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P R O C E E D I N G S

(7:05 p.m.)
(Sitting Members:  Constantine Alexander, Janet Green, Andrea A. Hickey, Patrick Tedesco, George S. Best.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER:  The Chair will call this meeting to order.  Welcome to all of you who are here.  I think I know why most of you are here.  In any event, let me open by making a statement.  After notifying the Chair, any person may make a video or audio recording of our open sessions or may transmit the meeting through any medium subject to reasonable requirements that the Chair may impose as to the number, placement, and operation of equipment used so as to not to interfere with the conduct of the meeting.  At the beginning of the meeting the Chair will inform other attendees at that meeting that a recording is being made.

And I wish to advise one and all of you that at least two recordings are being made.  A citizen of the city has left a tape recorder right there.  Our stenographer tapes the meeting to assist her when she prepares the
transcript. I think there's a third citizen who wanted to -- if you can leave your -- wherever you want to leave it, maybe --

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER FROM THE AUDIENCE: Wherever you recommend.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I think this works. Because I know this guy always does it and it seems to work.

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER FROM THE AUDIENCE: It's working, thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER FROM THE AUDIENCE: Any problem with a fourth?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: No. As many as you like.

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER FROM THE AUDIENCE: Thank you.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay.

All right, everyone has now been advised that you will be on tape.

So we'll turn to the formal business of the meeting. And the first business is something that doesn't
concern any of you out in the audience. It's the election of a Chair and Vice Chair for the coming year. Only regular members can vote on this. So Mr. Best, who is an associate member and sitting in place of Mr. Sullivan, will not vote on this, just the four of us.

So I'll open the floor to nominations for Chair. And we'll start with Chair. Who wishes to nominate someone to be Chair?

PATRICK TEDESCO: I'll nominate Gus Alexander.

JANET GREEN: I second that.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay, I'll make my usual speech. If there is anybody else on this Board who wants the position, I will gladly withdraw my name.

ANDREA HICKEY: No, I can't.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: No?

Okay, I will close nominations.

All those in favor of me say "Aye."

(Aye.)
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Three in favor.

(Green, Hickey, Tedesco.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And we need to elect a Vice Chair.

Now I've talked to Brendan Sullivan who has been a Vice Chair for number of years, and he made the same statement to me that I just made; namely, that he would be willing to serve, but if anyone else would like to be Vice Chair he'd be happy to step aside.

Any volunteers?

ANDREA HICKEY: I would like to nominate him.

JANET GREEN: I second him.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Nominations are closed.

All those in favor of electing Brendan Sullivan as Vice Chair, please say "Aye."

(Aye.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Four in favor.

Okay, now that that's over with I'm going to first
call a continued -- I know most of you are here for the
Mass. Ave. and Frost Terrace case. I want to take the other
two cases, one of which will be very short, quick first
because then in the case of the other one, the petitioner
has a family situation and has requested that we take his
case first. And rather than having him sit here for hours,
I think that's a fair request.

* * * * * *

(7:10 p.m.)
(Sitting Members Case BZA-014009-2017: Constantine Alexander, Janet Green, Andrea A. Hickey, Patrick Tedesco, George S. Best.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Let me call 140-142 Prospect Street.

Is there anyone here wishing to be heard on this matter?

(No Response.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: No one is wishing to be heard. We're not going to hear the case anyway. The petitioner failed to update the sign for proper notice, and, therefore, we cannot hear the case. This will be the second continuance. And for the record, and Sisia, make sure that this is communicated to the petitioner, no more continuances. Our rule is two continuances unless there's extreme circumstances to justify more continuances. And we did expect the petitioner to be here tonight or a representative, and the petitioner is not.
Anyway, I don't know what date they have in mind.

PATRICK TEDESCO: There's a letter.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I couldn't find it. I thought there was a letter. In fact March, a date in March.

SISIA DAGLIAN: Do you want the second date in March just to be safe?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I want to see what date he -- did I miss it? March 22nd a date?

SISIA DAGLIAN: Yes.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay.

The Chair moves that this case be continued until seven p.m. on March 22nd subject to the following conditions:

First, that the petitioner sign a waiver of time for a decision. And the petitioner has done that already.

Second, that -- and this is important because the petitioner didn't do it this time, the petitioner has to post a sign, can take the current sign and update and modify
it with a magic marker or get a new sign, that new sign must be posted for the 14 days prior to March 22nd.

And lastly and very importantly, if the petitioner wishes to present plans or dimensional forms different from what is in our file now, they must be in our possession or in the files of the zoning office no later than five p.m. on the Monday before March 22nd. And if that is not done, we will not consider those new or revised plans.

All those in favor of continuing the case please say "Aye."

(Aye.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Five in favor. Case continued.

(Alexander, Green, Hickey, Tedesco, Best.)

* * * *
(7:10 p.m.)

(Sitting Members Case BZA-014967-2017: Constantine Alexander, Janet Green, Andrea A. Hickey, Patrick Tedesco, George S. Best.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: The Chair will next call case No. 014967, 18 Bates Street.

Is there anyone here wishing to be heard on this matter?

DAVID O'CONNOR: Yes.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Please give your name and address to the stenographer. You can sit down first.

DAVID O'CONNOR: David O'Connor, 18 Bates Street.
LILLIAN JEN: I'm Lillian Jen, J-E-N also 18 Bates Street.

BRITTANY MILAS: I'm Brittany Milas, M-I-L-A-S from Maryann Thompson Architects.

JANET GREEN: You're going to need speak pretty loudly. We have a lot of people in here.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Tap on it to make sure it's working.

BRITTANY MILAS: The name is Brittany Milas from Maryann Thompson Architects.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay. You're here seeking a Variance.

DAVID O'CONNOR: Yes. Variance and actually Special Permits as well.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: That's right, Special Permit.

DAVID O'CONNOR: So I thought I'd just give a quick overview of what we're trying to accomplish here and
then see if there's questions to your concerns.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Go right ahead.

DAVID O'CONNOR: Okay. So we bought the house in 1984. It was a two-family house in a small neighborhood that's primarily single family. And as we -- our family started to grow, in 1994 ten years later, we converted our two-family into a single-family.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: When did you do it in 1994?

DAVID O'CONNOR: In 1994. That did not require any kind of permits or Special Permits or anything at that time.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: No.

DAVID O'CONNOR: And so it's now 23, 24 years later, we're empty nesters, proud empty nesters. And, you know, looking forward to staying in this house as long as we possibly can. And somebody in Inspectional Services, you know, last summer brought it to our attention the change to
the Zoning Ordinance around accessory apartments. And that started getting us thinking about how we would pay for staying in this house, in this neighborhood we've been in for 30-plus years. We couldn't make an accessory apartment work, and so we looked -- at we're proposing instead to convert back to a two-family house.

I think as you see from the file, that we did go to the Avon Hill Conservation Commission. They were not only supportive of the particular design, but were supportive of us converting to a back to a two-family house. As are our immediate abutters as well.

I think that like much of this part of Cambridge, there's a lot of large houses, single-family houses with relatively low density of population, people like us. In this particular neighborhood there's -- there haven't been any small children in the neighborhood for a while because it's a very expensive place for families to go. So we're being one block away from a very desirable elementary
school, the Graham and Parks School, we thought that this
also would also be a way to attract some young families,
renters into the neighborhood.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: How big will the second
unit be?

DAVID O'CONNOR: Second unit -- both units will be
approximately the same size, about 1600 square feet.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay, so --

DAVID O'CONNOR: Of living space.

And the configuration is a little bit different
than the original configuration, but pretty much follows
that. When we bought the house, we lived in the second
floor and the third floor attic had been used years and, you
know, decades before as living space but was pretty minimal.
It was, you know, less than seven-foot ceilings and very
long, narrow space. So we used it as storage. When -- what
we're proposing to do here is to make that more liveable but
putting it -- by dorming it out, shed dormer east and west.
And so the units will be basically first floor, plus. Part of the second floor will be where we will be living. And then the renters would be the rest of the second floor and the -- what is now currently the attic space.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Will there be a separate entrance?

DAVID O'CONNOR: Separate entrance.

So we're making a new -- basically cut a path through our front garden so they can enter on the side of the house. It's actually, you know, part of what we're looking for is very close to the neighbor's house at that point so we, you know, pull a permit on that, on that issue. This is a space where the neighbor, it's actually a second door for their house as well, rarely used, and so they don't have any problem with us putting an entrance there.

We're taking a lot of care to make sure that the entrance is appealing and follows basically the current design of the entrance. And we worked with Charlie Sullivan
on that particular aspect of the design.

So that's, that's sort of the basic, the basic plan. There's a request for a permit for a spiral staircase down the back of the house as a way for both a second egress as well as a way for the renters to get to the backyard where there's a very nice play structure.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And the spiral s staircase is not visible from the street?

DAVID O'CONNOR: That would not be visible from the street, no.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: That's why you didn't have any issues with the Avon Hill Conservation Commission, because if it's not visible from the street --

DAVID O'CONNOR: Yeah, no.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: -- otherwise you might have had a problem I think, I suspect.

DAVID O'CONNOR: Right.

I think the probably the one issue that we spent
sometime on with the Commission that is worth mentioning is that -- and they put this in the write-up of the Commission is that they want us to consider putting windows or glazing on the street facing side of the dormers. So that's not a requirement, but that is something that we're looking at. So it's not on the drawings that you have, and we're still working on some of the --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: It wouldn't modify the dimensions of the windows, would it?

DAVID O'CONNOR: No. It just, it just, they want to sort of potentially lighten up the look of --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: That's not a zoning issue.

DAVID O'CONNOR: Exactly. But I wanted to call that to your attention because it was mentioned in their decision.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay.

DAVID O'CONNOR: So, you want anything to add?

BRITTANY MILAS: You covered all the bases it
seems like.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay, we're going to get back to the dormer in a second.

DAVID O'CONNOR: Sure.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And the dormer guidelines. Are you familiar with those?

DAVID O'CONNOR: Yes, we are. We talked to the Commissioner.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Before we get there, you are seeking a Variance and a Special Permit. But the Variance is what this case is all about.

DAVID O'CONNOR: Right.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And first of all, let me say personally I'm in very much support of what you want to do. I think it's very good for the neighborhood, for the city, but we have to apply the law that's given to us, a Variance. And to get a Variance you need to satisfy three conditions:
One, that you're suffering a substantial hardship. And the hardship is not to you personally or supposedly, it runs with the land.

And that two, that the hardship is owing to circumstances relating to the soil conditions, shape or topography of such land or structures, and especially affecting such land or structure but not affecting generally the zoning district in which it's located.

And the third is a more general one, that we can grant relief without substantial detriment to the public good or nullifying or substantially derogating from the intent or purpose of the Ordinance.

So as best you can, address this substantial hardship argument for me. Again, not a hardship to you personally, but a hardship that would run with anybody who owns this property.

DAVID O'CONNOR: Well, I think similar to other property, older properties in Cambridge, this property, when
we purchased it was non-conforming in many dimensions.

It's, you know, too large for the property. It's too close --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Right.

DAVID O'CONNOR: -- at least two sides. And it is, it's not too tall. That's one of the few things it actually, it's conforming with. So, you know, any -- it really, the -- and of course also over the period of time that we've owned the property, we've gone from a -- the neighborhood being zoned B to zoned A2. I'm not sure exactly when that happened, but sometime in the last 30 years. And so I think that the hardship relates to the fact that the property itself is non-conforming with -- since the Zoning Ordinance has been put into place after the house was built.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: That doesn't get to why it's a hardship that you need a second dwelling unit in the structure, though.
DAVID O'CONNOR: I think that gets to the sort of the financial hardship, which is that the -- I mean I sort of hesitate to say it's obvious. But maybe I should state the obvious for the record. That keeping property in Cambridge is very expensive and as we move from income -- making income to retiring, it becomes impossible.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I understand that. No need to go any further with that. I just had to get it on the record, that's all.

DAVID O'CONNOR: Sure. I totally understand.

PATRICK TEDESCO: Can I ask a question? You may have said this, I apologize. You did not convert it to a single-family, you bought it as a single family.

DAVID O'CONNOR: No, we did. We did the conversion -- we bought it in '84 and we converted in '94.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: But never anticipating the situation you're facing otherwise you would have kept it.

DAVID O'CONNOR: No, in fact we had Fred
Meyer -- some of you probably been around long enough to know Fred, recommended we do this because he thought it would increase the value of the property, but I don't think even Fred probably anticipated what's happened to Cambridge real estate in the last 30 years.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Andrea, do you have a question at this point? We'll get to the dormer. Go ahead.

ANDREA HICKEY: No, I just would just ask that you speak a little more to the hardship and not again as the personal aspects of the hardship. I understand. But unfortunately those aren't relevant to us. So hardship relative to the property itself.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Could it be that the structure, given the way it was originally, is more conducive to be used as a two-family residence rather than a single-family. And then the hardship is it's difficult to maintain this structure in its current configuration as a single-family? Might that be a reason?
LILLIAN JEN: Thank you very much.

ANDREA HICKEY: Thank you. No, I think it's important to have it in the record sort of you're addressing that specific requirement of the Ordinance with respect to what you're asking. And, again, respectfully the personal part of it, although I understand completely, is really something that we can't consider.

So, thank you.

LILLIAN JEN: Thank you.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you, Andrea.

Let's turn to the dormer, your proposed dormer and the dormer guidelines.

BRITTANY MILAS: Yes.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: You're well aware it's too big.

BRITTANY MILAS: We're aware it's too big.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I'm sorry?

BRITTANY MILAS: We're aware it's too big, part of
the reason why we're here.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Well, why is it too big?

Why can't you do a 15-foot wide dormer? Which is what the dormer guidelines require.

DAVID O'CONNOR: So, if we misunderstand this we apologize, but we saw them as guidelines not as firm requirements.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Fair enough. But I have to tell you, you don't sit here every other Thursday.

DAVID O'CONNOR: Sure.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: We don't, we impose them generally. We treat them almost as a part of the law because the City wants us to do that. It's aesthetically pleasing at least in the eyes of the community services department. And so we don't, we have for good reason, but we generally do not deviate from them particularly as to the length of the dormer. In this case that's the issue.

In other respects which are more or less -- you
comply. Setting down from the ridge line, from the sides.

DAVID O'CONNOR: Right.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay. But you've got a 17-feet five and three quarter inch dormer.

DAVID O'CONNOR: Right. It happens to be exactly the distance between the hips. So we've got a hip roof and where the hips come to the ridge, we sort of basically span that space. I mean, so it has an aesthetic purpose as well as utility purpose. Utility purpose obviously is to get some -- is to maximize the amount of living space we can get from the attic itself. The roof is very short, it's very low rather, and so we're going to be at just a seven feet interior height at the ridge and then it's looking down from there. So we were looking to maximize living space with that seven-foot ceiling. But aesthetically it is about coming in at where the ridge is.

LILLIAN JEN: Yeah, it would be really awkward. I mean we could, but it -- you know, you could sort of say if
you had the ridge going like this, the natural thing to do is to dorm right at the ends of the ridge.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I understand the reasons, but generally on the times we do deviate from the dormer guidelines is because of stairs going to the third floor and you need the necessary headroom, you don't have it, and we've got to reconfigure it. This is, what I'm hearing, and I'll defer to Patrick, our architect, I'm hearing this would be nicer aesthetically. That doesn't cut it, to me anyway, generally with regard to the dormer guidelines.

BRITTANY MILAS: This is in fact the part of the reason why we have extended it at least on one side, on one end. And then in order to make it equal on either end, in order to maintain the aesthetics of the exterior, we did extend it. So on the interior we have the stairwell from the second floor unit.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Second floor.

BRITTANY MILAS: And it just, it barely --
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: You can take it off the stand.

BRITTANY MILAS: It barely reaches the peak of the ridge. Yeah. So it does involve a stair. I don't know if you have that in your drawing set, available. It's the proposed floor plan.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: We better. Because the drawings --

PATRICK TEDESCO: It's right here.

BRITTANY MILAS: And you can see the edge or the peak of that ridge at the end of that stairwell in order to maintain the proper height at the stair landing to access the space beyond.

PATRICK TEDESCO: How much beneath the allowable height is the roof ridge?

BRITTANY MILAS: It's seven feet.

DAVID O'CONNOR: No, no, he means in terms of the --
PATRICK TEDESCO: In terms of the zoning, not the ceiling.

DAVID O'CONNOR: Four or five feet.

PATRICK TEDESCO: Okay. I guess, I mean I share Gus's concern about the length of the dormer, although I will say on the broad side, you know, broad hip roof like this, which is quite long and wide, it's a little less objectionable than if somebody throws one on the gable end of the federal or Greek revival building. I'm also troubled by the fact that the roof is flat. And I understand why. I know you're trying to get seven feet. But that doesn't help the perception of the dormers from the street side. And I know that's not part of the dormer guidelines.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: But what you're suggesting it's an appropriate tradeoff if you want 17-plus foot dormer.

PATRICK TEDESCO: Well -- sorry, go ahead.

BRITTANY MILAS: If I might interject. We did
some 3-D modelings from views from the street. The house is tall. And in fact if you look at the general proportions of the proposed dormer to the existing building, you might find that it's in fact about 20 feet setback from the front facade, which means that you're barely seeing the peaks, the cat ears if you might -- of the dormers. So it's not in fact quite as harsh of a view as you might see, as you see on these extra elevations that are orthographic projections.

LILLIAN JEN: And this.

BRITTANY MILAS: Oh, yes. And this is in fact what we had discussed at length really at the Historic Commission because this was a concern of theirs as well. And once they realized in fact -- it's the red markings. Once they realized in fact that the extent of the dormers not as drastic as they had perceived from these extra elevations, they were completely on board.

PATRICK TEDESCO: So what's the height of the ceiling underneath the existing dormer?
DAVID O'CONNOR: In the center.

PATRICK TEDESCO: The stair?

DAVID O'CONNOR: Well, on the existing dormer -- so the center of the attic is seven feet, but the front dormer where the stair's coming up, because the dormer's actually below the ridge line of the house, it's a couple inches below that.

PATRICK TEDESCO: Yeah, but it's not ahead of the issue because of the stair. You're coming up from the stair.

DAVID O'CONNOR: Yeah.

PATRICK TEDESCO: I would ask the architect if you looked at, you know, a pair of shallow gabled dormers that were broken up slightly. And I realize that would bring the height, say, in your closets, at the end walls and cheek walls down below center.

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER FROM THE AUDIENCE: Could you -- I'm sorry, but could you use the microphone, please.
PATRICK TEDESCO: Sorry.

I just was asking the architect if they looked at a pair of dormers that were separated slightly but with gabled -- shallow gabled roofs which would reduce your habitable space and would reduce the amount of square footage at seven square feet I realize. But, you know, it's, it just might, you know, it might be a better solution architecturally. I just wondered if that was something you considered.

BRITTANY MILAS: Sure. Do you mean a steeper angle?

PATRICK TEDESCO: No. I mean a dormer just like the one in front. Maybe not a gabled roof but a hip roof, but one that, you know, a pair of smaller dormers side by side instead of the 17-foot single shed dormer?

LILLIAN JEN: I think because -- it's really because of the headroom.

PATRICK TEDESCO: No, I realize that.
LILLIAN JEN: We're actually pretty small people. Even for us, you know, seven feet is low, and to have it even lower than that it becomes really --

DAVID O'CONNOR: Money no object, the thing would be to raise the roof, but that's very expensive.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: While Patrick is pondering, any other comments?

ANDREA HICKEY: I'm troubled by the length of the dormers --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yeah, so am I.

ANDREA HICKEY: -- as well, and if there are options that put you at least closer to our guidelines, perhaps not in exact compliance, I'd be more inclined to consider something like that favorably. Frankly, if the goal is to have a unit that two people can remain in, I'm not certain that 1600 square feet of space for two people is sort of required. And if it's the length of these dormers that sort of give you that area, is there any place where
you could sort of scale back a little bit?

DAVID O'CONNOR: This is the tenant space.

ANDREA HICKEY: Okay.

DAVID O'CONNOR: So this is really meant for a family.

LILLIAN JEN: It's really meant for a family, you know, with two kids is what we were assuming.

ANDREA HICKEY: So that wouldn't be your unit?

LILLIAN JEN: No. Because we're planning to be old and on the first floor.

ANDREA HICKEY: Right.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: You could be assured of that by the way.

LILLIAN JEN: That said, you know -- so if we brought it to 15 feet, would that be something that you would feel comfortable with?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yes. That's the guideline.
DAVID O'CONNOR: How about 16?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: It's not Let's Make a Deal here.

ANDREA HICKEY: Right. I mean, the closer you can get to the guidelines, the easier it is for me to sort of be on board.

LILLIAN JEN: Sure.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Can I suggest -- and this is probably -- you're probably not going to want to hear this, but maybe continuing this case and giving you some time with your architect. You've heard the comments. Sit down and come up with something that's, as Andrea said, if not complying with the dormer guidelines in terms of length, at least much closer than what you have here, and come back before us again.

LILLIAN JEN: I think if you guys can see your way clear to 15 feet, I would say we'll just deal with it. I mean, it's not going to be as nice.
ANDREA HICKEY: Please go ahead.

JANET GREEN: I was going to say -- I didn't feel as concerned when I looked at the size of the house and the relationship of the dormer to the size of the house. I mean, I recognize the dormer guideline, but the guideline is meant to fit the dormer to the house. And this seemed to me to be with, as I looked at it, and particularly now looking at what the Historic Commission I think it was saw, it seems more reasonable to me. So anyway, that's my opinion.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Andrea, were you going to say something?

ANDREA HICKEY: No, I appreciate Ms. Green's comments. It doesn't really sort of change my own reaction.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Either mine.

ANDREA HICKEY: I still think the guidelines are there for a reason, and I for one like to see people as close to them as possible when possible.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: We can do one of two
things at this point: We can proceed with this, with your current plans with the proviso that that dormer is going to be shrunk to no more than 15 feet. Or alternatively we can continue the case and you can think about this and maybe come up with some solutions that will give you a 15-and-a-half-foot dormer or a 16 or something else. That's your call. I don't think you're going to get approval for the dormer that's on these plans tonight.

LILLIAN JEN: Right. So 15 feet is okay? I mean, so there are ways of making it.

DAVID O'CONNOR: We'll take the approval contingent upon shrinking it to fit with the guidelines.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Is that okay with everybody else? Okay, Patrick?

PATRICK TEDESCO: Yeah.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: The reason we're going to this, is that when we approve -- this is your first time you're before us, when we approve a Variance case, we do it
on the condition that the work proceed in accordance with
the plans you've given us. So we're going to do that
this time, but we're going to have a proviso that the dormer
that you show on here will be no more than 15 feet long --

BRITTANY MILAS: Absolutely.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: -- and otherwise comply
with the dormer guidelines. Follow?

