



CITY OF CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS  
**PLANNING BOARD**

CITY HALL ANNEX, 57 INMAN STREET, CAMBRIDGE 02139

PUD DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL DETERMINATION

CASE NO.: PB-18

PETITION: Special Permit for a Planned Unit Development

APPLICATION: The Carlson Group, Inc. and Darvel Realty Trust  
(joint venture)

ZONING DISTRICT: O-3A/PUD-3

DEVELOPMENT PARCEL LOCATION: A parcel of land located generally south-east of the corner of Third and Munroe Streets (see submitted plans).

APPLICATION DATE: August 12, 1981

FIRST PUBLIC HEARING: October 20, 1981\*

\*The 65-day time limit for holding the public hearing (from application date) was extended by the Planning Board and agreed to by the applicant.

DATE OF PLANNING BOARD DETERMINATION: November 10, 1981

THE APPLICATION

The proposed office development will be constructed in four phases and will contain approximately 780,700 sq.ft. of gross floor area at project completion. Four buildings are planned (one in each phase) ranging in size from 5 to 7 stories. Most parking for the development will be accommodated by two garages, one of 5 levels and one of 6 levels. According to the applicant's estimate, Phase IV is scheduled to be completed by Spring, 1985. The proposed development contains provision for open space and a pedestrian link with the Riverfront Office Park (construction in progress) on an abutting site.

DOCUMENTS

In support of the petition the applicant submitted the following documents:

1. Planned Unit Development Application, Development Proposal submitted by the Carlson Group, Inc./Darvel Realty Trust for develop-

ment at aforementioned location, dated, submitted, and received by the CDD on 8/12/81.

2. Required site plan, elevations, and cross-sections drawn by the Aldrich Co., Architects/Engineers, Cochituate, MA., dated, submitted and received by the CDD on 8/12/81.
3. Parking Garage Plans (for both garages) drawn by same, dated 9/2/81, and submitted to the CDD on 9/3/81.
4. Floor Plans for Phases III and IV, drawn by same, dated 9/8/81, and submitted to the CDD on 9/10/81.
5. Additional application materials submitted by Carlson/Darvel to the CDD, dated 9/24/81.
6. Revised, site plan, elevations, and cross-sections drawn by the Aldrich Co., submitted by applicant and dated 9/24/81 and 9/28/81.
7. Schematic Landscaping Site Plan, submitted by applicant, drawn by The Aldrich Co., dated 9/24/81 and 9/30/81 and received by the CDD on 10/6/81.

#### PUBLIC HEARING

PUD-3 Darvel Realty/Carlson Corp.

Steve Anderson, attorney representing the joint venture corporation, presented development background information and the general intent of the development proposal to construct a four phase research and development office park with two parking garages in the Broad Canal area on land presently owned by New England Gas and Electric. Fred Glover, project architect, presented illustrations of the development proposal and explained the details of the project design. Mr. Glover outlined specific problems on the site which affected the final site design.

#### Questions:

Chairman Parris asked Mr. Glover to explain the schedule for construction of the parking garages and to give his reason for the relatively low heights of the development.

Mr. Glover responded by outlining the parking construction schedule as follows:

- Phase I - all parking on-grade
- Phase II - some on-grade, first levels of the first garage would be used.
- Phase III - completion of the first garage, 900 spaces on-grade would be eliminated
- Phase IV - completion of both garages, 1,464 spaces.

In response to the question on height, Mr. Glover stated that the reason for lower buildings with a larger foot print is to accommodate the needs of R & D space.

Member Dietrich questioned the applicant as to the reason for choosing the northwest corner for phase I rather than the southeast section of the site. Mr. Glover stated that due to site constraints this was the most logical choice.

General discussion took place over the location of the parking garages and their traffic impacts on adjacent streets. Mr. Glover indicated that they were located to minimize traffic impact. Both garages would not be feeding into the same streets and adjacent development projects had been taken into consideration.

