

CITY OF CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

PLANNING BOARD

CITY HALL ANNEX, 57 INMAN STREET, CAMBRIDGE 02139

NOTICE OF DECISION

CASE NO: PB #25

PREMISES: 2067 - 2095 Massachusetts Avenue (Salvi Ford Site)

ZONING DISTRICT: BC and Res. B

PETITIONER: H.J. Davis Development Corp.

APPLICATION DATE: May 17, 1982

DATE OF HEARING: June 1, 1982

PETITION: Multifamily Special Permit, Section 4.26 and
Variances, Section 10.45

DATE OF PLANNING BOARD DECISION: August 3, 1982

DATE OF FILING THE DECISION: August ~~X~~ 1982

void

Decision (summary): Granted with conditions for landscaping, lighting,
and roadway improvements.

Appeals, if any, shall be made pursuant to Section 17 of
Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 40A, and shall be filed
within twenty (20) days after the date of filing of the above
referenced decision with the City Clerk.

Copies of the complete decision and final plans, if applicable,
are on file with the office of Community Development and the
City Clerk.

August ~~X~~ 1982
Date

Elizabeth McLaughlin
Authorized Representative
to the Planning Board



CITY OF CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS
PLANNING BOARD

CITY HALL ANNEX, 57 INMAN STREET, CAMBRIDGE 02139

CASE NO.: PB-25
PREMISES: 2067-2095 Massachusetts Avenue
ZONING PERMIT: Business C and Residence B
PETITIONER: H.J. Davis Development Corporation
APPLICATION DATE: May 17, 1982
DATE OF HEARING: June 1, 1982
PETITION: Multi-Family Special Permit, Section 4.26 and
Variances, Section 10.45
DATE OF PLANNING BOARD DECISION: August 3, 1982

The Petition

The applicant proposes to renovate the existing structure at 2067-2095 Massachusetts Avenue (historically known as the Henderson Carriage Factory building or the Salvi Ford building) to first floor retail use, office space on the second and third floors (41,390 square feet), and 43 units of housing on the fourth, fifth, and penthouse floors. The applicant requests the option to replace the office uses with an additional 36 units of housing depending on market conditions. Variances for number of housing units, floor area, and setbacks are requested under the authority granted to the Planning Board under Section 10.45 of the zoning ordinance. Existing structures to the rear of the building will be demolished and a landscaped parking lot constructed.

Documents

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

1. Special Permit Application, dated May 17, 1982.
2. Site plan and elevation drawings prepared by Gelardin/Brunner/Cott, Inc., dated May 10, 1982.

3. Landscape Plans prepared by Jay M. Berkson Landscaping, Inc., dated May 19, 1982.
4. One page supplement to the Proposal submitted at the June 1, 1982 public hearing.
5. Preliminary Traffic Investigation prepared by Allen & Demurjian, Inc., Consulting Engineer, Land Surveyors & Architects, Boston, Mass.
6. Lighting Plan, prepared by

Other Documents

1. Carriage Park Trip Generation, June 11, 1982, prepared by Community Development Department staff.
2. Letter, June 15, 1982, from Peg Majeski, 18 Hadley Street, Cambridge.
3. Letter, June 5, 1982, from seven residents of Hadley Street, Cambridge.
4. Letter, June 7, 1982, from twelve abutters to the Salvi Ford site.

Findings

After review of the comments made at the public hearing, documents submitted and discussion with Community Development Department staff, the Board makes the following findings:

1. The proposed development does not meet the dimensional requirements of this ordinance. However, many of these violations are the result of the existing conditions on the site and due to the additional zoning constraints on residential uses in the Business C district.

- (a) Violations contained in the proposed development which would customarily require a variance:

(1) Gross Floor Area:

<u>Violation</u>	<u>Required/Permitted</u>	<u>Proposed/Existing</u>
<u>Proposal A</u>		
44% (Res. (.5)	5,898.4	
(Res. (.75)	22,060.2	62,085
56% Office (2.0)	74,870.9	49,280
Total	102,829.5 s.f.	111,365 s.f.
<u>Proposal B</u>		
(Res. (.5)	5,898.4	
63% (Res. (.75)	31,586.1	69,975
37% Office (2.0)	49,468.3	41,390
Total	86,952 s.f.	111,365 s.f.

<u>Violation</u>	<u>Required/Permitted</u>	<u>Proposed/Existing</u>
<u>Proposal C</u>		
(Res. (.5)	5,898.4	
81% (Res. (.75)	40,610.8	90,670
19% Retail (2.0)	25,402.6	20,695
Total	71,911.8 s.f.	111,365 s.f.

(2) Density (dwelling units):

<u>Violation</u>	<u>Required/Permitted</u>	<u>Proposed/Existing</u>
<u>Proposal B</u>		
Bus. C (1200 s.f.)	55	
Res. B (2500 s.f.)	4	
	59 units	61 units

Proposal C

Bus. C (1200 s.f.)	55	
Res. B (2500 s.f.)	4	
	59 units	79 units

(3) Open Space:

<u>Violation</u>	<u>Required/Permitted</u>	<u>Proposed/Existing</u>
<u>Proposal C</u>		
Bus. C (15%)	8,122.1	
Res. B (20%)	2,359.3	
	10,481.4 s.f.	10,391 s.f.