BRITTANY MILAS: Yes.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Any other comments?

PATRICK TESDECO: The only thing I would say is 15
feet is still a very big dormer, and I think it's
actually -- it would be in keeping with the scale of the
house, which even on smaller houses it's often not even
though it is technically part of the guidelines. So I
actually think it will be an improvement from the outside.

LILLIAN JEN: Thank you.

BRITTANY MILAS: Thank you.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I'll open the matter up to
DAVID O'CONNOR: Is that it?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: No, no, no. Got a way to go yet.

PATRICK TEDESCO: All these people are here.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: They're all here.

DAVID O'CONNOR: I hope not for your sake.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I'll open the matter up to public testimony.

Is there anyone here who does wish to speak on this matter?

(No Response.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Apparently not.

We are in receipt of letters mas you've indicated, all of which are in support. And let me just briefly -- people take the time to write, I think we should try to take the time to make sure that what they've written gets into the public record.
We have a letter from learn Levin, L-E-V-I-N Campbell. (Reading) I am the neighbor that lives at 17 Bates Street, directly across from 18 Bates Street, and besides the abutters, and perhaps the most affected in terms of view and impact of the proposed alterations. In short, I have no objection to the proposed conversion of the house back to a two-family house and the addition of a small amount of liveable area on what is otherwise a very small third floor. It seems to make great sense to have been done with care. He then goes on to talk about his history of living in the neighborhood. I want to move it along because we have a lot of other people here for other cases. Anyway, I won't read the rest of the letter, but it's a letter in support obviously.

There's also a letter from David O'Connor. Very short. (Reading) I write to request -- oh, no. This is yours. Sorry, I apologize.

A letter from Laurel, L-A-U-R-E-L Lhowe,
L-H-O-W-E. (Reading) My husband David and I are next-door neighbors of Gish?

LILLIAN JEN: Yeah, that's my nickname.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: (Reading) Gish Jen and David O'Connor. We live at renovation plans for their house (sic). Renovation consists of creating an apartment with dormer. I hope that permission to renovate is granted to them.

And then also a letter from Jane Wolfson, W-O-L-F-S-O-N, who resides at 10 Bates Street. (Reading) I am writing to you regarding the renovation being requested by Gish Jen and David O'Connor next-door at 10 Bates Street and fully support this renovation project. David and Gish have been -- something was cut off -- have "something," and I am confident that this project will be a positive enhancement for our street.

And that's it. So only letters of support.

Further comments?
JANET GREEN: No.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Ready for a vote?

ANDREA HICKEY: Ready.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: We have two votes obviously. Let me see if I get it right the first time.

The Chair moves that we make the following findings with regard to the Variance requested:

That a literal enforcement of the provisions of the Ordinance would involve a substantial hardship. Such hardship being this building is a building that was constructed to be a two-family house, and under the circumstances appropriate to going back to being a two-family house.

The hardship is owing to the fact that this is a non-conforming structure in many respects, and therefore any modification to the structure requires zoning relief.

And that desirable relief may be granted without either substantial detriment to the public good or
nullifying or substantially derogating from the intent and purpose of the Ordinance.

In this regard the Chair would note that this project has apparently unanimous neighborhood support.

Has the approval of the Avon Hill Conservation Commission.

It will allow the petitioners to remain in their home, which I think is a desirable thing from a Cambridge point of view, not forcing people to move out as soon as they get a little older.

So on the basis of all of these reasons the Chair moves that we grant the Variance on the condition that the work proceed in accordance with plans submitted by the petitioner and initialled by the Chair except that the dormers, dormers plural, that are shown on the plans may not be any longer than 15 feet. And that in all other respects the dormer will continue to comply with our dormer guidelines.
All those in favor of granting the Variance on this basis please say "Aye."

(Aye.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Five in favor. The Variance granted.

(Alexander, Green, Hickey, Tedesco, Best.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And now we go to the Special Permit. And this is to install windows in the setbacks. Just briefly can you show us on the plans where those are?

BRITTANY MILAS: Sure.

On the east elevation primarily you'll see the additional windows. It's the top, right drawing. Sorry. East elevation, the top, right drawing has a number of windows that are identified as being new or increased in height matching the existing details of the house.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay.

Any questions from members of the Board?
JANET GREEN: No.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: This is a Special Permit case so we have to make a separate vote.

The Chair moves we make the following findings with regard to the Special Permit being sought:

That the requirements of the Ordinance cannot be met without the Special Permit.

That traffic generated or patterns of access or egress resulting from what is proposed regarding relocation of windows, will not cause congestion, hazard, or substantial change in established neighborhood character.

That the continued operation or development of adjacent uses will not be adversely affected by what is proposed.

That no nuisance or hazard will be created to the detriment of the health, safety, and/or welfare of the occupant of the proposed use or the citizens of the city.

And that generally what is proposed will not
impair the integrity of the district or adjoining district or otherwise derogate from the intent and purpose of this Ordinance.

So on the basis of these findings the Chair moves that we grant the Special Permit on the condition that the work proceed in accordance with the plans identified with regard to the Variance we just granted.

All those in favor please say "Aye."

(Aye.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Five in favor. Good luck.

(Alexander, Green, Hickey, Tedesco, Best.)

* * * * *

(7:40 p.m.)

(Sitting Members Case BZA-014892-2017: Constantine
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay, the Chair will now call case No. 014892, 1791 Mass. Ave. and 1 & 2 Frost Terrace.

Is there anyone here wishing to be heard on this matter?

Before you make a presentation, I want to make some comments for the benefit of the audience really, and some of these are comments I made earlier the last time when we continued the case, but most of the people are here tonight were not here then.

This is a Comprehensive Permit case under Chapter 40B of the General Laws. 40B was enacted by the state legislature some 40 or so years ago. And it was enacted because there was a concern about the lack of affordable housing in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. And many people ascribe the lack of affordable housing to the
difficulty in navigating the local permitting process. Where so many permits that have to be obtained, it dragged the process on, and housing didn't get built. So the idea was to streamline the process and to make it easier. Frankly, there's a bias in favor of approving Comprehensive Permits for affordable housing. It's not an automatic by any means. I don't want to leave anybody with that impression, but there clearly is a bias. And the way it works is rather than someone like this petitioner who wants to build affordable housing having to go to each Board in getting -- dealing with each Board and getting whatever permits or approvals are necessary, just one permit and that permit comes from us. It's a Comprehensive Permit. And what we do is we contact the various boards, and we have, and get any comments they may have if they wish to give us comments. And then we have the hearing. The idea is to grant a Special Permit. The person who can get a Special Permit or Comprehensive Permit, not a special, a
Comprehensive Permit has got to be a developer who meets certain requirements and we'll get into that when we get into the presentation. It's got to be a person who has been an eligible developer.

Anyway, so with that, that's how it works. One hearing or one proceeding, which is ours tonight, and maybe it continues later, but it will be tonight. And the vote, too, is different. To get a Variance or a Special Permit as the petitioners in the prior case, you need four votes, supermajority, four out of five. In a Comprehensive Permit case, the requirement is only three. So it's a simple majority. And with regard to our decision, we have -- as I said, it's not a rubber stamp, we can take into account safety issues, environmental issues, but not all of the usual issues; the design issues that are tenured to Variance cases. That's part and parcel on how the Comprehensive Permit process works.

So I hope that helps people understand -- one
second Mr. -- James. Understand how this is going to work or how we're going to try to make it work.

James, you have a question?

JAMES WILLIAMSON: Clarifying question. Thank you for that helpful explanation.

Does 40B apply in exactly the same way in all municipalities regardless of whether they have been determined to meet affordable housing threshold?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yes. The short answer to that is yes. There is a -- if a community has less than ten percent of its housing stock affordable, I think it's the appeals procedures are different. You can -- if we were to turn something down or make -- impose conditions that the developer finds onerous, they can take an appeal to the Housing Committee, a state body, rather than the courts. It's a simpler process. And, again, illustrative on the notion that there is a bias, frankly, in terms of granting relief for affordable housing on Comprehensive Permit that
we're going to consider tonight. But again, I don't want to
overstate that. It doesn't mean it's a rubber stamp. And
hopefully that will become clear as we go through this
hearing and questions are asked and raised.

With that, Sean, the floor is yours.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Yes. Good evening, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. On behalf of the
petitioner, CCHRE Mass. Ave. Tenant, LLC, I am Sean Hope, and along with my business partner and codeveloper, Jason
Korb, we are here tonight requesting a Comprehensive
Permit -- approval of a Comprehensive Permit pursuant to
Chapter 40B to construct a 40-unit affordable housing
apartment community called Frost Terrace. In support of the
application we have assembled a development team which I'd
like to briefly introduce.

We have project architect, Bruner/Cott and
Associates, we have principal Jason Forney. For our
landscape architect we have Jennifer Brooke from Lemon
Brooke. For our civil engineer we have David Biancavilla from BSC Group. From our parking consultant we have Giles Ham from Vanasse Associates. And our land use and comprehensive permit counsel we have Ruth Silman from Nixon Peabody.

As I mentioned, Frost Terrace is a proposed 100 percent affordable housing apartment community sited on three parcels which are now under common ownership. We have 1791 Mass. Ave, which is the front parcel. We also have 1 & 2 Frost Terrace which are in the rear, and we'll walk through the site plan, located in the heart of Porter Square and also in the Agassiz neighborhood. As a combining lot, the site is approximately 22,000 square feet located in the Res B District which abuts the Business C district to the north and also adjacent to the BA-2 District to the south towards Harvard Square.

Just an overview of the building program. The 40 units are located in four separate buildings. There are
three accessible parking spaces at grade. There's a total of 46 bicycle parking on the site.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: With the three parking spaces, are all for handicapped? None for people who are not handicapped?

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Exactly right.

There are 46 bicycle parking spaces on the site. We have both exterior and interior bike parking spaces as well as a bike storage room in the lower level.

We also have a play space for children in the lower level. And we've allocated room in the budget to have a part-time service coordinator to do some programming to really activate the space for families.

The unit mix is specifically designed to maximize the number of two and three-bedrooms, those are considered family units. Two and three bedrooms are some of the least available in the existing affordable housing stock and also some of the least produced in the City's inclusionary
housing program.

The resulting residential community will be affordable to individuals and families earning 30 to 60 percent of the area median income.

Prior to the design proposal, I'd like to walk through a few of the procedural requirements to establish for the record. I'd like to refer the Board to the site approval letter, eligibility letter from the Department of Housing and Community Development. These are one of the requirements in order to even come before the Board. So when we did receive a site eligibility approval letter which is in the file, the letter also states, and I think this is important to establish, that the project's eligible for funding in the form of low income housing tax credits.

That there was an on-site inspection.

Also the fact that the housing and the housing design and location were appropriate.

That the petitioner is a limited dividend
organization.

And also that the petitioner has the required site control to proceed with this application.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I want to return to those issues when you finish your presentation.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Sure.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: A number of questions about that.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Sure.

And finally as you will hear in greater detail, this proposal includes elements of historic rehabilitation, preservation of open space, affordability, LEED Certification, and also sustainability all within the context of a transit-oriented development a block from the Porter Square transit hub and the Porter Square shopping mall. Once complete, Frost Terrace will provide its residents with access to numerous family-oriented services, including a grocery store, pharmacy, hardware store, schools
and parks all within walking distance. This is a unique and exciting opportunity that is consistent with local needs and also furthers the City's goals of housing equity, resiliency, and also encouraging sustainable modes of transportation.

I'd now like to turn it over to Jason Forney to walk through the design proposal.

JASON FORNEY: Thank you, Sean.

Again, my name is Jason Forney, F-O-R-N-E-Y and I'm a principal with Bruner/Cott Architects in Cambridge.

Members of the Board, thank you. I will be presenting the design of Frost Terrace through tonight. In summary, it's 40 units of affordable housing, 48,000 square feet, a mixture of three and five-story buildings with an FAR of 2.18. And just like the rest of Cambridge our design is a mixture of old and new that responds to the layers and grain of the city along this part of Massachusetts Avenue.

It's the result of a year long process that included
discussions and listening sessions with the immediate abutters, a series of public transportations, working closely with the city staff and Community Development and Historic, all of which we think has made this a better project.

A Planning Board reviewed happened in early December and we've been working with the CDD staff to address a series of concerns and suggestions about the facade articulation, entrances and treatments of additions to this historic properties. The design we present to you tonight reflects those improvements.

It all begins with what we find on the site, and I'm looking at slide No. 6 in your packet. And the first, the first thing is the William Frost house a/k/a 1791 Mass. Avenue. As it stands now, it's been vacant for several years. Prior to that it was the home and office of Wallace Gardner who was a dentist. But before that, and we have peeked underneath the pink aluminum siding, it was a pretty
beautiful second empire style house built in 1865 with a
twin next to it and then the North Prospect Church next to
that.

Less visible and a little further back on the site
are 1 & 2 Frost Terrace, better preserved, better
maintained, and the shingle style built around 1895.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Are they being occupied
right now the 1 & 2 Frost Terrace?

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: 2 Frost Terrace is being
occupied temporarily.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Temporarily?

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Yeah.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: What do you mean by
temporarily?

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: So the previous owner who
sold the property is remaining there as an occupant.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And the other -- what
about the other property?
ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: It's vacant.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Vacant.

JASON FORNEY: Continuing on with the context, to the north is the North Prospect Church which was relocated several years ago, moved closer to the avenue from approximately this location. To the south a Newport Road condominium building, which is a four-story brick building. And then transitioning on into the neighborhood mostly two to four-story single and multi-family residences.

So our concept begins with the notion of reusing those three houses, and now I'm looking at Board No. 7 shown in grey. And we intend to move the William Frost house, 1791, forward to reestablish its location next to the church building. This is something we've discussed with the Historic Commission.

And on Board No. 8 is an image of a mansard house next to this historic church around 1910, and you can understand the relationship they had together but on a
different street wall where the avenue was narrower and the sidewalks wider. So since the North Prospect Church was moved forward several years ago, we're also moving the William Frost house to join it.

We're also moving it to the north to concentrate the open space on -- to the south where the abutter's property is closest to the property line and just give ourselves more room over there.

You know, I think that bracketed by those three houses will be a new, new architecture and designed to respond to the grain of the neighborhood in a way that mirrors the property line. So to the north our building is seven feet. From the property line the North Prospect Church is now an art library with stained glass windows, and it's also close to the property line. By locating our building there that leaves more room along the south, roughly 15 feet here which mirrors the 15 to 17 feet here, leaving an open space of about 30 to 32 feet.
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: What will be the distance between the Frost houses at the closest and the new, I'll call the larger house in front?

JASON FORNEY: Sure. Those remain the same. Those are not being relocated.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Because one of the zoning deviations, I'll use that word, is we're supposed to be 15 feet separation between structures on a property and that's done for safety reasons I believe. And how -- what's going to be here if we approve the project as you propose?

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: You mean the distance between these two buildings.

JASON FORNEY: Yeah, it's about ten and a half feet. And we have --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay, so one third less than what -- the minimum required by our Zoning Ordinance. And again, I'm talking about safety.

JASON KORB: Can you mention the code report.
JASON FORNEY: We've done an exhaustive code report.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Code what, I'm sorry?

JASON FORNEY: Code report.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: What's that? I don't know what that means.

JASON FORNEY: Building Code.

JASON KORB: So we hired an outside firm called Costantini. All they do is review building codes, that's their work, and they've drafted a multi-page, probably a ten-plus page memo reviewing every aspect of the development and they've approved this, the setback between these buildings based on I think the number of openings that exist; is that correct?

JASON FORNEY: In our view this meets --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Has that been submitted as part of your file, that code report?

PATRICK TEDESCO: It's going to have to be
submitted as part of the Building Permit.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Right.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay, but it's also relevant -- I think it's relevant to us in terms whether we grant the Comprehensive Permit at all. Because I think one of the issues we can take into account is safety. If we think the project is unsafe, that's too strong a word, we may not allow it. So you never get to the Building Permit stage. It would have been useful I think if you shared that with us before.

JASON FORNEY: The Building Code allows buildings to be as close together as zero feet. It just depends on what kind of a wall is next to it, how it's rated, and what the percentage of openings are.

PATRICK TEDESCO: Can I just interrupt with a question related to that? Because I think you'll get to this in a minute, but you've changed the facade material to be wood, partially wood, whereas before it was masonry. Has
Constantini reviewed the setback requirements relative to the change in material?

JASON FORNEY: Yes, yes.

PATRICK TEDESCO: Okay.

JASON FORNEY: Okay, any more questions? Okay, thank you.

And so, you know, that -- I was talking about one of our major moves here is to concentrate the open space along this southern part connecting the front and the rear yards and making usable space for the occupants of the building.

When we moved to the third dimension, you know, the restored mansard house is -- occupies the foreground. And now I'm looking at boards 2 and 3. Even though this isn't a listed historic building, it's important to us in this development to keep it. We've walked the site several times with Historic Commission staff and had preliminary consultations about restoring detail and choosing and
selecting colors.

Behind the mansard, the building's design is a layer of brick and clapboard reflecting the materials found in context. So it steps from three stories to four and up to a partial fifth story. The five-story masonry component is designed to be a quiet backdrop in the limestone colored brick. The lowered clapboard part slides behind the mansard house but continues around to the south responding more directly to the residential scale. It's floating above a brick base in a proportion that has this clapboard volume sort of relating strongly to the three stories of the mansard.

A closer look at the south facade, which is the one facing the Newport Road building, shows the attention that we paid to designing elevation with a high level of detail and articulation that take its cues from this building. So in essence that begins with this exterior wall that's folding back and forth, a modern interpretation of
bay windows that we find throughout the neighborhood and directly across the property line.

The windows are grouped together horizontally and connected with a natural wood siding that introduces a level of warmth. And the window groups are bound by projecting horizontal trim that's dark grey, further emphasizes that motion and responds, corresponds to some of the horizontal banding on that building.

At the corner there's a relaxed but pretty clear prevalent entrance, a glass door with a group of residentially scaled windows, and wood panelling next to it.

So, you know, in the way that the building has been masked it's also sort of that concept of mirroring applies here. It's 55 feet on the partial fifth story, which is adjacent to Lesley University's institutional building, 45 feet to the south which mirrors the condition at Newport Road. And then the 36 feet, you know, by maintaining 1 & 2 Frost Terrace, that has a transitional
effect as we move on into the neighborhood.

So looking at -- a little closer at the site plan, you know, I talked about the sort of distances between the property lines here that varies, but our goal here is to create, you know, a beautiful, usable landscape. And I'd like to invite Jennifer Brooke to talk about the details of it.

JENNIFER BROOKE: Good evening.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Good evening.

JENNIFER BROOK: Thank you. My name is Jennifer Brooke, B-R-O-O-K-E and I'm from Lemon Brooke Landscape Architecture. Jason, if you wouldn't mind being my laser pointer down there.

JASON FORNEY: Sure.

JENNIFER BROOKE: Thank you.

With almost 45 percent of open space on this site, landscape plays a fairly important role which is why I'm here to talk to you tonight. I'm going to outline three of
our main goals for the landscape.

The first being the quality of life. The day-to-day experience of people who live here.

The second is the functionality of the landscape. The job that the landscape has to do here.

And then the third is the -- how the landscape works to make this project a good neighbor.

With regards to quality of life and day-to-day experience, there's really two -- there's quite a few more, but the two things I'm gonna focus on are the materials and scale as well as the tree canopy cover. So one of the things that we've done is this place, we want it to feel as much like a garden as we can. People who live here, this is their front yard, this is their backyard, this is the place they walk through every single day, this is their home. We wanted the materials to reflect that level of intimacy, so we've proposed on the ground plain material like a concrete unit paver or a stamped concrete bringing the scale down
from something that you might otherwise find in the city.

The other thing that's really important here, as I said, is the canopy, the tree cover. We have an arborist on our team and they've done a tree study and they've identified the significant trees on the site. And we are keeping -- of those nine trees, we're keeping six. There's currently about 124 inches of caliper that will remain on this site which is pretty extraordinary for an urban site in general. And then the caliper that we will be removing, we're approximately replacing. So at the end of the day we would like to leave this place a leafier, greener, shadier space than it is currently.

Functionality is really important. The landscape has a job to do. We have to accommodate and support fire truck access because you're talking about health and safety. This is really important. So we are able to get a fire truck from Mass. Ave. all the way to the back of the site. We're also able to get pedestrians to the back of the site.
We have a responsibility to do that in an ADA compliant way which we're doing. Again, materials are important there.

And then storm water. We have to make sure that we're collecting, according to DPW standards, all the water that we're supposed to be collecting, keeping it on-site, and dealing with it. So that is part of the job of the landscape which is what we've outlined here.

And then lastly we have three, as Sean was saying earlier, parking spaces on grade. And we -- the last thing we want to do is leave someone who is driving an ADA vehicle in a lurch. So we've done the study and we are sure that those three vehicles can pull in and pull out of those spaces safely and that pedestrians are also safe.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Let me ask on that question, more for you, Sean. My sense is if affordable living units tend to attract people who have physical -- unfortunately, physical disabilities much more than other type of units. We're going to have 40 units
here. Are three handicap parking spaces sufficient?

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: I think they are sufficient.

One, outside of just parking, the -- that middle building, the 27 units in that center building are going to be all made to be accessible. So we actually have specific accessible units that meet the turning radiuses for wheelchairs and have the certain grab bars.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I'm worried about parking though?

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: So in terms of parking I think overall, and it's in the narrative as well, we expect half of our units to be able to have cars. And that's based on our data from Port Landing which is a previous project, as well as other affordable projects in the city. So when we think -- about half. And I think when we looked at favoring units in open space over parking, there was none. We wanted to make sure that we had requisite accessible parking. So I think the answer is yes and I think we wanted
to make sure, at the same point, that our handicap or accessible residents have a place to park.

JASON KORB: Just to add a few more additional things. The three parking spaces that we show are what's required under ADA, and all the other programs that are required. And that residence services coordinator that we talked about earlier, that Sean mentioned regarding the programming of the family room, that person will also be able to assist people who have physical disabilities with like Mass. Rides or CRTMA, you know, setting them up for rides and things like that. So we plan on providing that residence services coordinator to do that work. That's a good question.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I didn't mean to interrupt your presentation.

JENNIFER BROOKE: Oh, no, that's okay.

And someone who drives a wheelchair accessible van, having pick-up and drop-off is actually ultimately more
important, that's a little anecdotal evidence, but that is something that's relevant.

