials (dated 4/23/80).

Respectfully submitted,

For the Planning Board


Arthur C. Parris
Chairman

Attest: A true and correct copy of the decision filed with the offices of the City Clerk on _____ by _____ authorized representative of the Cambridge Planning Board.

Twenty days have elapsed since the date of filing this decision.
No appeal has been filed _____. Appeal filed and dismissed or denied _____.

Date: _____

City Clerk, City of Cambridge

CARRIAGE PARK
(Salvi Ford Site)

TABLE A

Required lot area given proposed development

The site is cut by the Cambridge Zoning Map into two parts. The south (Massachusetts Avenue) portion falls in a Business C zone and the north portion lies in a Residential B zone. This results in the following:

Portion of the lot in the BUSINESS C ZONE
(actual lot area = 66,928 s.f.)

	<u>Proposed</u> <u>GFA</u>	(divided by)	<u>Max. Permitted</u> <u>FAR</u>	=	<u>Needed Lot</u> <u>Area</u>	<u>Proposed Use</u>
Bldg. #1	20,695 s.f.	/	4.0	=	5,174 s.f.	Retail (1st floor)
(Main Salvi Bldg.)	56,912 s.f.	/	2.0		28,456 s.f.	Office and Storage (2nd and 3rd floors)
	51,995 s.f.	/	.75		69,327 s.f.	Residential (4th, 5th and penthouse floors)
Bldgs. #2,3,4	37,936 s.f.	/	.90		42,151 s.f.	Townhouse
	<u>167,538 s.f. proposed construction</u>				<u>145,108 s.f.</u>	total lot area needed to build at proposed GFA

145,108 s.f. lot area needed
 - 66,928 s.f. actual lot area
78,180 s.f. under required lot area

Portion of the lot in the RESIDENCE B ZONE (actual lot area = 11,718 s.f.)

	<u>Proposed</u> <u>GFA</u>		<u>Max. Permitted</u> <u>FAR</u>	=	<u>Needed</u> <u>Lot Area</u>	<u>Proposed</u> <u>Use</u>
Bldg. #3	7,867	/	.60	=	13,112 s.f.	Townhouse

13,112 s.f.
 - 11,718 s.f.
1,394 s.f. under required lot area

Allowable GFA at Proposed Development

BUS. C

Actual Lot Area = 66,928 s.f.

Lot area required at proposed development = 145,107 s.f.

$$66,928/145,107 = 46.12\%$$

<u>Proposed Use</u>	<u>Propor. L.A. Req. at Proposed Development</u>	<u>x 46.12%</u>	<u>Propor. L.A. Req. given Actual L. A.</u>	<u>x FAR =</u>	<u>Max. Permit. GFA</u>
Bldg #1 -					
Retail	5,174	x 46.12%	2,386	x 4.0 =	9,544
Office & Stor.	28,456	"	13,124	x 2.0 =	26,248
Residential	69,326	"	31,973	x .75 =	23,980
Bldgs. #2,3,4,	<u>42,151</u>	"	<u>19,440</u>	x .90 =	<u>17,496</u>
	145,107		66,928		
			Allowable GFA		77,268

167,538 s.f. proposed

77,268 s.f. allowable

90,270 s.f. in excess of permitted GFA

RES. B

Actual Lot Area = 11,718 s.f. FAR = .6

11,718 x .6 = 7,031 s.f. allowable GFA

7,867 s.f. proposed

7,031 s.f. allowable

836 s.f. in excess of permitted GFA