(4) Height:

35' 77'

(5) Front Yard (Hadley St.): 10' min.

2'*

(6) Front Yard (Mass. Ave.): 10' min.

2'*

*No change proposed in existing condition of structure)

(7) Alteration of a nonconforming structure:

Section 8.22(b) - special permit

- The preliminary traffic study prepared by Allen and Demurjian, Boston, MA, for the applicant, is not an accurate reflection of potential trip generations on this site. The quantitative assessment did not take into account important factors such as location (urban setting) nor the types of retail and office uses being considered. As a result, the final figures on trip generation are grossly distorted. Therefore, in making our assessment and recommendation, the Board is utilizing figures prepared by the Traffic section of the Community Development Department. The

ve significant
that access will be safe and
arking plan and public roadway improve-

ing structure will not adversely affect
ll improve an existing unoccupied
ed in each of the three proposals
e exception of storage use which is an
to the site. All of the proposed uses--
l and storage--are compatible with
in the adjacent area. The intensity of
nificantly with the three proposals pre-
residential), will have the least impact
ood than proposals A and B in terms of
ite (i.e. visits to the site, both
deliveries to the site, and hours of

ver the proposed screening and lighting of
a to the rear of the site and its affects
The proposed landscape screen around the
y lot will not adequately deter people from
not an appropriate solution to providing a
pleasing lighting system within this urban
e, additional screening along the northwest
s is necessary in addition to a revised

nt conforms generally to the intent and pur-
i) ce for this district.

ings, and having determined that the proposed
e evaluation criteria set forth in section
d subject to the following conditions, the

ermit to renovate the existing structure at
ssetts Avenue to retail, office, multi-family
s outlined below:

- floor): 0 to 20,695 sq.ft.
- ly): 20,695 sq.ft. to 90,670 sq.ft.
(18 units to 79 units)
- basement): 0 to 82,780 sq.ft.
- 0 to 8,000 sq.ft.

gross floor area shall not exceed 111,365 sq.ft.



2. The Board waives those zoning requirements as explained in finding number 1 above, in accordance with Section 10.45 of the ordinance.

The special permit, as granted, is hereafter conditional on the following:

- A. The proposed site plan and off-street parking plan shall be revised to contain the following modifications:

- (1) Landscaping/Screening:

- (a) The screening along the perimeter of the open parking lot shall provide a safe and secure buffer to adjacent residences. The landscaped screening shall include a six foot (6') high, wooden stockade fence along the northwest and northeast boundaries including the thirty foot wide strip of land which extends to Russell Street. This fencing shall be in addition to the proposed perimeter landscaping illustrated in landscape plans dated May 19, 1982.
- (b) Secondly, the landscaped strip along the northwesterly side of the parking lot shall be increased to a minimum width of fifteen (15) feet, in order to qualify as usable open space as defined in Section 5.221.
- (c) The proposed open space area, of approximately 2,400 square feet, which leads from the project site to Russell Street shall be suitably landscaped with a minimum of three, 3½" caliper trees, pervious ground cover and grass as defined in Section 2.000, "green area." This area shall permanently remain as a green area, except as provided in condition B.
- (d) To ensure that adequate buffering and landscaping is provided prior to maturity of the proposed landscaping, certain specified existing trees shall be preserved.
- (e) The applicant shall sod and maintain a strip of city property located between the southeast project site property line and Hadley Street. This public benefit is considered a reasonable requirement in light of the extent of zoning violations being waived.

- (2) Lighting:

The open parking lot and landscaped areas shall be adequately lit to ensure that this area is safe and secure and will not create a visual nuisance to residents of the building nor residents in the neighborhood. Therefore, the applicant shall revise the lighting plan by (a) reducing the number of pole light fixtures along the perimeter of the site and replace them with ground fixtures which will highlight the perimeter plantings and (b) replace the sodium vapor lights with metal halide.

(3) Off-Street Parking:

- (a) The proposed off-street parking plan shall be modified to ensure safe and convenient access through the site. The revised plans shall contain the following modifications:
1. The median strips shall be increased to 4-6 foot widths.
 2. Regular size spaces shall have a minimum length of 18 feet.
 3. The aisles shall have a minimum width of 22 feet.
 4. Handicapped spaces shall be provided in accordance with the Architectural Barriers Board requirements.
 5. The following corners shall be increased to a radius of 15 feet.
 - corner nearest Mass. Ave. at the entrance from Hadley Street.
 - corner nearest Russell Street at the middle aisle entrance to the parking lot.
- (b) The required modification to increase the radius at the Hadley Street entrance creates a zoning violation. The required maximum curb cut width in the BC district is 30 feet. The modification would result in a maximum curb cut of approximately 40 feet. The Board waives this violation in accordance with Section 10.45 of the ordinance and finds that the waiver will result in a safe and more convenient access to the lot.
- (c) In accordance with section 6.34 of the ordinance, 50% of the required off-street parking spaces may be designed for compact cars. Should the applicant choose this option, a revised plan shall be submitted to the Community Development Department for review prior to issuance of a building permit.