I only have one more point to make about the landscape, and that is how the landscape works to be a good neighbor. There is currently along the south side of the property several large mature trees that we are preserving. They provide cover, visual privacy down into the site from the adjacent buildings. But it's also important to note that the landscape is really being used at the periphery and that all the spaces where people might congregate to have a conversation or a small social gathering, they've been kept to the interior of the site. And so that the periphery is really meant as a buffer with those open spaces at the interior of the site. Again, for the privacy of the neighbors but also to be good neighbors to our abutters.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: How does it work with regard to maintenance of the landscaping? Is it like someone -- well, you can answer the question.
JASON KORB: Sure. No, we're required to maintain the landscaping.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Who requires you, the state or the Federal Government or who?

JASON KORB: You know, I think technically it would fall on the state and our different funding sources. So everything kind of ties back to the high quality nature of the development. There was a lot of mistakes made with affordable housing years ago. People are trying not to replicate that. That's why actually more private developers are developing affordable housing because you're putting private individuals on the hook for this type of -- these types of projects. So, you know, the state comes through, once -- at least once every three years and surveys the whole site, and we will get, you know, we'll lose points which will impact our ability to do future projects. The city actually does a review every year. So they have a person who actually comes through and looks at a sample of
the apartments as well as will walk the site, and so there's a lot of eyes on us.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Well, yeah, I don't want to make too much of this, but say you decide to get out of the business of affordable housing, so you don't care whether the landscaping is being maintained. Who is going to be doing that?

JASON KORB: So we have obligations -- we have guarantees that last at least 10 or 15 years. Financial guarantees.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Got it.

JASON KORB: And performance guarantees. So the wonderful nature of this financing source that we're using, the low income housing tax credit, which is what the site eligibility letter falls under, is that we are required to own this site and manage it for at least 10 to 15 years minimum.

ANDREA HICKEY: When you say personal guarantees,
do you mean personal or your LLC?

JASON KORB: So it depends. But they are -- but even if it's just an LLC, there are substantial liquid guarantees.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: But does the LLC have any assets?

JASON KORB: Yes, tremendous assets.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Where are they coming from?

JASON KORB: I feel like that's -- they're our assets.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: I mean, we have to have those.

ANDREA HICKEY: Like today?

JASON KORB: Yes.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I want to return later, I don't want to interrupt your presentation, to the structure that you have with the property being owned by an LLC that's
a for-profit entity. And then the 99 year lease which we haven't seen, is going to lease it to the petitioner tonight, the tenant.

JASON KORB: Sure, and this is --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I want to get into more detail.

JASON KORB: This is how many deals with non-profits in the city have been done as well. It has nothing to do with us being a for-profit versus a non-profit entity. That structure.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: The project you did over on Harvard Street, is this similar?

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Yes.

JASON KORB: Yes.

And other non-profits in the city also utilize this structure. So this is not something that we --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: In my time on the Board I haven't seen a non-profit utilize the structure, other than
the one that you identified.

ANDREA HICKEY: Yeah. Harvard perhaps?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I don't recall. Maybe, maybe so. Anyway, I didn't mean to interrupt.

JASON KORB: We're happy to speak to that at the right time.

JASON FORNEY: So just a little bit more.

It's -- it was important for us to consider the building in the broader context of Mass. Avenue in this stretch. And I'm looking at Board No. 12 now. As you move from the Porter Square T station passed the former Sears building, Lesley's Lunder Art Center and on down to the Newport Road condos, it's a consistent range of heights, a consistent range of masonry and clapboard materials. And so our west elevation really was designed to respond to those layers of heights and materials. You know, a series of volumes and brick, clapboard, you know, located behind this bright red mansard.
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: But they're higher. They're not the same level. Those are four-story buildings, the Newport condos and yours is going to be five stories, right?

JASON FORNEY: The Newport Road is 45 here, and the Lunder Art Center is 55 --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: The Lunder Art Center doesn't count, I'm sorry, in my opinion. I'm talking about the other way because that's where the impact is on the neighborhood. And you're talking as high as 55 feet when the buildings around it are no higher than 45 feet if I get it right.

JASON FORNEY: That's correct.

JASON KORB: Point of clarification. There is a six-story building directly across the street.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Across the street?

JASON KORB: Yeah.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: To me that doesn't count
very much, but that's me.

JASON KORB: Ruth, wanted to clarify that the 45-story portion is closer to Newport Road and the 55-story portion is to the north closer to the Lunder Art Center.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I appreciate that.

JASON KORB: Thank you.

JASON FORNEY: The south facade shows the series of floating bays above a masonry base with the horizontal banding. And it's also worth noting that the apartments on the ground floor are lifted up about three feet to increase that level of privacy. Both of these elevations show the mechanical equipment which we expect to inhabit the roof. This will be a VRF heat pump system residentially scaled, outdoor units, in between as much solar as we think we can get. This is a photo of Jason and Sean's development.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I don't know if people can see in the audience.

JASON FORNEY: You can turn it around. So these
are, you know, four to five-foot outdoor units. And our drawings do not show equipment screening because we think that will add more apparent bulk to the rooftops. We've been careful to locate all of these pieces of equipment at the center of the roof to minimize their visibility.

The north elevation is intentionally the simplest. It's a grade of larger group openings that continues what began on the west, wrapping around. Larger openings with windows and wood panels that bring warmth and texture, sense of lightness to that facade. And the brickwork is corbeled at the top in a way that reflects the heavy cornice and trim of the North Prospect Church.

And then to the east this is a continuation of the south with more clapboard and wood that began to step down towards the Agassiz neighborhood.

And now I would like to talk about 1 & 2 Frost Terrace which we're now proposing a series of small modest additions which began with two, you know, additions to the
back with truncated hip roofs. And then on -- facing the
property line, a small gabled dormer flanked by flat
skylights and then a shed dormer facing inward
toward -- each house to one another.

So in summary, you know, this design, you know, it
maintains and restores the three historic houses that remind
us of the past as a contextual architecture that fills this
missing tooth along Mass. Ave. surrounded by a lush
landscape, and we think a great place for 40 more families
to be able to live in Cambridge.

Thank you.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you.

JASON KORB: So I'd like to, I'd like to conclude
by saying a few things. My same is Jason Korb. I'm the
owner of Capstone Communities and one of the co-developers
with Sean.

I'd like to address in a little bit more detail
the community process we undertook, the site's proposed
parking, and the desperate need for affordable housing especially in this neighborhood.

We undertook an extensive one year community process that included multiple meetings with the Porter Square Neighbor's Association, the Agassiz Baldwin Community Neighborhood Council, an at large community meeting we held, and multiple meetings and design charrettes at our architect's office with an abutter working group, comprised of all of our immediate abutters, all of them.

We also maintain a website, 1791 Mass. Ave. dot-com where we posted events, upcoming hearings, countless documents. We really tried to be an open book to the neighborhood. And I'm product of the work we did there.

Through this neighborhood process, the proposed Frost Terrace development evolved from a 27-unit, five to six-story building located solely on the 1791 Mass. Ave. lot, which at the time was the only lot we owned. That building had a five-foot setback on the southerly side and
contemplated the removal of a beloved horse-chestnut tree. We didn't know it was beloved at the time, but then we found out. Through the community process and negotiations with adjacent landowners, we almost doubled the size of the site. And as you know are now proposing 40, 100 percent affordable apartment homes, a lower building four to five stories, much more generous southerly setbacks in a range of historic and landscape preservation measures. A big impetus for this change was our Newport Road neighbors' deep concerns about the setbacks, original setbacks of five feet, their views and light and air. The challenge that we had when we owned 1791 Mass. Ave. was that we were constrained by Frost Terrace. And you're gonna, you have to sort of imagine where Frost Terrace was. Some of you may remember it. It was to the north. Yep, so right there. Which was a 15-foot wide easement. It wasn't a private way, although some people thought it was. A 15-foot wide easement on the northerly 1791 Mass. Ave. property line. Our rear neighbors
at 1 & 2 Frost Terrace had passage rights and other rights, utility rights, things like that. So it was an unbuildable area of the lot that we owned. When we discovered it would be possible to purchase 1 & 2 Frost Terrace and thereby eliminate the Frost Terrace easement entirely, we thought it would be beneficial to all properties. Not only could we build additional affordable homes, but we could also relocate our proposed new building significantly further north away from the southerly Newport Road property line, which is what we have ended up doing.

The community and neighborhood process helped shape the development we are presenting today. And we are truly thankful for the time our neighbors and others committed to the process, and they committed hours and hours of their personal time to the process. The outcome is that one, we are preserving the historic 1 & 2 Frost Terrace houses with minimal exterior changes and very modest rear additions. The new addition to 1791 Mass. Ave. is now four
stories where it faces the Newport Road condos which reflects our abutters' concerns about height and its five stories where it abuts Lesley University. We are working with an arborist and landscape architect, as you've heard, to make attempts to not only save -- and some of these trees are in pretty bad condition, but also restore six of the existing significant trees on the site, including the most significant tree, which a lot of people can see in the neighborhood but they don't really know where it's coming up from, is the multistory 39-inch red oak. It's enormous. And a 20 -- and the 24-inch wide horse-chestnut tree. We've actually designed our building around the 24-inch horse-chestnut tree. That's the reason why the building comes in and then comes back out, because of the concerns we heard about the tree.

With regard to parking, we're proposing the three accessible parking spaces. And I'm actually going to skip over some of the things I've written because we talked about
it already.

But in summary, we hired Vanasse and Associates to put together an actual parking study and find out what the real data is out there. And we found out that there were 139 at the peak time, it was a Tuesday, October 17th, at 7:30 p.m. was the peak amount of demand for on-street parking and within a quarter mile of our site. Vanasse found that there were 139 on-street parking spaces available at that time. And 62 were east of Mass. Ave. near our site. Vanasse also proposed transportation demand management measures that we are committing to incorporate into Frost Terrace, and one of which is providing ride services that I talked about earlier. There's four others as well. I'm happy to go into the details later.

In addition, recent studies have shown that the future of car ownership and driving, particularly in urban settings, is changing. Our hope is that our residents will utilize existing public transportation and will be part of
the future where there will be fewer cars on the road due to ride sharing and car sharing capabilities. And there was a great article in The Globe a few months ago about this --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Can I push back a little bit on that or just ask some questions. You have 40 units, 27 of them are going to be two or three-bedroom units. Those are likely going to be units that have children in them most likely. Children usually lead to need for cars. So the notion that there is public transportation on Massachusetts Avenue, which is important, doesn't necessarily address all of the issues that you do, with use of cars.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: I think that's a really good point. So we've said from the beginning to the neighborhood, we expect about half of our residents to have cars. So the idea is there will be about 20 cars on the street. Not that our residents wouldn't have cars. And I can take your point, that families with children are going
to have cars. I've said this at several meetings. I live in Cambridge. We have two children under five. We have two cars. And when I come home late from meetings like this, we have to loop around the block. We choose to live in Cambridge and we choose to go through, we don't have a driveway, and many families in Cambridge don't have a driveway --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Right.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: What we do is we compete for parking. And there are always new developments that happen in our neighborhood, but that is part of living in this urban environment. And so the idea is for our residents, it is part of living in Cambridge that some of us don't have parking, but yet we choose to do so.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Let me ask you -- okay, fair point.

JASON KORB: Can I add --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: No, let me just finish my
point.

You're right next-door to Lesley.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Yes.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Lesley is a supporter of this project. We have a letter somewhere in the file in support. Lesley has ample parking, on-surface parking. Have you talked to Lesley about getting some parking spaces for them?

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Early on -- so we talked to our direct abutters. When we first bought the property, we talked to Lesley and one of the first things was asking about seeing if we could use some kind of shared parking location. Not to go into private details, but based on the demand, they have evening classes. They also have Partners Healthcare. They also is commitments as part of their Lesley rezoning. So there wasn't an ability to have an effective parking program.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: In other words, you got
turned down.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: We got turned down.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: But we've tried. And we also said we're going to continue to try.

JASON KORB: Absolutely.

And so I think lastly, and this most resonates with me and why I actually do this. I own a bunch of market rate apartments in Cambridge. It's great. I make a decent living off of it, and, you know, but this is the work that really gets me up in the morning and gets me excited and really moves me as a person to be honest with you. I think we have an incredible opportunity to participate in something remarkable here. We're proposing 40 new high quality 100 percent affordable apartment homes for individuals and families who can no longer afford to live in Cambridge and Porter Square. The median market rent for a three-bed in this area is $4,710. Do you know how much you
have to make to afford that apartment? $188,000 a year.

$188,000 a year to not about rent burdened. Our apartments at Frost Terrace will be restricted as affordable in perpetuity forever.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Wait a minute, on Frost Terrace. But what about the --

JASON KORB: The development is called Frost Terrace.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: All right. But what about the big building --

JASON KORB: Everything.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I saw something in your materials there's 30 -- Covenant for 30 years.

JASON KORB: So, yeah, so someone else picked up on that, too. The only reason we put that in is was to establish eligibility under 40B. There's a footnote at the bottom and we realize the footnote is not sufficient. So I want to go on the record right now and say the entire
development will be affordable in perpetuity. And I'm going on the record saying that, okay?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: A little more than that, it will be a condition if we grant the relief. That that will be the case.

JASON KORB: We would like that condition to be, we would like that to be condition No. 1.

Our apartments, as I said, will be affordable in perpetuity and eligible to households earning between 21 and 67,000 a year depending on the household size and the income restrictions for this specific apartment. While the market is charging over $4700 for a three-bed, our three-bed rents will range from $711 to $1,517. The need for these affordable apartments is nothing short of desperate and dire, and Sean and I see that every day at Port Landing.

Prior to the lottery at Port Landing, we had 1,386 applications. Currently there are over 450 individuals and families on the Port landing waiting list all waiting for
one of 12 affordable apartment homes. It's a 20-unit development. The CHA controls the other eight, that's why it's 12. As of October 2017, the City of Cambridge rental applicant pool has approximately 2600 applicants waiting for an inclusionary unit. And the Cambridge Housing Authority wait list has 5,000 households for family units. 5,000 households.

I've gotten to know many of these individuals and families personally. We actually signed a lease. Sean and I signed a lease when there was a fire in East Cambridge, one of the displaced residents from the St. Stephens Development, Just-A-Start, was living in the hotel down the street and we had a three bed, we had one three bed available, and we were able to move them in. And Sean and I signed the lease. And these people are wonderful. They're hard working. You know, a lot of them have multiple jobs. And they would just be such a tremendous asset to the Porter Square community. And Sean and I we're really, really
thrilled to be here tonight to present this proposal that has the ability to positively impact the lives of upwards of 120 future residents, the surrounding neighborhood, and ultimately all of Cambridge and all of us.

So thank you for your time tonight.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: So that's our --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: That's it?

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Yeah.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay.

I've asked a number of questions as you've gone through your presentation covering the points that struck me in reading your materials. I'm not sure I have anything more to add or further points to make or questions to ask. So I'll ask other members of the Board, do you have questions at this point? We can open the matter up to public testimony.

JANET GREEN: Can I just ask one simple question
that I'm not sure. I didn't, I didn't see it in the file, but there were many pages in the file, but where is the trash and how does that get picked up and where is all that taken care of?

JASON KORB: That's a very good --

JANET GREEN: That's an urban question.

JASON KORB: That's an excellent question.

So, Jason, do you want to answer that or --

JASON FORNEY: Sure.

JASON KORB: That's an excellent question.

JASON FORNEY: So there's a trash room located in the basement which has a lift that brings the trash up to this spot right here. So that it can get brought out here and taken away.

JASON KORB: Why don't you talk about the rear houses as well.

JASON FORNEY: So those would be, the trash would be brought along that same easement.
JANET GREEN: And is there a place in those two buildings where it goes?

JASON KORB: Yes, inside the building there will be a trash room and then there will be a lift to take it up. It's a great question. We intentionally put it on the north side as well.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Away from people.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Any other questions or want to open the matter up to public testimony?

PATRICK TAI: I've a question.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yes, sir. Your name, please.

PATRICK TAI: Patrick Tai. I live just around the corner. Where is the famous tree that you're saying about -- talking about? Can I see a picture of it?

JASON FORNEY: It's right here.

JASON KORB: Well, which one, there's two? There's two famous ones. That's the chestnut one and then
the oak tree is right in the middle.

PATRICK TAI: We don't have a picture of it.

JASON KORB: Do we have a picture? We do. We do.

JENNIFER BROOKE: The existing conditions, Jason, in our very first board.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: We can dig that out if you want to and put it up.

JASON KORB: That's the oak tree right there.

That's the 39-inch, five-story.

PATRICK TAI: I see. Look at it in the spring.

Let's see it. Where is it? What corner is this?

JASON FORNEY: It's in between the two houses here.

JASON KORB: You can see the canopy.

PATRICK TAI: Oh, inside. Inside.

What I'm interested is why is there a corner here? Why is this a gap here? Why can't we fill this up? You know, get some more space? Why is the cut corner there?
JASON FORNEY: Are we answering questions?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yeah, I think it's appropriate. And this is not directly germane to what we're here for tonight, but this gentleman took the time to come down and I think we should answer his question.

JASON FORNEY: I think one of the, you know, preservation principles that is applied here is that the further back this addition is, the more freestanding the house presents itself. And better, you know, preserved it. So that's the reason.

PATRICK TAI: Yeah, the house was built like that so you could not change it.

JASON FORNEY: Yeah, the further back we have that connection, the more you -- freestanding the house remains.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you.

Okay, now we are going to open the matter up --

ANDREA HICKEY: I just have one question. Can you just talk me through very briefly kind of the ownership
structure; the ground lease, who owns the building? Who owns the dirt? Who is responsible for what?

JASON KORB: Sure. So a lot of this has to do with the complicated financing structure that we're entering into. We'll most likely have plus or minus ten financing sources, each have their own requirements. That is directly driving this ground leaf structure that you see. So the landlord entity is CCHRE 1791 Mass. Ave. LLC and that's an entity that Sean and I control.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And that's a for-profit entity?

JASON KORB: Yep, everything is for profit.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Well, not the tenant, not the one that's going to get the financing.

JASON KORB: It is, yes.

ATTORNEY RUTH SILMAN: But it's a limited --

JASON KORB: It's a limited dividend organization.
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: But it is not -- it is for profit in a limited sense.

ATTORNEY RUTH SILMAN: Correct.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: It's not a for-profit like a typical corporation? A limited -- according to a limited --

ATTORNEY RUTH SILMAN: Dividend organization.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Dividend organization, is any organization that is willing to enter into a written regulatory agreement with a state or federal housing agency agreeing to limit its profit on the proposed development to a level prescribed by that agency.

ATTORNEY RUTH SILMAN: That's correct.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay.

ATTORNEY RUTH SILMAN: So the developer entity here, the LLC that has the word tenant in it, that's the applicant.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: That's going to be a
limited dividend?

ATTORNEY RUTH SILMAN: And that will be the ground lessee. Okay? So we've used this structure now many, many times. I'm a little bit surprised that you haven't seen it more frequently, but the -- so the Tenant LLC entity, the developer, the applicant, it's all the same. That will qualify, it already has been qualified by a DHCD as a limited dividend organization. There is a limitation on the profit that that developer can take, and so that is why sometimes people think of it as a, you know, we use the -- well, I don't, but some people use the for-profit, non-profit monickers. But it's really not appropriate. It is a limited dividend organization, fully profit. There will be a ground lease structure, which and again Jason can tell you a little bit more about why, but it has to do with the entity -- and this is not an attempt to funnel any sort of profit or money to the landlord. That is, that is absolutely not allowed. The ground lease itself has to be
approved by the state and also by all of the financing agencies. The ground lease will be closely monitored. All of the finance, all of the money, the revenue, the sources, everything is monitored extraordinarily closely. There are audits that are done. And so, Jason, I don't know if you want to talk a little bit more about why -- why the structure.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I still don't know why --

JASON KORB: It has to do with the financing sources have different requirements.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: But the financing is all going to go to Tenant.

JASON KORB: Not all of it has. Not all of it does. Some of it goes to the landlord as well.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: But why couldn't it go to the --

JASON KORB: Because the city's willing to fund certain costs that the state is not. And so those costs go
to the landlord. That's the best explanation. The land costs.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: The land costs.

ATTORNEY RUTH SILMAN: Costs of acquiring the land or actually not incorporated into the restriction on limited dividend organization, so there are certain ways that the developers can maximize how many units they can build at the various affordability levels, okay? And this, using this structure allows that to happen. So if they had to incorporate other kinds of costs, simply as one entity, they wouldn't be able to give you as much affordability is really a simple conclusion I think.

JASON KORB: Yeah. I mean it's a very complicated issue --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yes it is.

JASON KORB: -- that would take three hours to explain. But I think that's a good summation.

ATTORNEY RUTH SILMAN: But it is, I mean,
I -- we've closed many deals using this structure. I have them all over the Commonwealth. You know, six different towns and cities come to mind immediately that I can tell you about, but I don't want to bore you.

JASON KORB: But I think it's important to say that the Affordable Housing Trust has funded this development. And their counsels and their staff and the trust itself has reviewed all of this. So the city is very much on top of this.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay.

ANDREA HICKEY: So who is the ground lessor?

JASON KORB: So the lessor is the landlord who we described.

ANDREA HICKEY: Right.

JASON KORB: Right. So the tenant, the lessee would be the development entity that --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: That's tenant.

JASON KORB: Correct. They have the tax credits.
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: To answer Andrea's question, the LLC that's a for-profit entity that is the --

ATTORNEY RUTH SILMAN: They're both for profit.

JASON KORB: They're both for profit.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: No, no. Oh, the limited dividend is for-profit but not to the same extent as the owner.

JASON KORB: You're starting to see why people -- why for-profit developers don't like to do affordable housing, because it's exceptionally complicated and you have to create very complicated structures in order to tap into all of these different resources. So the tenant -- to answer your question, the tenant will be --

ATTORNEY RUTH SILMAN: The landlord. She asked about the landlord.

JASON KORB: I already answered the landlord. The landlord is Sean and myself.

ANDREA HICKEY: No, I asked who owns the dirt?
JASON KORB: The landlord, Sean and myself.

ANDREA HICKEY: Okay.

JASON KORB: With a mortgage from the City of Cambridge Affordable Housing Trust.

ANDREA HICKEY: With an entity that's completely separate from the tenant --

JASON KORB: Correct.

ANDREA HICKEY: -- entity? Are any of the principals the same?

JASON KORB: Yes. So Sean and myself are the same. We will have about .01 percent of the ownership of the tenant. It's just very complicated.

ANDREA HICKEY: I understand it. Thank you.

JASON KORB: So....

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I understand it's complicated. I still don't understand why. But I digress.

JANET GREEN: So what is .01?

JASON KORB: .01 percent. There will be a tax
credit investor that will own -- will be a member, not a
general partner, that will own 99.99 percent of the
partnership of the LLC and be allocated the 99.99 percent of
the low income housing tax credit associated with the
development for the first 10 to 15 years.

ANDREA HICKEY: Okay.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: That makes a little bit
more sense now. I'm starting to get it.

Go ahead.