Member Kennedy asked Mr. Glover whether the historical industrial building formerly on the site was ever considered for preservation and integration into the development.

Mr. Glover stated that they had considered the building as an added site constraint and didn't view the building as having historical significance.

Bob LaTremouille, 6 McLean Place, asked what the proposed FAR was.

Mr. Glover stated that it is 1.83.

Suzanna Russell questioned the applicant as to the provision for pedestrian flow through the development from the River toward East Cambridge.

Mr. Glover stated that pedestrian traffic had been anticipated and that the development would allow pedestrians to cross through it.

#### PLANNING BOARD DISCUSSION AND STAFF REVIEW

Following the October 20, 1981 public hearing, the Planning Board continued their review of this application. The discussion focused on issues relating to parking design, automobile access and egress to the site, and design of open space.

#### FINDINGS

After review of pertinent information and documents available to them, the Planning Board makes the following findings:

1. The Development Proposal was submitted on 8/12/81 and accepted as complete by authorized representatives of the Planning Board on 8/12/81. The petition met all the requirements of sub-subsection 12.343.
2. The procedural requirements of subsection 12.35 were met with the holding of a public hearing on October 20, 1981.

3. The development generally conforms to the General Development Controls specified in Section 12.50, except where noted below.
- a. PUD Development Parcel Size - The development parcel size far exceeds the minimum requirement of one acre (12.52), (sub-sub-section 13.432 requires a minimum two acre parcel for the PUD-3 district). The parcel contains 425,521 sq.ft. The actual parcel area contains 397,008 sq.ft. plus 28,513 sq.ft. for a portion of the Broad Canal (1/3 of Canal) as permitted in sub-sub-section 13.431. It should be noted that the approved Riverfront Office Park PUD already utilized the remaining 2/3 of the Canal for computing additional lot area. In effect, the "bonus" lot area has now been completely depleted by this proposed Carlson/Darvel development and the Riverfront Office Park and will not be available as bonus lot area for other developments.
  - b. Standards for Construction of Roadways - not applicable (12.53). However, the overall circulation pattern (12.532) should be adequate except as noted by Traffic Engineer Lauren Preston, Department of Traffic and Parking, Cambridge (see 4. below).
  - c. Standards for Construction of Utilities and Public Works (12.54) - All necessary utility permits will be secured from appropriate agencies as documented in the application form, pages 8, and 14-16 dated 9/24/81.
  - d. Landscaping (12.55) - The landscaping and open space proposed for the site are adequate except for three specific areas. (1) At the perimeter of the site along Third and Munroe Streets there should be more landscaping. Both deciduous and non-deciduous trees are currently proposed along such perimeter. The Board finds that all such trees along Third and Munroe should be deciduous and be consistent with the perimeter treatment of the Kendall Square Project and the Riverfront Office Park. (2) The courtyard needs to become a more active, usable amenity and should not be surrounded by drives. Provision for a few benches would be desirable. (3) The pedestrian link with the Riverfront Office Park needs a more attractive, creative design. Provision for additional landscaping, benches, and softening the contrast between pedestrian path and garage wall should be considered.
  - e. Environmental Performance Standards (12.56) - All necessary approvals will be secured as documented in C. Development Schedule, p. 8 of the application form, dated 9/24/81.
4. The petition was submitted to the Department of Traffic and Parking for their comment. Lauren Preston, Traffic Engineer of said department, responded in a letter to the Board dated 9/21/81 (reviewed original submission of 8/12/81). He cited three (3) problem areas: (1) need for a second exit/entrance at Munroe or Second Streets, (2) maneuvering room for loading spaces, and (3) congestion created by left turning vehicles at the Third Street entrance/

exit. The Board finds that the additional submitted plans of 9/24/81 have rectified the first two problem areas. As for the third problem area, Mr. Preston has informed the CDD that he will prohibit left hand turns for vehicles exiting the site at Third Street and will allow, on a trial basis, left hand turns into the site at Third Street.

