**Response to April 5, 2022 - Planning Board Meeting Comments:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial Report of AHO Design Consultation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Building Design.</strong> One Board member raised a comment from the staff memo, noting that the windows on the rectory building at the corner of Sixth Street and Thorndike were originally two-over-two and should be restored. They also would like to see the partially infilled window to the right of the rectory’s main entrance on Sixth Street be restored. A Board member suggested dual-draw blinds to balance natural light with privacy in the units with windows near the sidewalk.</td>
<td>Unit design comments are covered on the plan review comments below, the ramped access for the long-term bicycle is provided and adequately placed to serve the ground floor. Accessible route shown on slide #10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Building Plan.</strong> One Board member noted that the unit layouts were unclear and that the designs could be further refined. A Board member asked for more information about the adequacy of the ramp access to the long-term bicycle parking, as noted in the CDD memo.</td>
<td>The drop-off area on Sixth Street repurposes a designated parish spot in order to avoid removing any existing public street parking; it is approximately 70’ from the accessible entrance ramp as shown on slide #2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Site Plan.</strong> Board members raised concerns about the drop-off area on Sixth Street, noting that it is near an entrance that is not accessible for all users. They also noted that parking in a front setback conflicts with the City’s urban design objectives. A Board member would like to understand the potential for short-term bicycle parking on-site or on the public sidewalks.</td>
<td>Short-term bicycle parking: Due to budget constraints the applicant’s transportation mitigation efforts are focused on long-term bike parking (that would comply with zoning dimensional requirements, if it were required) since there are existing short-term options at the newly installed library park and on street signs; if DPW feels that it is a priority to install additional short term bike parking we are willing to coordinate in identifying locations. The existing short-term locations are noted on updated slide #5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- **Landscape.** Board members would like to see additional street trees. They would also like to understand what trees currently exist on site and any measures that will be taken to preserve them.

The applicant is willing to coordinate with DPW on location and replacement of street trees, but due to affordable housing budget constraints would not be able to incorporate new street trees into the affordable housing budget. Condition of the existing courtyard trees have been reviewed by the landscape team. Please refer to slides #3 and 4 in the revised slide package for additional information, as well as slide #9 for proposed plantings and site furniture.

- **Parking and Loading.** Board members would like more information on the discussions that the developer has had with the Traffic, Parking and Transportation Department about exploring off-site parking solutions.

The applicant recognizes the challenges associated with the site constraints that prevent the provision of off-street resident parking. In exploring off-site parking options, the team has identified that adjacent garages (One Kendall Garage and CambridgeSide) for households who may not need daily use of their vehicles. Access to One Kendall Garage will be enhanced in the future with the completion of the Grand Junction Pathway. The applicant would be open to a parking-share agreement with the Cambridge Public Library (O’Connell Branch) across the street, or other municipal building, but these conversations with the Traffic Department have not led to any concrete proposals to date. The applicant has reached out to St. Anthony’s on Prospect Street as well as a nearby property owner on Cardinal Medeiros Avenue that has a large surface parking lot on its property to explore whether any opportunities to lease some parking spaces might exist. To date, the response has not been encouraging. We would support the City in evaluating opportunities to expand resident parking, such as metered parking by Ahearn Field that could transition to resident parking after 5pm, or other areas where a parking study might suggest that metered parking is underutilized after certain hours.

We also have done some research into comparable properties to better understand car ownership rates, and at an anecdotal level understand that car ownership rates tend to be lower for households living at 30, 60, and 80 percent of Area Median Income due to their significant expense. One of the attractions of living in Cambridge, and
in particular this location, is that a household can easily access services and amenities without a vehicle.

**Detailed Plan Review Comments Recorded from the PB meeting on 04/05/2022:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Correction and Slide Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit 03 - Missing windows on 7th Street.</td>
<td>Corrected, please refer to slide # 10- Proposed ground floor plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 22 – the extent of the unit color and elevator to be adjusted.</td>
<td>Corrected, please refer to slide # 12- Proposed second floor plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 32 – Layout to be rechecked.</td>
<td>The Unit is separated by existing corridor, that would be maintained as per the historical consultant recommendation. So, we have a limited flexibility to adjust the spaces within this unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 40 – Elevation arrows</td>
<td>Corrected, please refer to slide # 14- Proposed Fourth floor plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 36 – 2BR but looks like it contains 3BR.</td>
<td>Corrected, please refer to slide # 14- Proposed Fourth floor plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 38 – No access to Living room.</td>
<td>Corrected, please refer to slide # 14- Proposed Fourth floor plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 33 - Why you don’t take down wall between living and dining area.</td>
<td>The separated wall should remain as part of the historical consultant recommendation on the historical classroom layout.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- Existing steep slope needs to be flattened for accessible and usable courtyard space

- Volunteer saplings
  - Various invasive species and non-native volunteer trees

- Architect concerned with the trees’ proximity to the buildings
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All new roof mechanical equipment shall have noise reduction features in accordance with the City of Cambridge noise ordinance.
49 Sixth Street Renovation
Cambridge, MA

Thorndike Street Elevation - Proposed
NORTH ELEVATION - PROPOSED

- All new windows and doors throughout
- +/- 10% Masonry Repointing
- New windows to be replaced with historically approved windows
- New historic doors to be added
- New historic door to be refurbished
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Courtyard Elevation - Existing