JASON KORB: As an aside, I'd be happy to go
through it in a lot more detail at another time if you'd
like. I wrote my thesis on this as well.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Andrea?

ANDREA HICKEY: I'm all set.

Thank you.

PATRICK TEDESCO: A lot of people want to talk.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I want to move on. I'm
going to open the matter up to -- Ma'am?
UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER FROM THE AUDIENCE: Public comment.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I'm going to open the matter up to public comment. Wait, wait. Let me finish.

JAMES WILLIAMSON: You want to start with information questions or right into public comments?

COUNCILLOR E. DENISE SIMMONS: Mr. Chair, if I may. Using protocol, we have our fine senior states person Mrs. Alice Wolf that's here, has been here for a very long time. And I know State Representative, Ms. Decker is here who is -- who would like to go home to her kids. And I'm just old and would like to go home. If you would at least allow Alice to go first as a courtesy and then you can do it however you like.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I certainly have no problem with that. But I was about to say is that to try to organize this, we're going to -- I'm going to take comments first, or the Board will, from those who are in support of
the project. And once we've gone through that, and I take it, I know Alice Wolf is in support because she wrote a letter, then we'll go to the people who are opposed.

Now, one point I want to say and underscore and say which will be ignored, is please don't repeat comments that someone else has made. We're not present, except for myself, we're not as stupid as we look. We get it. So you say it once, assume we got it, and please make new points if you're going to speak.

ANDREA HICKEY: And if we could ask people to maybe come up here and we'll bring a microphone.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yes.

ANDREA HICKEY: Could we have one of your microphones?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: There are too many people who wish to speak. We're not going to be here until three in the morning. I know without a doubt, we're going to get repetitive comments. So I'm going to -- I will start with
Ms. Wolf. But if I hear comments that I think I've heard before, I'm going to stop you right then and there and ask the next person to speak, because we do not -- we do get it, believe we do.

COUNCILLOR E. DENISE SIMMONS: Mr. Chair, can I just ask -- in the Council we often try to keep people to two minutes and have someone time it. And so of course you're the Chair and you're in control, but you might just want to remind people whatever they say if they can keep it to one or two minutes.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay, even though looking at the number of people, even with one or two minutes is going to go for a long night. Fair comment and I will try to do that. Thank you very much.

All right, let's start. Alice Wolf.

COUNCILLOR ALICE WOLF: Age before beauty. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board of Zoning Appeal. I have sent to you some testimony --
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: You did.

COUNCILLOR ALICE WOLF: -- which I will not read for you.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you.

COUNCILLOR ALICE WOLF: You would be happy to know. I would like to make two points:

One is besides the obvious, which is this is a very need of this affordable housing for Cambridge residents. I would like to make the point that perhaps to me one of the most important aspects of this project is what you've heard today, which is that this is affordable in perpetuity. And in fact I was the person who filed the footnote. I have a lot of experience with expiring used housing over many years in the City of Cambridge and across the Commonwealth. A few years ago there were 25,000 homes across the Commonwealth that were at risk. And that meant that people would not have the housing and the future generations would not have the housing. So that is
extremely important.

Secondly, and it has been briefly mentioned, I want to talk about the parking issue because I know that is an issue that concerns many people. And I want to make the point aside from the obvious public transportation there, that the changes now in the way in which communities development and people are behaving shows that there are fewer and fewer cars in the community. And I believe I am correct that there are already some buildings in this city where they have been required to have garages and parking spaces which are now sitting empty and are wasted space. And so I think in terms of looking at the future, the parking is not a huge issue. And in fact it is a case that all of the multiple housing units in the city, not quite all, but all of them historically have no parking associated with them except the public parking.

So I thank you for your consideration. I sincerely hope that this Board will approve this and that we
will have 40 additional affordable homes for people in our community.

Thank you.

THE STENOGRAPHER: Spell your last name, please.

COUNCILLOR ALICE WOLF: My name is Alice Wolf. I live at 48 Huron Avenue.

REPRESENTATIVE MARJORIE DECKER: Thank you. My name is Marjorie Decker, State Representative for the 25th Middlesex District, 29 Raymond Street, Avon Hill resident. I am here, I believe in my almost 20 years of elected office, this is my first time, maybe my second time speaking before the BZA. I do not come before the Planning Board or a BZA as a matter of protocol and courtesy and respect for the different body. This is an opportunity that we cannot walk away from. I'm not going to diminish the importance of parking for some people. It's a real issue. I spent last night driving around my neighborhood having to park a block and a half away. You can't find the parking. The idea that
40 units by these particular developers, who I have known, who I have worked to support in their last affordable housing development, who I personally reached out to -- when I was helping the city, I helped lead the charge on the housing replacement when we lost 50 units of housing in that fire in East Cambridge. It's not my district, but I have a lot of experience in housing in Cambridge and housing policy at the state level. They were incredible. They were incredible during the project. I supported that project, the quality in that project --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Ms. Decker, please.

REPRESENTATIVE MARJORIE DECKER: I'm just going to say very quickly and then I'm going to stop. I'm going to tell you I grew up in public housing in Cambridge. And when I look at this project and I look at where it's located and I look at the quality of work and the beautiful opportunity here, it made me cry to think that we might not do this. I work everyday with Cambridge residents who do not have
housing, whose children are being removed from important services and educational opportunities that they absolutely need, that this is going to be most vulnerable people in our society, and contrary to what some of us believe, they are still the most vulnerable and don't have all the housing and resources they need. Not only is housing important to them but our community is important to them, and it's game changing and it's life changing and I know this from my own personal experience. And I respect the developers involved in this. And I really hope that at the end of this day, and I understand that the tradeoffs are not going to be comfortable for everybody involved, I understand that, and I also understand that it was important for me to be here in person tonight and talk to you about why I support this.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you, Ms. Decker.

Sir, again, please, we've heard support for the developers. We've heard -- people addressed the parking. What else -- bring some new issues to the table or pass the
Mic on to somebody else.

MAYOR MARC McGOVERN: Mark McGovern, M-A-R-C M-C-G-O-V-E-R-N. And I will respect you and I expect to be respected as well.

I live at 15 Pleasant Street right out this window.

I will bring something new. I did have a lot to stay about how important this is. And I don't know what everybody does in their other lives, but I sit with people everyday begging me for help in finding affordable places to live. And there is no way in good conscience that I can sit across the table from someone -- that I can sit across the table from someone and say that we walked away from 40 units of housing that they might be able to live in because it's ten feet taller than the buildings next to it or maybe it doesn't have enough parking for someone. We need to stand by the values that we say we believe in. I think if you polled every one in this audience whether they liked this
project or not and asked them if they care about affordable housing, everybody would say yes. But it's easy to say that in theory, and it is much harder for people to say that when they're asked to put their chips on the table and make a personal sacrifice to get it. I'm asking us to be better as a community and this is exactly the type of project. For folks who are nervous about the parking, like I said, I live right there on the corner of Pleasant and Franklin. My family has been there 100 years this year. When I was growing up, it was all triple deckers, two-families and triple deckers. There are now a number of eight-story apartment buildings on Franklin Street that have impacted parking, that have impacted congestion. And you know what, we survived. Okay? And not only that, we have welcomed a needle exchange program across the street. Right? We've welcomed the City's first warming center for the homeless in this building. So these things work out. And they may be scary and they may be frustrating at first, but this is
about doing what is right for the community as a whole, not just the folks that live right next to that building. So I appreciate their concern, but this is exactly what we should be doing and I really hope we stand by our values that affordable housing is the number one issue in the city and we would be willing to sacrifice and step up to make it happen.

Thank you.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you.

CHERYL-ANN PIZZA-ZEOLI: My name is Cheryl-Ann Pizza-Zeoli. Two hyphenated names, Cheryl-Ann C-H-E-R-Y-L-A-N-N Pizza-Zeoli, P-I-Z-Z-A-Z-E-O-L-I. I'm a member of the Cambridge Affordable Housing Trust, and I also serve on the Trust Project Review Committee. So I first saw this project back in March of 2016. We are very involved in this project. We've committed $7 million for the site acquisition and the development costs will continue to play a role in monitoring this. And I want to say that
affordable housing does not get built or preserved without tax credits. This is nothing new or extraordinary, and it comes with the requirements that really go beyond zoning. They're pretty elaborate. And I wanted to give something very specific, a specific piece of information. It's not just a feeling that we need more family housing, this is a finding from the Cambridge Inclusionary Housing Study.

There are no neighborhoods in Cambridge with market rents that are affordable to four-person households with incomes at or below 50 percent of area median income. Less than one percent of two-bedroom apartments are affordable to four-person households at or below 80 percent of AMI. Zero percent of three-bedroom apartments are affordable to these households. I would also mention that there are families living in affordable housing that are severely under housed. So that is also a problem. That, you know, we don't have, we don't have a hard number for that, but as a tenant advocate, I've encountered that really all the time. I
wanted to mention the December 5th Planning Board meeting. One of the direct abutters said that the entire community benefitted from the 33 trees on the existing site. I take that pretty seriously. But the trust committed $7 million in loans to finance this project because the entire community will benefit from 40 new affordable homes. And we're the lender. So we can place all kinds of requests for updates and information on the developer. And we're not gonna go away.

I don't want Cambridge to turn into Berkeley, California, where a woman recently stood up and waved a zucchini at a City Council meeting arguing that the vegetable wouldn't be alive if a proposed housing project cast a shadow on her garden.

There was a recent article in the New York Times how "Not in my backyard" became "Not in my neighborhood." And it makes this really important point that communities always need to be changing and we can't have a process that
gives every individual sort of a veto of a change.

GEORGE BEST: Thank you.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you.

We're going to limit comments now to no more than one minute because we're never going to get through tonight. I think it's been established that there's a need for affordable housing in Cambridge so I don't think we need people to stand up and tell us we need affordable housing in Cambridge. That's not an issue. That's not been an issue at all tonight. So I think you should -- I'm sorry, Ms. Simmons, but I don't mean to pick on you.

COUNCILLOR E. DENISE SIMMONS: I won't take it personally, but go ahead.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: You know, we get it in terms of the need for affordable housing. There are issues that have been raised by people in the neighborhood. And it would be nice if people can address those issues rather than just repeating the mantra that we need affordable housing.
COUNCILLOR E. DENISE SIMMONS: Does that count as part of my minute.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I'm sorry? No.

COUNCILLOR E. DENISE SIMMONS: I just want to be sure. E. Denise Simmons, two M's, no D, S. I live at 188 Harvard Street, apartment 4B, Cambridge, Mass., member of the Cambridge City Council. And I'm here in support of socioeconomic diversity. And I see this housing project as a way to make that happen.

The City Council and I'm proud to have been a member over ten years just voted several years ago to increase our linkage fees so that we could get more affordable housing to support socioeconomic diversity. A year we increased our linkage fees in order to support socioeconomic diversity. Right now we're looking at comprehensive housing plan to increase our socioeconomic diversity. And four years ago the City Council said we want to make sure to get a thousand units of affordable housing
in our community. This is one way to make it happen. If we want socioeconomic diversity, really want a city that is diverse, this is one of the ways to make it happen, and that is why I stand in support of this project. There was a statement that was made about the quality of the kind of the housing. One of the things that's exceptional, particularly with these gentlemen, is the kind and quality of the housing. It is exceptional. I think market rate people would want to come and live in these affordable units they're so well done, particularly the projects that Mr. Hope and this other gentleman who's name I cannot remember --

JASON KORB: Korb.

COUNCILLOR E. DENISE SIMMONS: -- build.

So I stand here in support of socioeconomic diversity and I see this housing development of one way of getting us there, I hope you will support it.

GEORGE BEST: Time. Thank you, Denise.
BILL MCAVINNEY: Hi, my name is Bill McAvinney, B-I-L-L M-C-A-V-I-N-N-E-Y. I live at 12 Douglas Street in Cambridge. I want to talk a little bit about -- because of the housing crisis we have, we have basically sort of two choices shy of building a wall around Cambridge, we can either build up and create more new housing or what happens is that a lot of our existing neighbors get displaced. On my street over the past ten years of the 17 rental units on the street, 16 have been forced out due to increasing rents. The other thing I wanted to talk about is cars. I live at less than two blocks from Central Square subway station and I live one block -- half a block off of Mass. Ave. And my experience has been ten years ago I got rid of -- we went car free my family, and we were the first person on the block to do it. Everybody else on the block has since followed with the exception of the four people who have parking spaces. If you build it, they will come. So I really urge you -- the other thing I will say is that for
all of us, having a place to live is more important than having a place to park our car. So I really encourage you to --

GEORGE BEST: Thank you.

BILL MCAVINNEY: -- to approve this project.

JESSE KANSON-BENANAV: Chairman, Board Members, my name is Jesse Kanson-Benanav. J-E-S-S-E-K-A-N-S-O-N-B-E-N-A-N-A-V. I live on Willow Street in Wellington-Harrington. I'm also the Chairman of A Better Cambridge which is a citywide organization of Cambridge residents that are committed to building enough opportunities for a diverse and sustainable community to live here in Cambridge. I mean, we're very proud to support this project. I'm proud to stand up here on behalf of our hundreds of members and nearly thousand supporters across the City of Cambridge to say this is exactly the type of project we need in Cambridge. As my fellow ABC Board Member who spoke right before me, Bill McAvinney said, the height
is critical to provide the opportunity for people to live in Cambridge. If we reduce heights, we make these projects infeasible, we reduce the ability for families to live in Cambridge, and we need that opportunity.

I also want to address the fact that we need to plan for the future. And while there are very valid concerns of abutters that we need to take into account, those simply cannot be the only concerns, because we have a changing population. And without looking forward rather than just at the present day, we will lose those opportunities and we will become a singular community and lose the diversity that makes Cambridge so special.

Finally -- well, one other thing, I do spend my days as an affordable housing developer right across the border in Somerville. I know how incredibly expensive and difficult it is to build housing in the Cambridge and Somerville area, and I have great respect for these two gentlemen who have made this project work. And I know they
need the heights and densities and lack of parking to make that work. We need parking -- or housing for people, not for cars.

Finally, I do want to say we need to think --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you.

JESSE KANSON-BENANAV: -- we need to think about the community. We can't just look building by building. I was really taken aback, Chairman, when you shoot off the concept that the art center next-door, the six-story building across the street didn't matter. Buildings are next to buildings which are next to buildings which create neighborhoods and we need sustainable --

GEORGE BEST: Okay. Sir, we don't want to get personal. Thank you.

JESSE KANSON-BENANAV: Well, this is personal for the people who can't live in Cambridge.

GEORGE BEST: I live in Cambridge.

SAMUEL GEBRU: Hi, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. My
name is Samuel Gebru. That's G-E-B-R-U. I live on Memorial Drive. I just want to mention two things -- well, I ran for City Council last year. I'm a recovering politician. And there are two things that I want to mention tonight.

One I know these developers. They're doing phenomenal work. And I commend any for-profit developer who is committed to 100 percent affordable housing. That's the most important thing.

Secondly is one of the things that Cheryl-Ann mentioned with the inclusionary housing report that was released last year, is that out of the affordable housing stock that we have in the city, four percent of those units are three-bedroom and above. So that this project is committed to a majority of two and three-bedroom units is critical to the nature of our city. We have a lot of families that are being displaced from Cambridge.

And then the other thing that I do want to mention is the transit-oriented nature of this project is really
important. First and foremost, again, we house people, we don't house cars. That's critical as you know already. But the other thing over half of our residents already do not drive to work, and I believe you already know that. And so if we want to meet our transportation and our environmental goals in the City of Cambridge, we need to be building higher density around areas of mass transit and that ensures that we meet all of our goals; housing environment, and transportation. We can meet all three.

Thank you very much and I hope you vote in favor.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you.

ANDREA HICKEY: Thank you.

JANET GREEN: Thank you.

ELLEN SHACHTER: Hi, my name is Ellen Shachter, that's S-H-A-C-H-T-E-R. I live at 346 Concord Avenue. I'm also an attorney at Cambridge and Somerville Legal Services, and I've spent the last 28 years representing low income tenants in the city of Cambridge and I wanted to make a few
points. I know that we've established I need for affordable housing and I get that, but I did want to say that it's very easy to hear words like housing crisis, to hear words like the need for affordable housing where they become static units and not real people. And I just wanted to tell you very, very briefly a few of the people that have been in my office in the last few -- in the recent past that are being displaced.

A 90-year-old Cambridge resident who won the citywide volunteerism award.

Two brothers who are disabled, lifelong residents of Cambridge, one with a brain injury, the other cognitively impaired.

A pair of immigrant brother and sister whose parents had died and they were orphaned being raised by their uncle. This is the kind of thing that I see each and everyday in my office and every single family, to them this is critical. So I did want to put a face on this and remind
people it's not just about numbers and statistics but about real people.

The second thing I wanted to address is some of the points around density. I've been to a number of hearings in the Planning Board and Zoning Board and almost always when there are developments proposed that have increased density, there's opposition. Usually what I hear is we can't add this increase in density because these are luxury units and that luxury units are gonna cause gentrification and it's going to drive up the market, and that is usually what is behind the opposition that neighbors have. No matter what, there's going to be opposition to density. If I'm a million dollar homeowner or if I'm a renter, people don't want more people around them, right? So I did just want to say that in this case it is so different, the justification around gentrification and luxury housing is simply not here.

And the last thing I will say, promise, quick, I
sit on the Community Preservation Act Committee and almost every single year people come before us and say affordable housing is concentrated in certain areas. It's concentrated in East Cambridge and it's concentrated by Rindge Towers.

We need to have a fair policy that has affordable housing everywhere. Porter Square needs to have its affordable housing and it's an excellent fabulous (Inaudible).

ABRA BERKOWITZ: Hi, Abra Berkowitz, A-B-R-A B-E-R-K-O-W-I-T-Z. I'm speaking as a member of the Cambridge Residents Alliance, the Harvard Square Neighborhood Association, and the Area 4/The Port Neighborhood Coalition. First of all, if you want a face for someone who is a low moderate income renter, I'm actually one of them. I'm not in inclusionary housing, and I'm not speaking about my need for affordable housing, but, again, in support of the two and three-bedroom units. That's super huge. I'm so glad they're happening. We need to keep families here. But what I will also say that as a
resident of The Port, you'd think I'd have my own kind of struggles with parking, and this is purely anecdotal. You've seen like the graphs talking about the parking in the neighborhood, honestly we get people who leave their cars on my street in The Port to walk to Kendall Square. We have people who leave their cars probably for weeks on end because they live in a Kendall Square luxury building and they don't want to pay extra, you know, 300 bucks a month on top of their $3,000 a month that they pay for rent. And I always find a parking spaces. So and again this anecdotal, I haven't counted but I've lived there for over four years and I've never really had a problem.

I also want to say that I do sympathize with folks who need parking. My next-door neighbor is elderly and disabled. She really needs to have a vehicle, but she still finds a spot. So, I don't want that to get in the way of finding housing particularly for families who need it.

Thank you.
EMMANUEL ENRICO JOSEPHILUSARDI: Hi, thank you.

My name is Emmanuel Enrico Josephilusardi, E-M-M-A-N-U-E-L E-N-R-I-C-O J-O-S-E-P-H-I-L-U-S-A-R-D-I. I promise that I was not going to use my title, Liaison Affirmative Affairs out of the office of the Mayor. The reason why I decided to mention that was I deal with refugees and immigrants everyday. Many of these refugees don't care if they have a parking space. And with all due respect for the people that are concerned about that, you can't live in a parking space. And the refugees from the countries that I deal with are under attack from the administration and the White House and this is a concrete specific way we can help people that need homes. These people are going to be sent back to their homes and they're gonna die. It's not a joke.

Thank you.

GEORGE BEST: Okay, I just want to say we've heard about parking, diversity, the need for affordable housing.
So to -- if it's not, if it's on those subjects, I'd ask you to pass.

ADRIAN MUSGRAVE: Hi. My name is Adrian Musgrave and I live at Five Newport. My husband and I own our unit. So I'm actually speaking to you as a neighbor, and I have been involved in the public community process of this project from the very beginning and I have been so incredibly impressed with this team's ability to listen and learn from residents and change the design. I think what we have now is an incredible beautiful building that's really quite innovative and will be a true asset to the community. As you have heard before, one of the things among many that we really value in Cambridge that sets us apart from other neighborhoods and other cities is that we do value diversity of all kinds. And unfortunately right now in the neighborhood we don't have that here. There's not a lot of economic or racial diversity in the neighborhood. I'd also like to remind, as I've said in other public meetings, folks
in my own apartment buildings in the Newport Condominiums that in 1919 when they were built, there was not a lot of public support for them at the time. But if they weren't built, I wouldn't be living in them now and none of us would. So in building old Cambridge what the Historical Commission put out, it's a great book, very dense, but it said that the Newport Road apartments represented a clear indication of the acceptance of apartment living in old Cambridge among owners and tenants if not neighbors. So I ask that you approve the project and look towards the future and the individuals who are there and know that we'll be setting a really strong precedent for the future of the neighborhood.

GEORGE BEST: Thank you.

ADRIAN MUSGRAVE: Thank you for your service.

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER FROM THE AUDIENCE: Can you clarify where you live? I believe you moved away from Newport,
ADRIAN MUSGRAVE: We still own that building there.

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER FROM THE AUDIENCE: But you just said you live there.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Excuse me.

ADRIAN MUSGRAVE: We are still an owner. And we still have --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Excuse me, Miss.

ADRIAN MUSGRAVE: And so we are still an owner and we still have a very strong vested interest in keeping the community in a strong way that in a way that we value.

JEFF BYRNES: Hi there. My name is Jeff Byrnes. That's J-E-F-F B-Y-R-N-E-S. I live at 294 Summer Street in Somerville. And that actually makes me a neighbor of this. So I want to express this Somervillian support here in Cambridge, and I want to make sure that someone over in Somerville wants this to be in my neighborhood. It's ten minute walk away and I see it everyday and I think this
would be a great addition. Thank you for your time. I hope you vote in favor.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you.

LARRY FIELD: Larry Field, 42 Mount Vernon Street. I'm also speaking for -- or actually, I am noting the David Sullivan on Notre Dame Avenue with respecting the Chair's request and said that I should just put on the record that he's in support of the project.

I want to address one point which is the federal and state low income tax credits and the highly competitive nature of those credits and the increasingly critical role of cost per unit for even being considered for the tax credits. The February 2018 round has both requirements for a cost per unit and, you know, based on my experience, Cambridge projects are always very close to being over that limit. And if this Board considers requests to either substantially reduce the height or the FAR, that will raise the costs per unit and may make this project one that cannot
be considered in the round at all and may be a project that could never be awarded by the HDD.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you.

GEORGE S. BEST: Thank you.


UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER FROM THE AUDIENCE: Is the microphone on?