5. As indicated on the submitted drawings and application form (9/24/81) some supportive commercial space may be constructed in the latter phases. The Board finds that supportive commercial activity is desirable and would conform with subsection 13.41 Purpose (PUD-3 District). Actual commercial uses would have to conform to sub-sub-section 13.424 or 13.425.
6. PUD-3 District dimensional requirements of subsection 13.43 and minimum parking requirements of 13.47 will be met.
7. In accordance with subsection 12.353, the Board finds that:
  - a. The development conforms with the General Development Controls set forth in Section 12.50, except where noted (see 3.a-e above). The plan also conforms to the PUD-3 District Controls (see 5. and 6. above).
  - b. While the proposed development parcel lies near the East Cambridge Riverfront Plan Districts, it nevertheless is located outside such districts. In any event, this proposal aspires to meet the goals of the East Cambridge Riverfront Plan as much as possible (see 9/24/81 application B. Development Concept, p.7).
  - c. The development should provide benefits to the City (which outweigh any possible adverse impacts) due to its:
    - (1) quality of site design, integration of various land uses (if some retail is provided), relative low density and FAR well below maximum permitted, provision of open space and landscaping (particularly if recommended modifications, as discussed in this document, are instituted), and compatibility with other office developments in the vicinity;
    - (2) adequacy of traffic flow and safety considering Traffic Department's requirements;
    - (3) adequacy of utilities and other public works as previously discussed;
    - (4) minimal impact on the City's existing public facilities (see H. Development Impact, pgs. 15-18, 9/24/81 application); and
    - (5) tax benefits to the City.

8. There are a number of minor variances and special permits that are needed (see the attached list dated 10/15/81). Some of these could easily be eliminated and should be (see determination below).

DETERMINATION

The Board, pursuant to sub-subsection 12.352, conditionally approves ( vote, 7-0) the Development Proposal as submitted (in slightly revised form from the original submission of 8/12/81) on 9/24/81 and received by the CDD on 9/24/81. Pursuant to subsection 12.36, the applicant should submit a Final Development Plan to the Planning Board for consideration no later than Dec. 4, 1981. The Final Development Plan shall satisfy the conditions set forth below.

1. The variances (see list) concerning bicycle parking (6.37) and landscaping of on-grade open parking 6.48(g) could be easily eliminated. The applicant is expected to eliminate these. In addition, the Board requests that the applicant explore a means of eliminating the violation concerning driveway setback (6.441 b.). Finally, the Board does not view the screening violation (6.47) as a problem and can waive such requirement, if necessary, in the Final Development Plan Decision.
2. The applicant shall delineate on a revised site circulation plan sheet (currently sheet L-8 of 9/24-9/28/81 plans) how left hand turns out of the Third Street access point will be prohibited.  
  
It is recommended that a sign be installed at the applicant's expense, that a small island forcing right turns only exiting from the site be installed and that such be delineated on the appropriate plan.
3. The applicant shall make a serious attempt to make the courtyard a more usable, attractive area for pedestrian activities. Redesign of the driveways and open air parking surrounding the courtyard is desirable.
4. The applicant shall make a serious attempt to redesign the pedestrian link with the Riverfront Office Park. It would be desirable to eliminate the hard contrast between garage wall and pedestrian path.
5. The applicant shall provide for more perimeter planting of decid- out trees (3" caliper at time of planting) along Third and Munroe Streets reflecting the pattern to be established in Kendall Square. The arrangement and type shall be delineated on the appropriate plan.

This determination of CONDITIONAL APPROVAL under sub-subsection 12.352 of the Cambridge Zoning Ordinance has been made by a unanimous vote, (7-0) of the Planning Board on 11/10/81.

For the Planning Board

*Arthur C. Parris*  
Arthur C. Parris, Chairman

Attest: A true and correct copy of this determination was filed with the Office of the City Clerk on November 13 1981 by Marc  
A. Lerye authorized representative of the Cambridge  
Planning Board.