(4) Bicycle Parking:

The applicant shall provide bicycle parking in accordance with section 6.37 of the ordinance and illustrate the location and amount of required bicycle parking on a final development plan.

(5) Waste Disposal:

Waste disposal for all uses in the building shall not cause nuisance to residence on the site or adjacent to it. A screened or enclosed trash compactor or an equally acceptable process shall be provided. A dumpster on the site or trash can area is not an acceptable alternative.

- B. If at any time, the total amount of residential gross floor area is less than 69,975 square feet, automobile access shall be provided from Russell Street to the parking area and the following conditions shall apply.
1. There shall be an access drive from Russell Street which shall be designed and maintained as an entrance only.
 2. The width of this entrance drive shall be twelve (12) feet.
 3. There shall be a nine (9) foot landscaped buffer on either side of the entrance drive. Each nine (9) foot buffer shall contain densely planted shrubs or trees which are at least two (2) feet high at the time of planting and are of a type that may be expected to form within three years after time of planting, a continuous, unbroken year-round visual screen.
 4. The Planning Board reserves the right to revise condition B(1) above, following a public meeting of which parties in interest are notified, modifying the Russell Street driveway to serve as a means of egress as well as access. The Board may require this revision upon their finding and/or recommendation by the Cambridge Department of Traffic and Parking, that the volume of traffic exiting from Hadley Street causes undue congestion and hazard.
- C. The applicant shall be responsible for making certain roadway improvements along Hadley Street, including: widening the radius of the easterly curb at the Hadley Street-Massachusetts Avenue intersection to a 10 foot radii, replacing curbing, sidewalk and street pavement disrupted by said improvement and replacing the concrete sidewalk along the westerly edge of Hadley Street from Massachusetts Avenue to the development site. All roadway improvements shall meet the approval of the Cambridge Commissioner of Public Works and any street standards accepted by the City of Cambridge.
- D. The applicant shall submit final plans to the Community Development Department reflecting all conditions of this decision prior to filing of the special permit with the City Clerk.

This conditional approval of the special permit application has been made by a unanimous vote of five members of the Planning Board on August 3, 1982.

For the Planning Board



Arthur C. Parris
Chairman

Attest: A true and correct copy of the decision has been filed with the Office of the City Clerk on August 4, 1982 by Elizabeth McLaughlin, 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

Attachment "A"

Henderson Carriage Park

Public Meeting: 5:30 p.m., July 15, 1982

Discussion Traffic Issues

The following people attended the meeting held in the Community Development Department Conference Room to discuss unresolved traffic issues relating to the proposed development.

Jonathan Davis, H.J. Davis Corporation, Petitioner
Loren Preston, Traffic Eng., Cambridge Traffic Department
Elizabeth McCarthy, Community Development Department
Jim Fagen, 31 Hadley Street
Steven Spitzer, 27 Hadley Street
Frederick P. Ikels, 18 Russell Street
Carl Ikels, 18 Russell Street
Eugene Dufresne, 34 Hadley Street
Marie Hazlett, 20 Russell Street
Gertrude Ikels, 18 Russell Street

Elizabeth McCarthy explained the purpose of the meeting and summarized the unresolved traffic issues, including the means of access and egress to the site.

Lauren Preston made a recommendation that the following modifications be made:

- Provide a 12 foot access drive from Russell Street into the proposed parking lot which will be designed so as to ensure its use as an entrance only;
- Increase the radii at the Hadley Street/Massachusetts Avenue intersection to 10 foot radii;
- Remove one parking meter located on Massachusetts Avenue in front of the gas station.

In response to abutters' concerns over potential illegal parking along Hadley Street and Russell Street, Mr. Preston stated that his Department would post permit parking signs along Hadley Street, but he could not post them along the northern section of Russell Street because it is located in Somerville.

Jonathan Davis, stated that he would be financially responsible for making necessary roadway improvements including widening the curb radius at the Hadley/Massachusetts Avenue intersection.

Jim Fagan, 31 Hadley Street, suggested that a condition be made in the special permit where upon a design modification could be imposed to make the Russell Street access a two-way drive if the traffic was causing substantial congestion exiting at Hadley Street. Jonathan Davis stated that he had no problem with such a condition as long as the only required modification would be to make the Russell Street driveway two-way.

Attachment "A" (continued)

Carl Ikels and Marie Hazlett made a request that the fencing along the perimeter of the site not be chainlink, instead a wooden stockade be used. This would ensure privacy to their back yards.

Elizabeth McCarthy informed those present that the Planning Board would be discussing the special permit on Tuesday, July 20 and that the staff would propose a draft decision containing the suggested conditions and modifications discussed at this meeting.