ALEXANDRA MARKIEWICZ: All right. I live at Six Laurel Street in Cambridge and I agree with everything that's already been said, but in order to not repeat it, I'd like to add a little bit about the regional perspective. The housing crisis is not only Cambridge's issue, it's happening across the region, and as a renter I know all too well that if we cannot afford to live in Cambridge, we're going to be forced to live further and further out. The further out that you live, the less likely you'll be able to
use transit to get to your job. So, congestion is not gonna go away if this project goes away. And I think that that's something really important to keep in mind, that this is a regional responsibility and Cambridge is a prime location to increase density and increase transit ridership.

Thanks.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you.

CHRIS NOBLE: Thank you. My name is Chris Noble, N-O-B-L-E, 34 Mount Vernon Street. Just a couple of things. First, Larry Field who spoke before me asked me to hand you personally just in case the e-mail of it didn't get there, a letter in support of the project by six families on Mount Vernon Street directly across -- virtually directly across the street from this project. And we support it very strongly for all of the reasons that are in the letter.

A couple of things. Sir, with respect about not talking about parking anymore, I've lived on Mount Vernon Street for 25 years and there's never a problem finding a
parking space on Mount Vernon Street. So that's just personal experience that would add to the findings of the study that was done.

Second, with respect to height and density. To restate the comment on the buildings -- building across the street, six stories across the street, I just want to point out that the -- a lot of the density in this part of Porter Square and the height in this part of Porter Square has been with buildings that were done right on the street. New buildings in the past four or five years, it's right on the street. One of the geniuses of this development is setting the height back in to the north and maintaining gorgeous building in the front. And as we know from the Lesley building down the street that was moved by Harvard 10 or 20 years ago, being able to have this type of development in this part of Cambridge is a treasure from a design point of you, architectural point of view. And lastly, Mount Vernon Street is an example of the disappearance of rental units in
the city. When I moved there, there were many, many, rental units on Mount Vernon Street. Now there's one building that has some rental, but otherwise it's all turned into condos. And so just from personal experience having the diversity of more rental units in the neighborhood would really add to the quality of why you move to Cambridge.

Thank you.

GEORGE BEST: Thank you.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Excuse me, before the next person speaks I just want to make a statement. Part back to my introductory comments about how Chapter 40B works and the, if you will, the bias towards affordable housing, basically I don't believe a Board can consider density and height of buildings in terms of whether to turn down or to qualify a Comprehensive Permit. So I think I should have probably made that point a little earlier, but I think there's no need to address the issue about rebutting the notion there's too much density, too much height. That's
off the table. The issues that are really relevant are things like environmental issues, storm water runoff onto neighboring properties, I haven't heard addressed yet, and are in written materials. Things like safety issues, which we touched upon in the discussion. The space between buildings, for example. Those are the issues, but I don't think -- if you feel you need to talk about density or height, it's not appropriate. So maybe that will cut down some of the number of comments.

PATRICK TEDESCO: And the point's been made.

ITAMAR TURNER-TRAURING: My name is --

GEORGE BEST: Talk about the trust.


ITAMAR TURNER-TRAURING: My name is Itamar Turner-Trauring, T-U-R-N-E-R-T-R-A-U-R-I-N-G. I've lived in the Porter Square neighborhood on Forest Street and now on Oxford Street, 139 Oxford Street. And now it's two or three
blocks away. I could probably see the street from my window. So I've been living in this neighborhood. I just wanted to respectfully disagree with one point from the Chairman, I have had a baby and now I'm with a child almost six-years-old, and I've done so without a car in this particular neighborhood. And one of the benefits of being a parent in Cambridge is that there are school buses which means you can get your child to school without owning a car. So it is actually quite possible to be a parent with a child without owning a car in Cambridge.

GEORGE BEST: Thank you.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you.

KELSEY HARRIS: Hello. My name is Kelsey Harris. K-E-L-S-E-Y H-A-R-R-I-S. I live at 8 Newport Road, apartment 5 so I am looking out on this development or will be.

For years these are the directions that I have given to my unit: Get off at Porter Square, walk south
towards Harvard passed the Lesley building, right passed the ugly pink house, turn left on Newport Road. I'm in the building 8 at the end. Watch your step, the sidewalks are old and uneven. Ring the buzzer for my apartment or call my cellphone. Cambridge has now fixed the sidewalks. Thank you very much. I hope Cambridge will also build these units. I'm prepared step by step rebuttals of many of the issues, but since we have a quite long line, I won't go into the details.

Thank you.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you.

PHOEBE AYERS: My name is Phoebe Ayers, A-Y-E-R-S. I'm at 55 Eustis, which is roughly four blocks away. I moved here a few years ago to take a very good job at MIT, and with roughly 15 years postgraduate degree experience, I can barely afford this neighborhood. And I was lucky to find a nice place to live. I would love to have new neighbors who can also take advantage of the same amenities.
that I enjoy. And many of those amenities are that this is a very good neighborhood for families. There's a lovely playground, there's Sacramento field, and there's a good neighborhood school, and this seems like an ideal place to put a development for families.

Thank you.

GEORGE BEST: Thank you.

LEE FARRIS: Hi. My name is Lee, L-E-E Farris, F-A-R-R-I-S like Sam. I live at 269 Norfolk Street and I am the Vice President of the Cambridge Residence Alliance which has over a thousand supporters in the city and works for affordable housing amongst other things. To try to make some slightly different points, but I think the height and density issue does still need to be addressed. I read the 48-page or so memo from some of the abutters. I think five of the abutters at Newport. And I wanted to make the point -- they're concerned about any change in height and density here leading to or establishing or setting precedent
for zoning changes and other nearby parts of the area. And
I think that these are changes being proposed or differences
from the current zoning proposed only for affordable
housing. And anything that the BZA approves you can say
specifically these are being done only for affordable
housing, which is this is 100 percent affordable, you don't
need to consider this as any precedent for other areas.

Secondly, I want to mention the design which I
think people haven't talked about. I think the changes in
the design are very good and do address some of what the
Planning Board was looking for. I personally would be fine
if there were more design work even. I can't say anything
that I think needs to be better, but I'm impressed at how
much it improved in this last iteration. And I know the
Planning Board had concerns. So in that sense I think if
that would make the abutters more happy, that might be a
reasonable compromise.

And then lastly, I want to point out that these
developers -- I live in The Port. I worked with them on the Port Landing. They gave up a floor on the Port Landing and -- to satisfy abutters, and there are other people in the neighborhood, including me, that are mad at them for giving up that floor. There's more people that are mad at them for doing that than are satisfied in the one building where they gave up the floor to accede to them, and those people lived in affordable housing so it drove me nuts. So those, the developers have not told you that story, but they have their feet to the fire from the community not to give up the height. So just so you know where there's feedback coming from.

Thank you.

SEAN TYRANNY: Sean Tyranny, 12 prince Street. I just want to talk a little bit about 40B and the low income housing tax credit, and 40B and the low income housing text credit is the main driver of affordable housing projects in Massachusetts. Tens of thousands of units are produced
every year using this framework. So this is a very typical way of building affordable housing. I think there shouldn't be any concerns about that. As far as 40B goes, you know, typically our suburban neighbors are utilizing the statute because they are less than ten percent of their affordable housing, but Cambridge, and I don't know if it was mentioned, about 14.8, which puts us in company with towns like Andover, Burlington, Gardner, Greenfield, Hopkinton, North Adams, Salisbury, Southboro, Bedford, and Plainville. In fact, Plainville and Bedford are about 19 percent and 17 percent. So we could do a little bit bitter. We always consider ourselves more of an inclusive community than those communities so we should really check those facts and measure our success against that.

And I just want to say, you know, density is something that 40B's can be challenged over at the housing appeals committee. And so, you know, opposition to this project they've argued that the development's inconsistent
with the planning recommendations from the Agassiz neighborhood. And one of the recommendations that the consultant for the abutters references is that neighbors prefer new housing development to be of low density with open space required on private lots. And I just like to say that, you know, this planning is inconsistent with our city. We really need to have open space on private lots, but also the density to create that open space around it. And so, you know, the heights around the area are consistent and the other abutting properties are very similar to the one that is being opposed here. And, you know, there are other local issues around flooding, parking. And 40B allows for that balance to happen because it challenges the Zoning Board. And the hack of it goes that far to look at those local concerns, are they reasonable in light of -- with all the circumstances being looked at, in light of the need of affordable housing, you've heard how affordable housing is, and what has this group here, and other affordable housing
developers that do work in our city, what do they do to mitigate those concerns? How much money do they invest to ensure that storm water is taken care of? That the environmental concerns are taken care of. That there won't be flooding in certain areas. That all needs to be taken into consideration when we're building affordable housing, so we know how great that need is. I hope you support the project.

GEORGE BEST: Thank you.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you.

BHUPESH PATEL: Hi. Bhupesh Patel, B-H-U-P-E-S-H. I live at Bowden Street, Three Bowden Street, right behind Temple Bar. I just want to state three things:

One is, retail on this corner is very difficult to preserve and hard to sustain. Basically there's some 85 percent on one side is retail, 55 percent on the other side is retail, and we have 5,000 plus families on one side and 2,000 on the other, and their incomes are 55,000 and 58,000
average. When you take all that information together, basically the income they spend at that retail, and if you make $100,000 you basically spend 30 percent of it on stuff, which is $30,000. And 15 percent of that we use for these formulas to figure out if a retail business can work. And so we got $100,000, 30 percent are spent on retail or expendable items. 15 percent of that spent on local retail, meaning $4500. If I take everyone's 15 percent and compare it to what the rents are for all those businesses on Mass. Ave., basically our housing covers a third of that rent. So we don't have a thousand to cover the rent for all those businesses. A lot of us survive because they own the building or they have a lot of website presence and things like that. There's some really important things that we have more housing because of that. And so I push for a lot of in-laws. And this brings me to my second point, but basically all the in-laws that I get variances for as an architect, basically are things that are very, basically
universal design. A lot of handicap people need access.

Parents that get there when they're further in their years.

And this building basically accommodates that, because a lot of times we can't provide those performance centers in basement apartments and attic apartments, so what we have to do is rely on the younger generation that are in that building, maybe it's the kids that are in that building, to basically assist with their parents getting in and out of that building if they're handicapped or challenged or if they're just -- a lot of different challenges basically.

And it allows us to cut corners on what we could do in that building for performance standards because people can't afford to do everything. This building has somebody on site to provide that amenity. That means basically even though people are physically challenged and be in this building and have assistance, they probably can't in other buildings.

That's a huge benefit.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you. Your minute is
BHUPESH PATEL: One last thing? The storm water on this site is being dealt with on site. We live further down Mass. Ave. and the storm water's a huge problem, because the building development's on Mass. Ave. The fact that they're actually have a comprehensive process to deal with their storm water is a great thing relative to the other properties.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you.

TOBY HYDE: Toby Hyde. I live at 11 Wendell Street. So about seven blocks away.

THE STENOGRAPHER: Spell, please.

TOBY HYDE: T-O-B-Y H-Y-D-E. Doctor Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, except I'm not the evil one.

To your point about safety, so there are will be 40 units and 100 to 120 people living here, so that's more bodies on the streets, that's more eyes on the streets, and I think that actually makes me feel safer. I think walking up.
down empty streets at night is often sort of a weird feeling. So I actually think this will make the neighborhood safer. Those extra people will, as you just heard, increase the neighborhood business. So this will be terrific for the neighborhood. And I would like to now take back and make a few broader points about growth. It's hard to build in Cambridge, right? It's expensive, right? Two quick points:

If -- it's hard to move here, right? I moved here within the last year. It's expensive. If we had these same geographic dispersion across this country of income as we did 40 years ago, our economic growth as a country will be 13 and a half percent higher. It's $2 trillion annually. So it's a small things, but we are responsible for our own economic growth, and we need to do a little better with that.

You've heard about cars, right? They're the largest source of emissions these days. People not cars.
Small scale neighborhoods, big scale problems.

Thank you.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you.

NATALIE JANSON: Hi. My name is Natalie Janson, J-A-N-S-O-N. I live on 476 Windsor Street in Wellington-Harrington, and I work for an affordable housing non-profit, and the organizational structure of this project's very complex, but it is also extremely commonplace. We use it all the time. And I just wanted to reiterate a point that was made during the presentation, which is this is an urban area, and for being in an urban area the density and the height is extremely reasonable. And this is a great place to put affordable housing, close to public transit, amenities, and I would welcome more developments like this in Wellington-Harrington on Cambridge Street.

Thank you.

GEORGE BEST: Thank you.
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you.

SASCHA ALACH: Hi, my name is Sascha Alach and I live on 16 Springfield Street. The first name is S-A-S-C-H-A. People usually get that wrong. Last name is A-L-A-C-H. I'm here because I'm a lifelong resident of Cambridge. I went to our Cambridge public schools. I benefitted from the tremendous diversity and opportunity that was here, and what I've seen over the years is all the people that I went to school with no longer being able to live here. And what I see from that is our community's basically being ripped apart in a way that makes it impossible to establish communities. I think what you see from this project, which I think very much fits the neighborhood character, is that this is an attempt to try to reestablish that community in a way that can build for the long term to try to bring the kind of place that we want Cambridge to be. And the other point home I'll make about this, I think this is very much a compromise project if you
think about it. The kind of housing needs that we actually need, if you look at housing report cards that have come out, if you look at the kind of housing needs based on demand, this falls tremendously short of that. If you look at the kind of places that could be built here, we need considerably more housing of what we need, but I see this has a very reasonable compromise made between the neighborhood and between the developers here and I commend them on their efforts.

The last point I will make, I promise you I will stop, is if you look at cities like Detroit that brought in a tremendous number of people when they were booming because of the opportunities there, our area has failed to do that, and this is one of the ways that we can try to bring that around.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you.

GEORGE BEST: Thank you.

Bristol Street. I'll keep this very brief with a haiku:

Ideal location near public transportation it makes
perfect sense.

RUTH RYALS: I'm Ruth Ryals, R-Y-A-L-S. I live at 115 Upland Road and I'm the President of the Porter Square Neighbors' Association so we're right smack -- we're neighbors and a neighborhood organization. And I have copies of my letter which I hope you received, but if you didn't, I'll get them to you.

But -- and I won't repeat the stuff that's in here because it deals with the process we went through and some of the problems are -- people have, are problems with parking, problems with density. But when we polled and I polled our membership and when I looked back on all the people on-line who commented on the proposal, frankly the majority of all that comes out to we support the proposal. And I know from my interaction with the gentleman who are behind the proposal how good they've been about changing
things or addressing things or explaining things.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you.

SAM SEIDEL: Good evening. Sam Seidel, S-E-I-D-E-L, 43 Harris Street. I'm a neighbor of a couple blocks away from this project. A couple of points:

The Chair pointed out that Comprehensive Permits are what I like to call forward leaning. They assume the need to some degree, and they are there to meet the need barring some extraordinary reason that they do not meet the need. And the Chair also pointed out the constraints on the Board itself. I was once a member of the Conservation Commission. I recognize those constraints. You have laws that bound what you can do regardless of what's happening in the broader community, you have to follow what the rules are. That can be difficult at times. I support this project for all the reasons you've heard already. The diversity will bring to the avenue, much needed. The added retail, and people who can shop in the area.
In terms of height and density I recognize that's not an issue for you, but the neighborhood -- this is the characteristic of the neighborhood. It is not correct to say that this is the neighborhood of three stories and triple deckers. It has many four and five-story and some six-story brick buildings. Not just on Massachusetts Avenue. Directly across the street on Arlington Street on Lancaster Street. If you walk down Linnaean Street, that is all there. Oxford Street as well. Wendell Street, Shepard Street, Chauncy Street. That is the nature of this neighborhood. I know because I live in it and I walk my dog in it every single day. If you want to live in the neighborhood, have a car and not have parking associated with your house, you can do it if you have enough money. You can do it at Newport Road if you want to do that. You can do it at Arlington Street if you want to do that. You can do that on Linnaean Street if you want to do that.

It always seemed to me as a matter of fundamental
equity that we ought to at least recognize that if you can't buy your way into the system of yes, I have a car and no, my building does not provide parking, we ought to try to do that. We are forward leaning on affordable housing. You've heard that over and over again. Comprehensive Permits are forward leaning. Unaffordable housing, that's what tonight's all about. And I'll leave with just this question. I know this development group, I support them, I've seen their work at Port Landing, but this is the question I would ask the Board:

If this is not a place for a Comprehensive Permit for affordable housing in Cambridge, where in Cambridge is there a site that does actually make sense for a Comprehensive Permit? This place is ideally suited. It has the space, it has the land, and it has the location less than a quarter mile from a T stop. I leave that with the Board to make the decision.

Thank you.
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE CONNOLLY: Good evening. My name's Mike Connolly. For the record, I live at four Ashburton Place. I have the honor as serving as state representative for the 26th Middlesex District, and I also have the honor of serving on the Housing Community in the Massachusetts legislature, and I'm here in strong support of the project. I had an opportunity to review the plans in detail several weeks ago and I had an opportunity to go through the history of this project, and I'm really struck by the thoughtfulness that's gone into making this project fit within the scale of the neighborhood. And to me it's inconceivable that in a time of housing emergency we could ever say no to the 40 affordable housing units that are on the table. And this is a development group with attorney Sean Hope and the people at the table who have proven that they can deliver on these 100 percent affordable housing projects. So I submitted a letter to the Board last week in
support of this, so I'll just refer you to that and stand here in support of the project.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you.

GEORGE BEST: Thank you.

ARI OFSEVIT: All right, thanks. Ari Ofsevit, A-R-I O-F-S-E-V-I-T, Ten Lard Street. I'll make a quick joke. I won't be as short as the haiku and I won't be as long as Mike Connolly. But really quickly I just want to talk about some of the transit availability that we have near this site and then talk quickly about some parking.

So the transit availability in addition to the Red Line and in addition to the 77 and 96 busses, and if you go up to Porter Square, all the buses that is go down to Lechmere. The commuter rail is also there. We shouldn't forget that a lot of people who are coming into Kendall Square get off of the train in Porter Square. And if you're going downtown, it's a really great opportunity to easily and quickly get downtown. So this is one of the most, if
not the most successful transit locations in Cambridge.

As far as parking goes, if you look at the city has transportation trends in Cambridge report, and it shows that as housing units have gone up, the number of parking permits has gone down. So, you know, if we hear that there's a crisis in parking -- we heard that in Cambridgeport where I live a few years ago, we were talking about a Hubway station, and I was told there was never parking available and if you went out late at night, there will be no spaces. So for about a week I walked around the block at around eleven o'clock at night and there were always parking spaces. I understand that sometimes you might have to look and you might have to park a little further away, but that should not be 00 that should not outweigh the need for affordable housing in Cambridge.

Thanks.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thanks.

MATT BROWNELL: My name is Matt Brownell. Brown
like the color with E-L-L at the end. And I work at Lesley University. We wrote a letter of support, so I won't reiterate anything there. Just to stand in support. I think the people involved here, Sean, Jason, and Bruner/Cott were wonderful to work with. They were very collaborative. We felt really listened to in the whole process, and they really addressed a lot of our concerns about the building that's right next to them which we own, and visibility to that building. And I want to just bring up one small point about aesthetics and visual impact. I'd say the picture on the right there I think says a lot about what they've done to think about the relationship with the adjacent buildings. I think you're not gonna really notice that fifth floor if you're on that side unless maybe you're on the top floor. On the opposite side where we are, you're gonna see the fifth floor, but it doesn't impact us in the same way. We have an office and stained glass. You won't even notice it. So I just wanted to thank again the -- for them listening to
us and just support them.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you.

LAUREN HOLLERAN: Hi. I'm Lauren Holleran, H-O-L-L-E-R-A-N. I live at 73 Frost Street, just around the corner from here. I have four kids who have gone through the Baldwin School and just wanted to talk a little bit very quickly about -- of course, we feel so lucky that our kids have this incredibly diverse school experience, but how much of the school experience extends beyond the school day; weekend play dates, after school at the park, to pajama pizza nights at the school, all of that, which really tends to favor neighborhood residents. And without more affordable housing in the neighborhood, there's this whole group of kids that doesn't get that experience. And our kids who live in the neighborhood see sort of this divided world between at school and not at school, and I think this is such an exciting project. I think it looks beautiful and want to wholeheartedly throw my support behind it.
Thanks.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER:  Thank you.

ELAINE DEROSA:  Do I get a prize for being last?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER:  Only if you're short.

ELAINE DEROSA:  Okay, ready start.  You'll be surprised.  Elaine Derosa, D-E-R-O-S-A.  I'm the director of the Cambridge Economic Opportunity Community, Cambridge's Antipoverty Agency.  And I just want to speak to the fact that this project is gonna address the health and safety of many of our families that are currently living cramped up in under housed units where they're cramming in one and two bedrooms where they really need three if not four.  So this is an important issue of the health and future of the growing families in the city.

Thank you.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER:  Thank you.

Okay.  Now, we're going to take comments from those who are in opposition or who are opposed of the
granting of the Comprehensive Permit that's the subject of tonight's hearing. There's four of you are going to speak in sequence? Again, one minute, please.

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER FROM THE AUDIENCE:
Respectfully, sir, you did give two minutes to the first couple of people.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: You got to remember the issues that you got to address: Not design, not height, not density. We're talking -- those are not issues that this Board can legitimately consider. So we're talking about safety, environmental issues, issues of that sort. Please confine your comments to that.

Now, Ma'am.

MARTHA HASS: My name is Martha Hass, H-A-S-S.
And a member of the 1791 Residential Abutters' Working Group. In the interest of time my remarks are very brief in order that the members of the abutters' group who follow me can present our case.
I think Jason and Sean have recognized tonight in their words the hours we have spent with them on trying to make this work for the residents of 1791, the direct abutters, and the neighborhood. We have also spent countless hours as evidenced by the document we submitted to all of you. And so we would respectfully ask that you give us the time to put our case forward. May I begin by saying on behalf of the members of the 1791 Residential Abutters' Group that 1791 Mass. Avenue is a great location for an affordable housing rental community and how very much we look forward to welcoming our new neighbors. We want to be clear at the outset that there is not one among us who does not support the affordable housing development at 1791 Mass. Avenue and 1 & 2 Frost Terrace. For over a year we have met with the developers, spent countless hours going through plans and proposals, and always reiterating at each meeting and at every community our request for a development that ensures height and density appropriate to the site, a design
that enhances the neighborhood setting, and the respect for the historic residents residing on this site. This case is in many ways unique as it asks for 18 waivers that affect almost every aspect of the site and the living conditions of the 1791 residents, abutters, and the neighborhood. The height, mass, and design of the main building limits light and air to all development residents and abutters. The large footprint of the buildings reduces open space for the families residing at 1791. And the lack of on-site parking increases demand in already overcrowded neighborhood streets. So tonight we ask that you not approve this application for Comprehensive Permit as currently submitted, but rather direct the developers to design and build an affordable housing rental community that is right sized for the height -- for the site that truly incorporates and preserves three historical houses and that provides the 1791 Mass. Avenue residents, abutters, and neighborhood a development that all can embrace.
Finally, the 1791 affordable housing rental community should be a development that sets a benchmark for future development on the avenue and provides a model showcasing a well-designed affordable housing community in a historical city on its landmark avenue.

