

RECEIVED BY
OFFICE OF CITY CLERK
CITY OF CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS
1988 FEB 17 PM 3:49
CAMBRIDGE MA.
PLANNING BOARD
CITY HALL ANNEX, 57 INMAN STREET, CAMBRIDGE 02139

Minor Amendment

Case No: PB-17
Premises: Thomas Graves' Landing
Zoning District: PUD-4/BA
Date of Decision: November 10, 1981
Date of Previous Minor Amendment: September 1, 1987
Date of Minor Amendment: February 2, 1988

Documents Submitted Alison Dykstra letter to Lester Barber from Unihab, dated December 3, 1987, requesting a reduction in full size parking spaces from the 92 required to 89.

Discussion

As the reduction in regular spaces is minimal, the total number of spaces provided exceeds the minimum required and the facility is a private residential condominium there was no objection to the requested amendment.

Decision

The Planning Board GRANTS a Minor Amendment to Permit #17 to allow reduction in the number of full sized parking spaces provided to 89.

Voting to grant the minor amendment were D. Kennedy, P. Dietrich, C. Cooper, A. Cohn, C. Mieth and A. Callahan.

For the Planning Board,
Paul Dietrich (PM)
Paul Dietrich, Chairman

unihab

3 December 1987

Mr. Les Barber,
Zoning Coordinator
Cambridge Community Development Dept.
City Hall Annex
57 Inman Street
Cambridge, MA 02139

Re: Thomas Graves' Landing

Dear Mr. Barber:

This letter is a follow-up to our recent telephone conversation regarding parking at Thomas Graves' Landing.

According to the Cambridge zoning ordinance, 50% of required parking spaces should be designed for standard cars. We presently show less than that: 48% of our project's required spaces are standard. The combined parking for Phase 1 and Phase 2 breaks down in the following manner.

Total required spaces:	185
Total required standard spaces:	92.5
Total provided spaces:	220
Total provided standard spaces:	89

We respectfully request that the City of Cambridge permit us to complete this project with a reduced percentage of standard parking spaces. The layout of structural columns is such that in order to gain an additional three full-sized spaces, we would end up losing three compact spaces. Although our project clearly meets requirements for the number of spaces, we are finding that our project is less attractive to buyers because we cannot always offer a second space. Reducing the quantity of spaces would intensify this problem. We feel that providing as many extra parking spaces as possible will, ultimately, be more beneficial for the community as well as the project than increasing the size of three spaces. We hope that you will view this request favorably.

Mr. Les Barber

2

3 December 1987

Please let me know if there is any additional information which I might provide. And, of course, don't hesitate to call if you have any questions. Otherwise, I'll look forward to hearing from you regarding this matter.

Sincerely,



Alison Dykstra
Project Manager

cc: Arthur Klipfel
Russ V. V. Bradley, Jr., Esq.