Thank you.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you.

SARAH FARRINGTON: Good evening. Thank you for waiting for us. My name is Sarah Farrington, F-A-R-R-I-N-G-T-O-N. Sarah with an H. I live at 18 Frost Street and I am a member of the abutters' group. I also own property of 22 Roseland, which is to the north of the site, 5 Frost, which is to the east, and I own two condos at 8 Newport Road which is of course to the south. These are properties that are owned by my family. We have been managing rental property in the area since the 1950s. I took over for my dad about 12 years ago when he got ill. We don't have a lot of time. I had some prepared remarks that
I wanted to talk to you about that I feel so passionate about this, but I really want to get to the heart of the matter here.

My plan was to talk about height. Martha Hass and I spent a lot of time looking at building height in the neighborhood along Mass. Ave. and I'm a little perplexed because you're telling me you're not going to take that into consideration. So I guess I have a question before I get started. Is that something -- is it worth my time to talk about height?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: No, it's not that we don't want to consider it. It's just not -- Chapter 40B in my opinion does not allow us to say yes or no based on height or density. Because, again, it is to encourage affordable housing.

SARAH FARRINGTON: Let's go out of order, okay. Could Brooke come and talk before me then, and I go afterwards, is that all right?
BROOKE FLETCHER: Hi, Mr. Chairman. My name is Brooke, B-R-O-O-K-E Fletcher, F-L-E-T-C-H-E-R. I live at 8 Newport Road. I'd be remiss if I didn't say congratulations on your reelection. Or condolences.

Having said that, I heard what you said about 40B at the beginning of the night. I heard what you said two others times about 40B. If I may, I'd just like to quote a couple of things from the overview of the Mass. Comprehensive Permit law?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Sure.

BROOKE FLETCHER: I got this from mass.gov. The purpose of the law is to increase the supply and improve regional distribution of low and moderate income housing by allowing a limited suspension of existing local regulations which are inconsistent with construction of such housing. I emphasize the word limited. While I realize that could be subjective, we've looked at these plans and we think their request for waivers is not limited, especially when you
compare them to other 40B projects in Cambridge.

Secondly, once again from the overview, the general principal governing hearings before the local board is that all local restrictions as applies to the proposed affordable housing be consistent with the local needs. If less than ten percent of the municipality's total housing units are subsidized low and moderate income housing units, there is a presumption that there's a substantial housing need which outweighs local concerns. As we've discussed, Cambridge has 15 percent, roughly 14.8. Given that, that presumption does not exist. Local concerns must be weighed by this Board.

Continuing to quote: The Zoning Board of Appeals holds a public hearing to ensure that local concerns are properly addressed. Local concerns include health, safety, environmental, design, open space, and other concerns raised by town officials or residents. We're residents raising concerns about design.
I'm aware you received a letter from the Planning Board and they give you six bullet points that were rather vague.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Right.

BROOKE FLETCHER: For example, you know, bullet point two: Several Planning Board members stated their opinion that the project's density and scale is appropriate.

I think Politifact would say that's true but misleading. Don't you wonder what the other ones thought? Several out of six? Here's a taste of what they thought:

Quote, in my mind the project would benefit from more design review.

Another quote, different member: It's just too plain.

Another quote from a different member: I'm certainly not wow'd by the design.

Another quote, and I apologize in advance: I think it's horrendous.
And from the Chair of the Board: I think there's a lot I would accept for the affordable housing, but I think at this point it's just not ready. The Chair of the Planning Board a month ago said: At this point it's just not ready.

The last quote and then I'll end: The application containing the eligibility letter and preliminary development planning is then filed with the local Board of Zoning Appeals. The Board then notifies and then seeks recommendations from other local boards, including as appropriate, the following: The first board listed is the Planning Board. The Planning Board has not given you a recommendation. They have said design elements they would like to see changed, but they -- a recommendation to you would be "We approve" or "We don't approve."

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: No, I'm sorry. I'm going to have to disagree with you right now. They did not make any recommendation, that's for sure. They threw a lot of
balls up in the area and letting us have to decide where the balls land.

PATRICK TEDESCO: Can I also say they made a lot of design recommendations, most of if not all have been picked up in this redesign in my opinion.

BROOKE FLETCHER: I admit you have done a better job. You have taken some of their points, and I agree. I would ask that you then go back to the Planning Board and see if the Planning Board agrees that that is sufficient.

Thank you.

LARRY BEALS: So my -- I can sit down?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: By all means.

LARRY BEALS: So my name is Larry Beals. I assume you can spell Larry, but Beals is B-E-A-L-S. So I think the good news I have is that I've been here for two and half hours, I haven't heard anybody say anything about my comments. So what I want to focus on as in our view is storm water management, which I don't think we've discussed
much of, some of the site plan concerns that we have, building plan information and zoning.

So my role in the project, I work with Beals Associates. My business address is Two Park Plaza. I was hired by the abutters' group to provide a technical review. So I know you've gotten a lot of subjective comments. I have nothing subjective to say tonight, but I do have a lot of comments on the site.

I think -- and I heard the Chair a number of times reiterate the importance and the obligation regarding safety, and so I'll try to focus on that a bit.

I've been involved in the project for about a year. And I will say that there has been a lot of work that's gone into it on both sides. And certainly a better project than it was a year ago.

The issue with the storm water management system is when you look at all the plans that were filed and the plans that were presented tonight is it's not really
designed yet. There is a -- the plan does show some manholes and catch basins and pipes, but there are no drainage calculations that have been submitted to actually document whether or not that works. There's a network there, but nobody knows what its capacity is. And also importantly the system is designed to rely on infiltration which means the runoff is going to be collected and put into the ground. So there's this, there's this assumption that the storm water runoff will be infiltrated, and yet I'm not aware of anybody digging a test pit on the site, doing a boring, testing the soil permeability, doing any infiltration studies. And the proposed system has been designed with no knowledge or information about soils, ground water, bedrock, fill, potential hazards materials, or any other subsurface condition that may affect its infiltration. So the reason that's critical, the reason I think the Board should review it is that if the system cannot infiltrate the storm water, then it either impacts
what goes off the site and surcharges the system, flows on to the abutters, or it goes out into the Mass. Ave. and floods whoever is downstream. And so I think you need some good engineering information on the storm water management system.

Importantly, because the Newport Road condominium trust recently spent a lot of money in the alley between the new building and the existing building to fix some existing drainage problems, and that was all designed and constructed to deal with the situation at the time. If this system doesn't properly function, the new system next-door it may overtax that system. So that's a concern.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Excuse me Mr. Beals, I don't know if you're aware, but we do have a letter from the Department of Public Works saying that they are confident that they can work with the developer to deal with the runoffs, storm water runoff. And I propose when we get to the point, at some point of voting on this, imposing a
condition that the, that the petitioner take all steps necessary to prevent any runoff of storm water on abutting properties. So I think that issue should be off the table. I mean, and what made me think about this and look at the file, was your very good analysis and letter that's part of the package that the abutters have presented. But I think that issue is not going to be an issue going forward.

PATRICK TEDESCO: If I can further add, the letter from the City makes it clear that while other requirements for relief can be provided by the Special Permit, storm water relief cannot. And it also further says that the project will be subject to thorough and complete engineering review at the time of the building permit, which anyone who has gone through Cambridge knows that that's a very extensive review process.

LARRY BEALS: Sure. So I guess my suggestion would be why approve a project and then have the drainage design -- why not design the drainage and then consider that
when you're approving it.

I'll just use an example. What if they find out that the site is underlaying by clay or bedrock and it's impervious, and their infiltration system cannot work? Or even worse, it's slowly permeable and you have to make it twice as large? Which will then start to move around the various elements of the site plan. So it seems like -- and they're probably right, they're probably confident. I wouldn't be that confident. I'd want to at least dig a hole in the ground and see what's under the pavement.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Well, again, if what you're suggesting might happen did happen, they'd have to come back before us and with a new plan or a relief from the condition. Because it's going to be a condition that there can't be any runoff. And it's up to them to solve that, to deal with that. And if they can't, we'll have another hearing, God forbid, and discuss it. It's not an issue right now, theoretical issue right now.
LARRY BEALS: So what you're suggesting is there would be a condition that says there will be no runoff --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yes.

LARRY BEALS: -- up to and including --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yes.

LARRY BEALS: -- a 100 year storm --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yes.

LARRY BEALS: -- and onto the abutters' property?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yes.

PATRICK TEDESCO: I think the condition has to be City requirements really.

JANET GREEN: The City requirements, yeah.

PATRICK TEDESCO: Really. I mean, we can't, we can't overrule the Department of --

LARRY BEALS: But what the Chair was just saying, which I think is a good idea, is that this new development should not direct runoff onto abutting properties. And that's pretty handle as a condition.
PATRICK TEDESCO: I suspect it is. Yeah.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I think the City requirements are such that that's the case.

PATRICK TEDESCO: But the Zoning Board cannot get that specific --

LARRY BEALS: So as a person working with the neighbors, I don't share your confidence that all of this can be designed without any geotechnical information. And I think that once the geotechnical information's generated there may be a different conclusion.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Well, again, if that's the case, we may have to have another hearing.

LARRY BEALS: Yep, I understand.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: We don't know that. And I don't think it's required -- I know it's not required that every little potential problem be dealt with in advance. There are certain things in a project that's as complicated as this, that gets deferred to various city bodies. And
that's what will happen here with regard to storm water management.

LARRY BEALS: And I understand. I'm just offering my opinion.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay.

LARRY BEALS: And the Board will make its own decision.

I do think some of the notes on the plan should be fixed. There's a note 19 on the civil plan that states there is a storm water tank that's designed to hold or infiltrate the peak runoff. I scoured the plans and I couldn't find a storm water tank. I did find an infiltration area but no storm water tank. So that needs to be added to the plan I guess.

We talked about storm water enough?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: As far as I'm concerned.

LARRY BEALS: Good. Well, I didn't want to leave it undiscussed.
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: No, I know.

LARRY BEALS: And then there are -- we do have some concerns about the site plan. And we mentioned this for the Planning Board, and I'll mention it again. If you look at the site plan, the one all the way on the left, and if you look at it very closely, there's some dashed lines that show how an emergency access would be provided to the rear of the building, the rear of the site. That pathway is quite narrow. It's perhaps 11 feet at its narrowest point. One of the concerns is, and one of the things that hasn't been emphasized, but -- and Jason, if you could just -- can you show where -- so right there. Right at that point there's a cantilever. So the building is cantilevered out about 13 feet or 11 feet or something like that. And so for emergency vehicles to get from the front of the site to the back of the site, they've got to negotiate that narrow pathway and then they've got to go under the cantilever and access the rear of the property. The other thing under that
cantilever is a hydrant, I think, looking at the plans that were submitted. It would seem to me odd to have a fire hydrant under a cantilever of a three-story wood frame building if it were on fire. I think it's not fair to expect a firefighter to go under a burning building to access the source to water to fight the fire.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: With regard to the comment just so the record is clear, we did ask as part of our obligation, the fire chief to comment on these plans. We received no comment back. And I don't know what that means. It means he doesn't see any issues as you've raised, or it means he hasn't paid attention. But the fact of the matter is we've done what we can do. We've asked the fire chief to comment and we don't have any comment right now.

LARRY BEALS: Well, just for example, if you were designing fire access or a fire lane, you'd want it to be 18 feet wide or 20 feet.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Well, I would expect the
fire chief to say that. And if he hasn't said it, then I don't know -- we as a Board are not in this industry, are going to -- should not impose our views on that. We talked earlier -- I raised it earlier, considerable discussion about space between buildings and whether that raises safety issues.

LARRY BEALS: I agree.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And again we got no response from the fire chief.

LARRY BEALS: I guess as a life safety issue I'd at least ask the question one more time if you have any comments.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: We've asked once.

PATRICK TEDESCO: The fire department will do a final review as part of the --

JASON KORB: Do you mind if we comment on this?

LARRY BEALS: Actually, I think this is my time. So if I could just keep going.
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: You'll have a chance afterwards.

LARRY BEALS: Okay, thanks. And so I'll move on.

The other concern is as I understand it, you're approving a set of plans and those will be the controlled documents.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: No. Let's be clear about that, and that's a good point because we haven't raised it. They've given us preliminary plans. One of the conditions will be that the final plans that's signed off by the Building Department is consistent with the preliminary plans. They can't change them, show us and you one set of plans and then the final will be different. But it's not the final plans that we have. We have preliminary plans. And that's very typical of 40B proceedings. Because it's too early yet to have the final plans be drawn up and approved, as we would do for a residential development. So that's, that will be a condition, again, that the
preliminary plans will be -- or the final plans will be consistent with the preliminary plans.

LARRY BEALS: Okay. I think you need to have enough information so that when you're comparing that set of plans that they filed with the final set of plans, you can make that decision.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: We won't make it the building inspector does that.

LARRY BEALS: So the problem I have with the set of plans that were submitted is there are no dimensions on it. So I'm not sure how you can take a set of plans without any numbers on it, compare it to a highly detailed set construction set of documents and say these are the same, because there's no basis for making that comparison. They can visually look the same, but I think it just ought to have a little bit more detail. How tall is the building? How long is it? How wide is it? You know, pretty simple dimensions.
Another thing on the site plan is on these handicap spaces, they are very difficult spaces to get in and out of. The concern I have, I think you can get a car in fairly easily. Getting the car out is difficult. It's a narrow travel lane there. It's 11 feet. And for a handicap van that's quite a maneuver. If you look at the drawing that they submitted as part of package to the BZA, in order for that vehicle to get out of that space, the wheel has to crank all the way over. So they're starting with the wheels turned. And then on the example on the information that they provided, the rear bumper of that van actually goes through the bollards behind it. So that their diagram actually demonstrates an accident. And I think things like that need to be fixed on the plan.

None of the landscape or the architectural plans are stamped. I think responsible professionals should at least stamp them. The site civil plans are stamped.

And you've been gracious with your time, I think
those are the key issues. It does require 18 waivers and that does seem like an excessive --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Say it again, please.

LARRY BEALS: This 40B application does require 18 waivers from the zoning, and because that seems to be a fairly large amount of waivers, I think it's at least within the Board's purview and jurisdiction to request more detail to justify the 18 waivers.

Thanks for your time.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you for taking the time to come down.

KEN SMITH: So good evening. My name is Ken Smith. I live at 7 Newport, No. 8. We talked about access from fire along the side of the building. I want to talk briefly about the parking situation, and I know it's already come up before and I sent a letter in. They've done a great comprehensive survey. Let me actually start by saying I attended the first meeting that these gentlemen presented
at. And as they recall, I walked all three of you out and we shook hands and padded backs. I am absolutely in support of spreading affordable housing throughout the city. I think it's critical and necessary. And we had lots of speakers before talk about it, and I think frankly they gave those of us on Newport Road a little bit of a black eye saying that maybe we're not for affordable housing, and that's not at all the case.

So let me just point out, and I've handed these around, this is the reality as of the 8th of this month right after the big snowstorm, okay? The parking survey was great, but the practical reality is snow happens. And what happened was, and I walked around to the immediate abutting streets, and all of you have a copy of this -- and by the way, I'm also a cycle commuter. I don't on a car. I do ZipCar. My wife and I made that decision. So that's the camp that we're in. I really do believe the practical reality is you're going to see 20 or 30 cars at least.
Especially if you're talking about people with kids. They've got to get to the groceries, they've got to get to the stores. I love everybody to be riding bikes, including tandems and cargo bikes. But I'm just not sure that's gonna happen.

So these were the actual spaces and there were only nine available at the time that I walked around which was approximately 2:30 in the afternoon. Here's my point:

We are over the limit with the requirement with respect to affordable housing in the City of Cambridge. I want this project to work, but more importantly, I want the people who move into it to succeed. If you have too big a project with too many people and too many cars, what it's gonna do to the neighborhood, we don't really know. And what I'm seeing out my window now is what's happening in Southie. People are putting a chair, and I have seen heated arguments and almost fisticuffs, even if you're right, and it's only 50 percent, and 20 new cars, that's everybody on
Newport Road has to move their car. Or maybe half of them can stay and then the people in the new development will move one block down. And then maybe a couple of those people a couple -- it snows. Chair, chairs get put -- I never thought I'd see it in Cambridge. So my only point is it seems as though we're getting an -- it's a question of all or nothing. 40 or nothing. Can't we go back to the original proposal that I completely supported of 27? And if they say that there's a financial hardship, my argument would be, well, if you bought those properties in the back and you laid down a bunch of money before you had the approval from the Board, I'm a business guy, I wouldn't have done that. I wouldn't have put that money down. If you thought this was just going to be rolled over by the Board, that's -- it's hard for you to make the argument that it's significant hardship. But again, I'm generally supportive of the project. I just think for this neighborhood we need to curtail it a little bit. Similar to what you already
decided on the previous request, they wanted the 16-foot dormer and you asked them to make it 15. Pretty much all I'm saying is rather than 40, can we get this back to about 27? Can we make this a little bit more manageable for the community? And I think we should be able to do that where we're not under the 10 percent. We are well over the 20 percent, and we're not saying no, we're simply saying can we make it a little bit more manageable?

Thank you very much for your time.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you for taking the time to come down.

BABETTE MEYER: Hi. My name is Babette, B-A-B-E-T-T-E. My last name is Meyer, M-E-Y-E-R. And I live at 8 Newport Road, No. 7. I would like to read a statement, actually part of a statement, so we're not redundant written by my neighbor Janet Reckman. Janet lives at 4 Newport Road, No. 1. She's a member of the 1791 abutter group and regrettably was not able to be here
tonight. She shared the statement with me based on my own agreement with everything she has written. The following is Janet's statement. I'm just going to skip to I think the part that's probably -- that has not really gone over.

(Reading) As a quick review to the best of my understanding, with Reg 40B in mind, the developers identified an available piece of property and purchased it with Cambridge Affordable Housing Trust funds and then did the same thing with the next two abutting lots for a total spend exceeding $7 million. Expensive. Then the developers told community members at an Agassiz neighborhood council meeting that they were confident there would be no problem getting their friendly 40B Comprehensive Permit approved, allowing them to waive Cambridge Zoning laws and build a development over 400 percent larger than allowed by current zoning. As an abutter, this led me to ask many troubling questions.

How is it the developer can be so confident with
barely a sketch in hand to know that their 40B application would be approved by the City?

Did the developer know at the time that they would be requesting 18 zoning waivers pretty much making a mockery out of the dimensional form where just about every data point they entered failed to meet the ordinance requirements?

Did the developer also think it was okay to pay millions of dollars to acquire the properties with the City's open checkbook and then design a project as large and plain as necessary to make their finances work?

Was this developer led to believe that they had carte blanche with this project based on City funding in support of a 40B proposal regardless of the number of waivers required to design proposed long before any community members were even aware of the initial purchase?

Where did they get the idea that all of this would be okay with the community?
It seems clear at this point that property finances based largely on acquisition costs are driving the size, design, and build of the development. As a best practice, we may need to make finances work for a desired project, not design a project to work for the finances. To do so would be completely backwards, financially irresponsible and disrespectful to the community and most certainly dangerous -- a dangerous approach for the continued distribution of housing funds and development in Cambridge. And I just want to reiterate that Janet -- I didn't read this, but at the top of her comment was that, please note we're all in favor of affordable housing. It's true.

Thank you.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Last but not least.

SARAH FARRINGTON: If you let me come back, I appreciate it.

JAMES WILLIAMSON: No.
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: James, you want to speak.

Next to last but not least.

SARAH FARRINGTON: All right. I'm Sarah Farrington once again. Thank you for letting me come back. Let me first start briefly if you permit me to just quote Section 21 of the 40B statute. This is the section entitled, "Low or Moderate Income Housing; Applications for Approval Or Proposed Construction Hearing Appeal." I'm not going to quote the whole thing. Just a section of it.

(Reading) The Board of Appeals shall request the appearance at said hearing of such representatives of said local boards that are deemed necessary or helpful in making its decision upon such application and shall have the same power to issue permits or approvals of any local Board, which you already explained to us. But not the part about requesting the appearance.

The official -- any local Board or official that would otherwise act with respect to such application,
including but not limited to, the power attached to said permit or approval, conditions and requirements with respect to height, site plan, size, or shape or building materials as are consistent with the terms of this section.

The Board of Appeals in making its decision on said application shall take into consideration the recommendations of the local boards and shall have the authority to use the testimony of consultants. The concerns since you do not have -- it seems like all of your reports in order from all of the various commissions and boards that are supposed to weigh in, that there should be a continuance on that grounds alone.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Let me tell you from experience, we haven't had a lot of Comprehensive Permit cases, but we've had a number of them. We make a request from everybody. Very few of them get back and give us any comment. And we have -- we can't force them. We can't put a gun to their heads. We make the request and that's all we
can do.

SARAH FARRINGTON: I understand that in some of these case in what Mr. Beals is talking about, we're talking about safety issues. I don't see how you can just say They never responded, therefore.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I can only assume --

SARAH FARRINGTON: -- that to me is a problem. Maybe the problem is -- I'm sorry.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: No, no. I'm sorry.

SARAH FARRINGTON: I shouldn't speak.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I interrupted you.

SARAH FARRINGTON: I lost my train of thought. I'm sorry.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I'm sorry.

SARAH FARRINGTON: That's okay. Let me talk a little bit about height, and I will keep it brief.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Before you do that, let me
go back. We, as I said, solicit the views of each of all the various boards: The fire chief, police chief, legal department. When they don't come back to us, comment, it can be one or two things:

One, they don't have any comments to make. They're satisfied with the project. That's one.

Or the other they didn't want to pay attention or didn't want to get involved, etcetera. We can't force them to give comments. I have to assume that the lack of comments means they have no comments, which means they don't see any safety issues or other types of issues that are within the jurisdiction.

SARAH FARRINGTON: As a resident who owns property next to these properties, I find that very, very disconcerting. And I don't fault you. I don't fault you. What I fault is that maybe this process is not used often enough in this community for there to be an understanding of how important it is that you're making this decision but you
rely on all these other boards. And maybe that something needs to change about how 40B's are handled in the city.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: You have to change the statute. You have to go to the state legislature. The statute is very clear, that we -- it's our decision. We should seek out comments from the various other boards.

SARAH FARRINGTON: I understand.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: But at the end of the day, the buck stops with us.

SARAH FARRINGTON: Well, did you request the appearance of such representatives of local boards?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I have to ask -- the Inspectional Services Department handles the mechanics of it. I don't note answer to that.

SARAH FARRINGTON: All right.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: But we've had many over the years. Many Comprehensive Permit cases, maybe not as many as we should have, but we've had many. And so on all
the boards, we have, according to the Legal Department, know the drill. They know the requirements. They choose not to respond. I don't know what more we can do.

SARAH FARRINGTON: I understand. I did, I did read through the minutes of the Highland -- the Concord Highlands case, and it was, you know, it was a very friendly case. So everybody who came out was very supportive. So I think it's at least with respect to that case, I wasn't able to look at the minutes for the other ones. But it's a different -- I think it's a different case. And it's also a building in a much more industrial, you know, area that's being converted from industrial to housing. So it's a different ball game. And these are very close properties -- these houses are all very close to each other.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Understood. But everybody knows, this project is not being done in the dark of the night. It's been vetted, talked about --

SARAH FARRINGTON: Oh, believe me, I've been at a
lot of these meetings.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I know you have. But the fact of the matter is if the boards don't want to comment on it, I can't -- I don't know what I can do it about it or we can do did about it as a Board.

SARAH FARRINGTON: Well, we'll have to think carefully what we're thinking from our side on that. Briefly on height if I may?

So the elevations from the west, which these renderings are lovely, but they really don't show how the new masonry construction really overwhelms the three historic structures on either side. I find that really problematic. That's No. 1.

No. 2, new construction along Mass. Ave. There are four current projects from Harvard up to the corner of Linnaean -- I'm sorry the corner of Upland. Four projects are all four stories. There's nothing more than four stories.
The two lots across from -- that are part of Lesley's -- at least the ones that Matt talked about -- I think Matt talked about, or maybe Sean talked about. Somebody talked about those lots, about trying to get parking from Lesley. Those lots ultimately will be developed. They're part of the Lesley Porter Overlay.

The Mount Vernon residents, as far as I know, at least somebody on the Lesley working group, lobbied very hard to make sure that the height of development on those lots would only be 45 feet. Okay? So that's already gone through, that's been vetted as gone through a public process. That's really important to me, especially because I'm on the other side and they basically said, put all the development you want over there. That really bothers me.

Okay, so we've got, we've got existing new development. The only last thing I will say is that the one of the folks who have spoken in support of the affordable on this project mentioned the Cambridge Housing Authority
development on the corner of Garfield and Mass. Ave. and how this was mentioned in the Agassiz -- the most recent update of the Agassiz Neighborhood study which was done in 2008. And we incorporated those comments into our, into our packet.

My intention for incorporating that was not to say necessarily this should be the design standard, but to say there's a process here for neighborhood studies. The last one was done in 2008. It hasn't been done in ten years. We should not be making decisions for height along the avenue or height in Agassiz without going back and -- these are precedent decisions. They will -- other developers, whether they're for-profit or not, will come in and say look, we can do this now. This has been done. We can do this now.

I appreciate your taking the time to think, to listen to me.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I appreciate you taking the time as well. Thank you.
SARAH FARRINGTON: Thank you.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Just two more. You and James who is sitting in the bushes there.

STEVEN DIAMOND: I'm sorry, I was not able to stand on that long line. My name is Steven Diamond. I live at 61 Frost within a couple of blocks of this proposal. I'm just gonna spend a little time talking in detail about the issue of parking. I hope you received my letter.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yes, we have all the letters in here.

STEVEN DIAMOND: Okay. I was formerly director of design review of housing at the Boston Redevelopment Authority. So I understand. I'm an architect, and I understand the problems of dealing with this kind of decision. But I -- and I just want to give you more detail of what's the situation is with parking. I've been working with the Agassiz neighborhood for a long time, and one of the things that we've been working on is supporting the
local businesses along the avenue between the Common and Porter Square. One of the things that we've been concerned about is parking for those businesses, either for the -- their staff or their owners. My barber has to put money in the meter in order to find a place to park. Now that takes away a space from his potential customers. So then one thing that you should consider is that parking is also needed for commercial spaces which we, which the city wants to support small local businesses.

The other things, thing that I want you to consider is that the parking on the street is extremely tight. Right now, as has been explained to you, with snow on the ground many of us can't find a place to park. If we move out, we don't have any chance of parking again. It was mentioned that other buildings in the area have no parking. These are the buildings that were built before there was a requirement to have parking, and that very point we have a -- I have five buildings, small apartment buildings,
including my own that have no parking space. Now if you're saying we should continue to do that, I don't understand that. The developer himself has said that at least half, or approximately half of the people on this building will have cars. That means on top of our crowded streets they'll have to absorb at least another 20 cars. I think that if -- the architect on this job is one of the best architects I know of. If they had been given a program that says you have to have at least 50 percent parking, I believe they could have done that. I believe they could have done that. And I would like them to reconsider. I'd like the developers to reconsider the proposal and make that part of the program. 20 spaces or some smaller number than 100 percent, but some number of spaces, because you can't treat people with lower incomes less well than if this were a market rate development. Let's have some equity here. I would be up here just the same explaining the need for parking if it was a market rating. It's unacceptable, and I think, and I
think demeaning to this project that claims to be 100 percent wonderful affordable housing but not providing at least the opportunity for some parking.

So I can stop there.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Please. I don't mean to be disrespectful. The points you made are points made by others and that's the points we've had in our questioning we recognize already. So I appreciate you taking the time and staying here, but that's the reason for that. I don't mean to be -- I apologize.

STEVEN DIAMOND: Okay, I understand. Let me throw out one more blasphemous remark. One of the problems with putting parking on the site is the cost of doing it. Which does -- which serves the neighborhood better? Saving that house that's on the front of the lot and saving the two houses in back? The renovation proposed of the two houses in back is not historic conservation. Why are they saving them? The house on the front would be nice to save, but
frankly from an urban design point of view, I would much rather see a new building built up to the street designed by this very good architectural firm.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I just will comment and the end of it. Charlie Sullivan does not agree with you one bit. Okay?

STEVEN DIAMOND: That's why I said this is blasphemy. I understand.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: All right, James, you're last.

JAMES WILLIAMSON: Thank you. Appreciate it.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Why don't you tell the audience who you are. I know you are.

JAMES WILLIAMSON: My name is James Williamson. I live at 1000 Jackson Place, which is Jefferson Park, the projects.

First of all, I am not -- I wish to align myself with the non-aligned for this hearing. I think it was
unfortunate that you have just sort of only two sides. I think there's a little more --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I want to go home tonight.

JAMES WILLIAMSON: Not everybody is easily, you know, one for or against. And I think probably it's too bad that this project was is called Frost Terrace, it might have been more warmly received if it were renamed Solar Terrace. I just want to make a few information questions.

The renderings don't, I don't think very well show what the actual impact of the three parking spaces is gonna actually be. And I think that would be useful. I'm not, I'm agnostic about what that might mean, but you have one car, people who drive those kind of cars typically they may be even higher than the one shown. So I think that's maybe something to think about.

Also, the comment about what the building is across the street, I did a Google thing. It was actually a building that's just one story. The building directly
across the street is four. And then you have to go up to Mass. Ave. to get to the five, the higher story building for what that's worth.

So, the -- on the parking analysis, are -- did that include metered? I found it interesting how many -- the analysis was there metered, were some of those metered spaces or were those all resident spaces? These are just a couple of questions.

And mention was made with the limited dividend entity, but nobody asked what is the level of profit that is allowed? And I think that would be useful to know and interesting for those of us who care about affordable housing.

Who are in fact going to be the people who are gonna be able to get these affordable units? And I will just say that where I live, which is next-door, buildings got torn down and new buildings are being put up. And because it's tax credit financing, people who used to live
there are not gonna be allowed to move back because they are over 60 percent of AMI, which under tax credit financing, you are not eligible for but that may only be a percentage of the units here which is the complexity that you are referring to. Although I remember a hearing, I remember a meeting of the Board of Commissioners at the Cambridge Housing Authority lawyers working on these elaborate and complex finance deals normally charge $500 an hour. So much for affordability.

I have a specific question which was mention was made of a residence service coordinator, and I just wondered is that going to be a full-time position? Because I think that would be useful to know.

So my comment: I don't think this is really a nimby thing. I think maybe there's a little bit of that on the part of some people, but I don't really think that's what's going on here. As somebody who lives in -- I mean, I'm glad that people who both don't live in affordable
housing, care a lot about affordable housing. I'm glad that people who do live in affordable housing care as do I. But people who live in affordable housing, and I really appreciated the comment just now about, you know, the equity dimension of this. We also care about open space. We also care about design. We also care about historic preservation. We also care about community gardens, that may not be a single zucchini, but we care about the same things that everybody else cares about. And even mention was made about, you know, having two jobs and there's a fight, people get towed out of Jefferson Park all the time because of the difficulty of finding places to park. And people who have two jobs are probably people -- some of them who are gonna need a car to get to the two jobs. So and I'm not saying that means that you should not approve of this project. And here's my final observation, and I think what this means is I'm generally broadly in support of this project but or and, when I look at this and the first glance
I took at it, I saw a boxy building next to a historic church and it bothered me. That church, I don't agree with Charlie Sullivan, that the steeple had to be replaced with this earlier version, but that's what was done. It was moved forward. There's a history here. That church, and people were upset -- some people were upset with what was going on with the church. The church got moved and the steeple got replaced. And there's a boxy rather large building being proposed for next-door, and I wonder whether that relationship couldn't be better. That's -- and I think about, and I'll close with this, Temple, Temple Place. Temple Place was right across the street here. That I believe is also a 100 percent affordable project and supported by the Affordable Housing Trust. It was originally going to be six stories, they had to remove one because they had some financing problems. They put the parking interestingly underneath it, if you look at it. And I don't know if that's a great solution, but what's
interesting is that building is sort of hidden behind a big
building on Mass. Ave. and there's no -- there's no building
like this right next to it. And I think that means that we
might try to think differently about this proposal and this
relationship and see if we can't come up with a better
solution that still does a lot of affordable housing.

So thank you.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you, James.

I'm going to close public testimony. And I want
to say at the outset, and I want to say I thank, I sincerely
thank each and every one of you for taking the time to come
down and spend the late hours, to stay to this late hour.
We have no choice and we're going to spend a lot more time
after you folks have left, but it's a good sign for the City
of Cambridge that people are interested, are involved, they
have opinions, and it's consistent with Cambridge,
everybody's not unanimous. There are opinions in support,
there are opinions in opposition, but I myself didn't hear
one comment, in my judgment, that demonstrated a lack of good faith or a desire to do what they think, they think is best for the City.

So with that I'm going to stop. We usually give the petitioner time to give final comments, the hour's late --

JASON KORB: We have some very quick.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay, but I want you to address -- no speeches. Address specific issues that were raised by the people.

JASON KORB: Yes, I'm going to run the list really quickly because I know it's late. So, with -- just very quickly I want to enter for the record and we submitted -- so I just want to clarify for the record that we submitted the approved project notification form approval from the Mass. Historical Commission. So we have an approval.

We have a Letter of Recommendation from the
Cambridge Historical Commission, Charlie Sullivan, who is also a member of the Massachusetts Historical Commission. He's one of the most highly regarded people in the state when it comes to historic preservation.

And we also have approval from the Mass. Historical Commission because we are utilizing federal funds in this project. And they actually reviewed the prior proposal, which was more extreme alterations to the rear of the building. So I'd like to enter that for the record.

With regard to storm water management, an infiltration just very quickly to put our neighbors at ease. David Biancavilla who is from BSC Group, was also the civil engineer on Lesley University. Lesley University was nice enough to give us all of their reports. They put in a major basement in subgrade basement, 15 feet, and we have all their reports. And we have a pretty good sense of what the soil looks like on our site based on what's on their site. So we thank Lesley for that.
With regard to the emergency access in the fire department, the fire department was one of our first stops because we -- obviously. And we met with Lieutenant Towski twice. We followed up with memos that are in his files. You are welcome to go and look at those memos. We altered the plans. These plans fit what Lieutenant Towski asked us to do with regard to the fire hydrant and the overhang. He gave us a pumper truck to put on our plans and David did all the turning radiiuses and the heights and so --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: It would have been nice if this gentleman gave us that report.

JASON KORB: Understood.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: It would avoided a lot of questions and accelerated our hearing.

JASON KORB: And we also have no control over that. And we're happy to provide those memos. We're also happy to provide those memos to our neighbors as well.

There have been a lot of memos and documents traded. We've
done our best to put everything possible online. And we're happy to provide them with curb report as well if they would like that. With regard to the dimensionals, with -- in terms of what's the -- Larry Beals raised the question about, well, what's the width of the building? Every plan has a scale on it. And so that all of those dimensions could be scaled off.

With regard to the handicap spaces, and we'd like to thank you, Larry, for this. Larry questioned the turning radiuses, and we went back and looked at that based on his comments. We would like to submit this revised plan, which has very minor changes. David, about an hour ago gave it to Larry to look at. I'm just going to explain it.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: It's de minimus.

JASON KORB: It's de minimus, but we want to just enter it for the record. Okay? All that happens, and I'm going to -- Sean, you show the Board and I'll show the audience. These parking spaces from here, right? To here.
The hedge lines stay the same.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Show the Board.

JASON KORB: Yeah, I'm sorry. I apologize.

Sorry. I haven't been here in a while.

The parking spaces moved from -- Jennifer, why don't you do it.

JENNIFER BROOKE: Parking spaces moved from here to here.

JASON KORB: The hedge line stays the same. So the visual from the street stays the same.

DAVID BIANCAVILLA: And all the turning movements were done through (Name) with their design standards for a large car. Essentially what you're looking at are a turning movement for a Lincoln Town Car.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I don't --

JASON KORB: It is de minimus, but we wanted to -- we wanted to get it on the record.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I'll try to speak loudly.
I don't want to make too much about the handicap parking. There's no requirement that you have any. You've offered three. I am sure you will work with the city to make those spaces as functional as possible. But this project is not going to fall or rise based upon three handicapped parking spaces. So I think we made -- we probably spent too much time on that issue in my judgment. A lot more time could have been spent on the parking for the people who don't need -- who are not going to need handicap spaces. That is a major issue, as you've heard. It's certainly a major issue with me, but we'll get to that in due course.

Anyway, anything else?

JASON KORB: For the record, I think the revised set of plans are all stamped, I believe.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay.

JASON KORB: So, Jason, you stamped your plans?

JASON FORNEY: Uh-huh.

JASON KORB: David's plans are stamped.
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you.

Do you have the set of the plans, the ones that -- I have them. We've got them here. That's it.

Okay, I'm all set. We need to....

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Those are the ones we presented tonight.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Right. I want the ones that were part of the file --

ANDREA HICKEY: Underneath here?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: -- right there.

ANDREA HICKEY: All of this stuff is part of the pile.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Those are the supplemental plans.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: That's what I'm looking for. Thank you.

Okay. I'm going to close public testimony. And the time is now for us to debate and make a decision one way
or another.

Does anyone wish to go first? I'll go first if no one else wishes.

GEORGE BEST: You go first.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thanks a lot. This is not an easy project in my judgment as been pointed out over and over again. There's great departure from our zoning requirements in terms of what's going on here. There is serious issues I think regarding parking. But, and I think that's a big but, there is a need for affordable housing in the City of Cambridge, more affordable housing.

Two, and may be more important, there is a need for affordable housing in this part of Cambridge. In the past all the affordable housing seems to be in East Cambridge or out on Concord Avenue. We need to spread it around, around the city. Who knows, maybe if we prove this, and in the future we'll have an affordable housing case on Brattle Street. I won't hold my breath on that.
The fact of the matter that we do. You've got to balance. No affordable housing project in a city like Cambridge is going to be perfect and meet every requirement and every item of zoning. I balance the need for affordable housing, the location, the thoughtfulness that's gone into this, and, you know, a large community support. Not necessarily the support of the abutters, but large community support. And to me, these outweigh the real detriments to this project, starting with parking. So I think if we -- I'm going to propose that we vote in favor of it subject to a number of conditions, not many, and I welcome additional conditions or comments from other members of the Board when we get to that. But that's how I come out.

Yes, the building is higher than our zoning allows, but it's not that much higher. And the density is not that -- and it's not any greater than any other apartment development in an area. Parking, though, is an issue. And you can show me all your surveys you want,
there's going to be a big problem in this area for parking going forward. That's just a fact of life and the price I think we're going to have to pay if we're going to have affordable housing in that part of Cambridge.

Those are my views.

GEORGE BEST: So I want to thank everybody for coming tonight, first of all. And for me personally I haven't taken any of your comments lightly. I'm a lifelong resident of Cambridge. I was born in the Cambridge City Hospital in the Cahill House. How's that?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Don't brag.

GEORGE BEST: Right.

Cambridge is going through a transformation, and along with it we have to transform. We have a convergence of bicycles and cars and less parking spaces. If you go down Cambridge Street -- I go to Skenderian, for instance, to pick up my medication. I have to park across the street, if there is a parking spot, because there are two new bike
lanes right in front of his door. So all of those things are considerations that we need to, as Cantabrigians, get used to. I mean, it's really a change.

But I personally am in favor of this building and I'll tell you why. A lot of the buildings that have been recently built are one and two-bedroom apartments, and we're looking at family apartments here in a family neighborhood where people can go down the street is to parks and school. And Benjamin Banneker is right down the street. So which encourages, you know, more people of diverse backgrounds to move into that area.

So when you're looking at the landscape of Cambridge, if you look at it when I was growing up, it's 150 percent different. So we're trying to bring it back somewhat. And with all of these high rents, and I know because I'm a landlord myself, I have to keep the rent low to get people in that I can, you know, that can afford it. And I work with them tirelessly. So I just want to say that
when you're looking at -- yes, it's a change. Yes, everybody's not going to be satisfied. But in the end result, what are we looking at and what are we coming out with? So if we're not looking at it from a personal standpoint, then -- and we're looking at it as benefitting someone else, then what do we arrive at? How are we helping somebody else?

That's all I have to say.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you, George. Anyone else want to talk?

JANET GREEN: I also feel support for this project, and I think the reasons have been stated. I think this project -- I live near the Agassiz neighborhood, and I really appreciate the comments about encouraging the diversity of our city to be more spread out around the city. But I don't think that's the only reason that we want to do this. I was really struck by the heartfelt comments of people who were both in favor and against this project. But
I think at the core of it what people were saying was we do support this. And whether there's this problem and there's that thing we like or whatever, I think that's going to come with this, but I think on balance this project has really gone far in trying to find best solutions in working. And so I am in support of this project.

ANDREA HICKEY: I support this type of housing specifically in this neighborhood. What troubles me is sort of the idea or concept that lower income people maybe don't deserve parking spaces. That concept troubles me a little bit. But I think that everything has a tradeoff. And to house a low or moderate income family, might cost their ability to have a parking space. I think the priority here is to bring families to this neighborhood that represent sort of a socioeconomic diversity that may not exist there now. And the tradeoff is parking. I don't take it lightly, but I think the more important thing is to provide this type of housing in that neighborhood. So I struggle with the
parking greatly because, again, I think that knowing that perhaps 20 of these units will have cars will make a real impact on this community, the people that live there now. But for me the overwhelming sort of benefit of providing these type of units sort of causes me unfortunately to have to put the parking issue aside.

So, thank you.

PATRICK TEDESCO: I'm also inclined to support the project, and I really do appreciate the passion of the comments on both sides. And I really empathize with the abutters who worked so hard with the design team and the developer who perhaps didn't arrive at the complete satisfactory place. But I can assure you your efforts have made the project better. I have no doubt about that.

I was most moved by a comment that was made early when someone said, when you talk about a unit of housing, you're talking about a family or a disabled person or a person who might be on the verge of homelessness. You know,
when you say, well, it shouldn't be -- affordable, it should be 27, that's 27 families, right? That's 27 families who won't be able to live in Cambridge. Let's not compare that to feet of an attic dormer, because it's a very, very different condition.

And the last thing I will say, and I said this earlier, I will commend the design team not only in response to the Planning Board, which I think was just two days ago, but to the success of redesign. Because I agreed with the Planning Board comments, frankly, about the severity of the facade especially facing the condominiums, so I do appreciate that.

So that's it.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you.

I think it's time for a motion, a formal motion. It's going to be a little bit long, but I think -- and please pay attention to the conditions at the end. Most of what I'm going to say is standard stuff.
But the Chair moves that we find that the petitioner has met all of the jurisdictional requirements of 760CMR, that's code in Massachusetts Regulations 31.01. Namely, that they have represented that they are -- will be or are a limited dividend organization.

That they have submitted an eligibility letter with regard to financing, which is all that's required at this stage.

And that they have barely, in my view, demonstrated that they control the site. I'm still very much troubled -- this is not part of the motion, by the fact that you didn't give us a 99 year lease. I don't know what's in that lease. I don't know what there might be in terms of early termination. I would have liked to seen that lease. And the reason you didn't give it to me makes me more suspicious about what's in it. But I think, again, as we talked about before, there are pros and cons here, and I'm willing to live with the fact that we have to rely on
the notice of lease and not seeing the lease itself.

Continuing with the motion: That we -- the Board finds that the applicant has submitted to us a complete and satisfactory application for a Comprehensive Permit, which includes preliminary site development plans, preliminary scaled architectural drawings, tabulation of proposed building units by type and size, and information concerning ground coverage and related data.

Further, the Board finds that the applicant has submitted evidence concerning the continuing -- continued need for affordable housing in the City of Cambridge and the surrounding region.

That next that the project consists of 40 units, as we all know, all of which will be affordable according to the requirements of Chapter 40B, and of eligible subsidy programs.

The units will be developed with the state or federal subsidy, and will be subject to long-term
affordability restrictions required them to be sold initially and on resale at restricted prices to help those with incomes below 80 percent of the area median income.

That in reviewing the project, this Board has not identified any significant health, safety, environmental design open space or no adverse impact on storm drainage, traffic, or other engineering and planning matters that would support denial of the project or outweigh the local or regional housing need.

But, again, I would mention that we did -- have identified a number of issues that are concerning, and the be conditions that will also deal with some of those as well. So it's a close call, but I believe in my view, and I believe hopefully the board members agree with me, that they have met this requirement.

I think with that, I would say based upon the above determinations and findings that I've just identified, the Board finds that the proposed development meets the
requirements for a Comprehensive Permit under Chapter 40B, and that such a permit shall be granted to the applicant subject to the following conditions:

One, that final and detailed construction plans must be submitted to the building inspector to ensure that the final plans are consistent with the preliminary plans submitted by the applicant, the first page of which has been initialled by the Chair.

Two, that the petitioner shall take all necessary steps to prevent, and at all times and under all circumstances -- to prevent at all times and under all circumstances storm water runoff from being discharged onto abutting properties, up to and including a 100-year storm event.

And three, that in no event shall any of the dwelling units proposed to be erected on the site ever be used for any purpose other than to provide affordable housing as proposed by the petitioner.
Go ahead.

ANDREA HICKEY: You mentioned sale or resale of units, and I think you meant to say perhaps renting or re-renting or letting of units.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I think that's right.

ANDREA HICKEY: So you may want to just correct that part of your findings.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: We'll do that in the minutes. Thank you.

GEORGE BEST: So is there any plan to dissolve your corporation down the road and sell this to another management company or something like that? Because I'll tell you why, because I was on the Rent up of 808. Now when management owns it and it's no longer affordable housing. So I don't want that to transpire.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Well, again, I made it one of the conditions is that these units can never be used other than for affordable housing. So, if they do that --
ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Regardless if we sold them or not.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I'm sorry?

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: I said that restriction would be regardless if we sold them or not, you're putting a restriction on the permit.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yes.

GEORGE BEST: But I asked the question is it your plan --

JASON KORB: Yes. The answer is, no, that would not happen. Unfortunately in the paths, the developers were only required to commit to 30-year affordability terms.

ATTORNEY RUTH SILMAN: Or 40.

JASON KORB: 30 or 40.

So what you see now is a lot of what's called expiring use properties. The legislature actually passed a law called 40T to try to deal with that issue. Now, we've learned from our mistakes, this will be affordable in
perpetuity.

GEORGE BEST: Yeah, okay.

JASON KORB: And I encourage you to put that in bold letters in the decision.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Anything else?

PATRICK TEDESCO: Just the comment about the storm water and 100-year storm. Are you comfortable with meeting --

DAVID BIANCAVILLA: Well, it's typically you can't increase the rate of runoff onto abutting properties from which the existing conditions. I think that's what we would agree to. We have talked with DPW, and right now the site is not connected to the city storm water system on Mass. Ave., and they're letting us connect into that system. So our runoff will leave the property. It will just go into the Mass. Ave. storm water system.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay. If that doesn't happen or there are problems, you're going to have to come
back before us.

DAVID BIANCAVILLA: Well, we still need the storm water permit from the DPW.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I understand that.

DAVID BIANCAVILLA: That's not part of the Comprehensive Permit. SO that will get reviewed at that time by the city.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I think that's the motion.

All those in favor, please say "Aye."

(Aye.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Five in favor. Permitted grant.

(Alexander, Green, Hickey, Tedesco, Best.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you, all.

* * * * *
(11:00 p.m.)

(Sitting Members Case BZA-4874: Constantine Alexander, Janet Green, Andrea A. Hickey, Patrick Tedesco, George S. Best.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: The Chair will call our regular agenda that was supposed to start at 7:30. The Chair will call case No. 4874, 2050-2070 Mass. Avenue.

Is there anyone here wishing to be heard on this matter? Let me cut to the chase on this and moving ahead. You're here for a -- you want to add an additional unit to a senior citizens housing.

ATTORNEY SUSAN COHEN: That's right.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: That was approved by a
Comprehensive Permit no less in the 80s. It was a controversial case then, and the Board put a condition on that any increase in the number of units would require you to come back before us and get approval. And you've identified some empty space within the building that can be converted to another unit. So you'll go from 50, which is what we approved back in the 80s, to 51 units.

ATTORNEY SUSAN COHEN: I'm Susan Cohen. I'm general counsel to the Cambridge Housing Authority.

GARRETT ANDERSON: And I'm Garrett Anderson in the Planning and Development Department.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Anyway, so that's the issue. And the one more unit, is that an insignificant change?

ATTORNEY SUSAN COHEN: Yes, we believe it is.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And I agree with you and hopefully other members of the board will as well.

I'll open the matter up to public testimony. Is
there anyone here wishing to be heard on this matter?

Mr. Williamson.

JAMES WILLIAMSON: I'm just curious where this is. I didn't hear where this is.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: It's on Massachusetts Ave. -- well, I can give you the address, but you want the location? You go down Mass. Ave., go through Porter Square. You're driving down, there's a (inaudible), there used to be Kentucky Fried Chicken on the corner. It's now an Indian place. Right before that is a senior citizens housing.

JAMES WILLIAMSON: Russell apartments?

ATTORNEY SUSAN COHEN: Yes.

GEORGE BEST: Near the corner of Walden and Mass.

JAMES WILLIAMSON: Thank you.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER FROM THE AUDIENCE: I would just like to speak in support.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: You don't need to. I
don't think they need your support.

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER FROM THE AUDIENCE:  All right.

GARRETT ANDERSON:  It is appreciated.

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER FROM THE AUDIENCE:  That works for me.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER:  Thank you anyway for taking the time.

I don't see any controversy here, if I may speak. It's a very modest change. There's no neighborhood opposition. In fact, there's a tenant of the property has written a letter in support of the project. So I would make a motion that we find that what is being proposed, the addition of one more unit is an insubstantial change and can go forward.

All those in favor please say "Aye."

(Aye.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER:  Five in favor.

(Alexander, Green, Hickey, Tedesco, Best.)
(11:05 p.m.)

(Sitting Members Case BZA-015008-2017: Constantine Alexander, Janet Green, Andrea A. Hickey, Patrick Tedesco, George S. Best.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: The Chair will call case No. 015008, 20 Surrey Street.

Is there anyone here wishing to be heard on this matter?

ATTORNEY JACK MILGRAM: Good evening.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Good evening.
ATTORNEY JACK MILGRAM: Mr. Chairman and all the members, for the record, my name is attorney Jack P. Milgram which is M-I-L-G-R-A-M. And I appear this evening on behalf of the applicant.

SHIH-CHEN HSU: Shih Hsu. I'm the owner of the building.

BRIAN LAU: And my name is Brian Lau, L-A-U. I did the design for the deck addition for the homeowner.

ATTORNEY JACK MILGRAM: 20 Surrey Street is a three-unit residential property. My client has owned it since 2013. All the work that my client has always done at the property has been pursuant to permits. In the summer, this past summer pursuant to a permit my client was doing exterior siding work when he found himself in an emergency situation. Somehow it's not clear to me, but the rear egress of the property became detached, which obviously would be a problem. Emergency work was done to rebuild the rear egress and rebuild the rear decks to the property.
The purpose of being here this evening is to legalize the work that was done at that time.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: It was done not in compliance with our Building Code. I mean, there was a cease and desist order that had to be issued.

ATTORNEY JACK MILGRAM: That's correct because the permit was not issued for -- that's correct.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Right. And it talks about rebuilding a deck that was damaged, you've also expanded it, too.

ATTORNEY JACK MILGRAM: At this time, that's correct. That is correct.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: You're a little bit cute, frankly, with regard to the advertisement and for your case. Now, the relief you're seeking is modest. It's a tight neighborhood. We're talking about the rear decks. I don't find it myself controversial, but I am not pleased with the fact of how you went about running your property and dealing
with our zoning laws. Okay? And don't -- next time if you ever come back, you're going to have a problem.

Any other comments?

ANDREA HICKEY: Not yet.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay, the Chair will take public testimony.

Is there anyone here wishing to be heard on this matter?

(No Response.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Apparently not. I'll close public testimony.

I don't think we have any letters in the files.

PATRICK TEDESCO: Remind me, Gus, remind me of the dimension of the extension?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yes.

JANET GREEN: It's on all three decks.

(Looking over plans.)

PATRICK TEDESCO: I have the dimensions. That's
okay, I have them.

ANDREA HICKEY: I'm interested in knowing how far the decks were expanded beyond what was there previously.

ATTORNEY JACK MILGRAM: About eight feet.

ANDREA HICKEY: Eight feet.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: No, no, no. More than that. A total of 100 feet had been added.

PATRICK TEDESCO: Well, there's eight feet in one dimension.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yeah.

PATRICK TEDESCO: And nine foot, six in another.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And there's more than one deck, too.

PATRICK TEDESCO: Yeah, exactly. This is the original deck and this is the proposed.

JANET GREEN: Doubled.

PATRICK TEDESCO: And it's more than doubled.

ANDREA HICKEY: Yeah.
SISIA DAGLIAN: It's built. It's not proposed.

ANDREA HICKEY: Yeah. That's what troubles me.

That you can't go ahead and do something and then come back and expect us, because it's already done, to say okay. We have rules, and expanding the deck in my mind wasn't part of fixing an emergency situation. I sort of feel it was not done in the proper order, and I'd welcome counsel to speak to that.

ATTORNEY JACK MILGRAM: Sure.

In regards to that aspect of the case I was not involved at that time. The deck was rebuilt before my office was retained.

ANDREA HICKEY: Right. Please don't take this personally. It wasn't --

ATTORNEY JACK MILGRAM: No, I understand that.

ANDREA HICKEY: I didn't mean that as a comment against you.

ATTORNEY JACK MILGRAM: I understand that. From
what has been explained to me -- I haven't driven by the property. From what I understand, though, the property's been 100 years old, and I understand that both the front and rear egress, probably due to the nature of the age of the home, are narrow. And the previous decks that were there, probably by today's standards, are a little bit small. And to be honest, this isn't a primary residence. It's an income producing property. So you got tenants moving in and you got tenants moving out. And due to the narrowness of the staircases and narrowness of the decks, it's been very, very difficult for people moving in and moving out over the years. So I think --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And by expanding the decks you can perhaps increase the rental income.

PATRICK TEDESCO: I mean, the stairs are completely dependent of the deck. And the existing deck was a more than generous landing of the stair. I mean, it was 100 square feet.
ATTORNEY JACK MILGRAM: I mean, obviously the homeowner is here, the homeowner can testify. But from what I understand, it's been people moving in and people moving out over the years, it's been difficult. That's what's been provided to me as the rationale for the increase of that.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: But why didn't they go to the Building Department when they found this damage and inquire about building permits and find out what they got to do? I mean, it got to the point where they got caught by and a cease and desist order went out. That's what troubles me. It was not -- you didn't approach this in good faith. Your clients didn't, not you, sir.

SHIH-CHEN HSU: It was not a get caught. We were in a panic and tried to fix it, and we sometimes tried to get a joint done, try to repair for these applications. But at that time we take sometime for the application and those kind of things. So before we finish it, we, we are trying to have proper document to submit, but before we have not
finished, one of our neighbor complained, yes.

ANDREA HICKEY: Did a licensed contractor do this deck expansion for you?

SHIH-CHEN HSU: Yes, contractor, but at that time we are in a panic moment because there are no second stairs at the time. The second stair was damaged, and we -- basically we tried to just fix it.

ANDREA HICKEY: Did the contractor recommend that you pull a proper permit? Was there any discussion about that?

SHIH-CHEN HSU: Yes, we are try to pull --

ANDREA HICKEY: I mean before the work was done respectfully.

SHIH-CHEN HSU: Yes. We are in the process to prepare for A document to apply.

ANDREA HICKEY: Right, but after the fact. Properly done it's applied for before.

SHIH-CHEN HSU: In between. We are already in the
preparation. But the whole thing happened in about -- the whole thing finish -- happen in about ten days.

PATRICK TEDESCO: But how does the emergency prepare relate to your decision to expand the deck? Okay, how is that related is what I'm trying to understand?

SHIH-CHEN HSU: Okay, because at that time we feel that the original deck was not safe because if you look on the first floor, there are some of that --

PATRICK TEDESCO: Okay, but how does that justify expanding it is what I'm trying to understand? I'm sorry, I don't mean to interrupt.

SHIH-CHEN HSU: Because we find out there are some safety concerns where we don't -- we don't expand it because people in and out and other people move the furniture up. They always move furniture up by lifting, by lifting from one neighbor to the others, and very difficult to move. The patio, this happened right above those bulkhead in the areas. So very difficult kind of dangerous to move the
furniture in and out and avoid just -- spend as much that we can move the furniture from the driveway there.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Did you expand the staircase as part of this project?

SHIH-CHEN HSU: No the staircase. Basically the same staircase.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Same?

SHIH-CHEN HSU: Yes.

PATRICK TEDESCO: Have you had a response from your rear abutters?

SHIH-CHEN HSU: Yes, we have a support --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yeah.

SHIH-CHEN HSU: Yeah, that's -- from the, from our rear end, front, as well as side neighbors support us. They saw us there and they know that structure there need to be improved because it dangerous, and we do get support from our neighbors.

JANET GREEN: Is one of those the neighbor who
said you weren't doing it right? You didn't have a permit?

Who was that neighbor?

SHIH-CHEN HSU: The neighbor is one of the

neighbor is on the 16 Surrey Street, yeah.

GEORGE BEST: So when you hired your contractor, did they tell you what they needed in order for them to proceed to build the deck? So when you hired the contractor --

SHIH-CHEN HSU: Yes.

GEORGE BEST: -- did he tell you that there was some paperwork you needed to have done before, not now, before when you were building the original?

SHIH-CHEN HSU: Yes. This happened at -- we pull the permit to work on the siding, okay? And the same contractor doing the siding, and this happened that damage of the stairs. And the same contractor, they find out -- they say that they can just help us to build it at the same time we tried to get some to prepare, because they
are available at that time and they are doing, they are doing the siding, so it's -- they are there just help us to fix it and that's what happened.

GEORGE BEST: Okay. So he didn't tell you you needed a permit to build a deck?

SHIH-CHEN HSU: No, no, we, we -- they tell us we need a permit then. So we right in the process to making the design, those staircase, we do. But the whole thing happened in a very short period of time. So when we are in the process of design those and provide the paperwork. At the same time, yes, we make a mistake that we continue to get it done because it happened, because it's time window about less than ten days the whole thing can be finished. And at the same time we tried to have the whole thing prepared, but it's not, it's not finished the paperwork before we start the work.

GEORGE BEST: Okay, so you realized that you were in violation only when the person called and told you?
SHIH-CHEN HSU: No, no, we are already in the --

GEORGE BEST: Now you are. I'm taking about before.

SHIH-CHEN HSU: Before we know the violation before the person call.

GEORGE BEST: Okay. So then why didn't you stop the work at that point?

SHIH-CHEN HSU: Because we already start, we start the design of the work before that.

GEORGE BEST: Right, but if you don't have the okay by the Building Department, you can't build anything.

SHIH-CHEN HSU: Yeah, that's our mistake because we are in the panic because the whole stair was damaged and there's no second exit.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: You talk about preparing the paperwork. You weren't preparing an application for a Comprehensive Permit. I mean, you needed an application from the Building Department to repair the stairs. And they
would have identified for you if there are any legal issues.

SHIH-CHEN HSU:  First, we need to do a plot plan and it takes sometime to schedule the person to come to --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER:  Sir, that's just what everybody goes through in the city if they want to do work to expand a deck. You know, you just can't go ahead and do it on your own and then wait to see whether you're going to get caught. Or if not, you plead mercy on the grounds it took us time to prepare the paperwork. That's not what's going on here -- gone on here.

GEORGE BEST:  So what he's telling you basically is this is putting you in a bad light --

SHIH-CHEN HSU:  Yeah.

GEORGE BEST:  -- because you didn't follow the rules.

So what Board would like to hear is how you intend to follow the rules and what you've done already.
SHIH-CHEN HSU: Okay. You know, this house I pulled the permit, every time follow the rule. This is the fourth permit I pull right now. This one. I have pull three permit. Every time I follow the rule to pull the permit. This is, and these are times because in a panic situation so this happened. Unfortunate it happened this way.

GEORGE BEST: So I'm -- I understand you're panicking, but I don't understand what you're panicking about.

SHIH-CHEN HSU: Because there's no second set of stairway for the people to go out.

GEORGE BEST: So the only way in and out of this building is through that one staircase?

SHIH-CHEN HSU: One staircase in the front and there's one staircase in the back.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yeah, the second means of egress.
SHIH-CHEN HSU: The second one is required.

ANDREA HICKEY: Right. But you don't need a bigger deck to have a safe second egress. I'm troubled by the fact that you went beyond what it would take to address an emergency. That's what troubles me. That you took that opportunity to expand the deck.

SHIH-CHEN HSU: Because was a safety concern.

ANDREA HICKEY: All right, I think we're going around in circles here.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: There can't be a safety concern. If you build stairs that are consistent with the Building Code, by definition this should not be a safety concern. You're expanding the deck because you wanted to give more room for your tenants. That's what's involved. Let's being honest about things.

SHIH-CHEN HSU: Yeah. The main safety concern is one is when people move in and out, because I have a students live there, people move in and out. When they have
the bed or the furniture --

ANDREA HICKEY: Right. So in a case like that, you come and apply for your permit and ask us whether it's okay. You don't do the work and then expect us to say it's okay.

PATRICK TEDESCO: Right. And if the concern was -- and I see what you're talking about. If you want to hoist furniture over the deck, the bulkhead was in the way of doing that. So you could have expanded the deck just beyond the bulkhead. And I don't understand why you expanded it all the way to the property line.

SHIH-CHEN HSU: There is an air conditioning unit right next to the bulkhead.

PATRICK TEDESCO: Well, you know --

SHIH-CHEN HSU: So that's go all the way to the edge of the driveway there.

PATRICK TEDESCO: Well, you know, that may be a hardship argument for moving furniture in and out, but, you
know, why you chose to push it all the way to the property line --

SHIH-CHEN HSU: The other side in the property line, that was the older structure there, the property line. Actually we push it to other side, increase to other side, not toward the property line.

PATRICK TEDESCO: What is this line here?

SHIH-CHEN HSU: The position is the same, not push further to the property line.

PATRICK TEDESCO: What about this? What about that expansion?

SHIH-CHEN HSU: Nothing is -- yeah, that's about one foot post, the position there. It's one foot.

PATRICK TEDESCO: The post for the railing. But the post for the structure align with the, you know, is set back from the property and just like the old deck is. Right? You see them right here.

SHIH-CHEN HSU: A post, yes.
PATRICK TEDESCO: Those are the columns supporting the deck. These are just posts supporting the third floor rail. Is that correct?

SHIH-CHEN HSU: The post --

PATRICK TEDESCO: These are in a different location than these. Look at the elevations. That's what's set back. This is outboard. It's just a newer post for the railing.

SHIH-CHEN HSU: Yeah, we do not -- the stairs there, the stairs there is very close to one of the posts, because, because construction there. From a distance there, if we can, a small distance and then we can come in and out, it would become visible.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Why shouldn't we just give you permission to rebuild a stair as it was before and to remove additional deck that you put up there? That seems to be the right solution. If you want it -- you had stairs, they were damaged, we'll give you permission to rebuild
those stairs. But to go ahead and add deck, and essentially where you didn't go before our Board to get permission or go to the Building Department, and in a tight neighborhood with setback issues, I have a lot of problems with what you've done.

SHIH-CHEN HSU: Actually in this neighborhood, the setback is both of our neighborhood. The setback like my left-hand side neighbor setback is actually is less than ours. And our kitty corner -- and so in our neighborhood is a very --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I understand that, which all the more reason not to expand the size of the deck. You're in a tight neighborhood, which I went by the property, and I acknowledge it. You shouldn't be expanding the deck particularly the way you've done it without getting permission or trying to get permission from our Board at the outset. Why shouldn't you go back to what you had before?

PATRICK TEDESCO: Or come back to the Board with a
request for a Variance and explain the hardship. Right?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yeah, that too.

JANET GREEN: Is that his wife who is trying to speak?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I know, I was letting our dialogue go. Come forward.

ANDREA HICKEY: Give your name, please.

SUSAN HSU: I'm Susan.

SHIH-CHEN HSU: This is my wife.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I assumed or your sister. I figured it was one or the other.

SUSAN HSU: So sorry. Because why?

THE STENOGRAPHER: Give your name, please. Susan. Susan who?

SUSAN HSU: H-S-U.

And for this, for this house, the front entrance going up is so, so narrow, okay? It's very narrow.
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yeah.

SUSAN HSU: So it's very hard for them to move the mattress up and, you know, move the furniture.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Right.

SUSAN HSU: And so they always move from the back. And then when they try to pull the, you know, the mattress up so they cannot move that mattress from the front, so they will move from the back. But when they move, when they move on the back, some -- because it's so small, okay. It's so small. And then just fall down. It's so dangerous. That's why we thought about oh, this is not -- because every year, every -- we have three stairs. I mean, three levels. Every year at least we change from one to two of our tenant. And so we though about that oh, this is not right because, because the front, the front entrance is so small about --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: But, Ma'am, I'm sorry to interrupt you. But the process is you want to make the stairway a little wider than it was before, you go and get,
you pull a building permit. And if you got to get zoning
relief, you come to see us first. What you don't do is what
you've done. You just went ahead and did it and you got
caught and that's what happened, you got caught and then you
come back to us and say please make it all better after the
fact. That's not the way we expect landowners in Cambridge
to behave.

SUSAN HSU: Yes, we really understand that. And
then because when we are, we are changing the siding, right?
We are just changing the siding and we don't expect we will
change the stairs. And then the, you know, the contractor,
he just oh, this do two thing at the same time yeah.
Because we only have the front. It's too dangerous. Just
because they, we change the whole, the whole three stories
siding, right? And it's so dangerous just have one to go
in, because we have three unit, right? And then we have
three bedroom in each row. So you can see how many tenant.
It is we have nine tenant in that building. So it's so
dangerous. And so we just oh, we better do it, I mean we need to, you know.

SHIH-CHEN HSU: We are really sorry.

SUSAN HSU: Yeah, we are so sorry.

SHIH-CHEN HSU: So sorry that we screw up the time.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yes, you're right.

SHIH-CHEN HSU: We are very sorry.

SUSAN HSU: Yeah.

SHIH-CHEN HSU: We are working in the good faith because you know that I always apply the permit. This one is not get caught, and I apply -- because in the process I try to prepare for this one. And the whole thing happened in just two or three days, those kind of things happened. Very short duration. The whole, the expansion finish only a few days. So at least timing wise we screw up timing and we do not say that okay, we just hold it, don't do anything and, that's our mistake, we did not, we are in a panic and
we move forward so that we, we thought we could catch up to get a permit now. We really very sorry for our -- we made a mistake, and we just come here to ask for your forgiveness because this is first time we make a mistake. I never make this mistake. And this is the first time I make this tiny mistake, I'm hopeful that you can forgive us -- forgive us this mistake. And we will never come back with this problem to the Board. You know, and so we really sorry for the situation.

ATTORNEY JACK MILGRAM: May I see something, please?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: By all means, yes.

ATTORNEY JACK MILGRAM: I know it's late, I understand that. I'm not trying to justify or excuse what happened here. I think we all probably can understand that the concern was -- I've seen pictures. Somehow the rear egress was completely detached from the building. I think in theory would have just had ISD from going to the building
and ordering the building closed. So I think that's what
the panic situation was. As my client has pointed out, to
the best of my knowledge, he's never had any problems
previously on any of the properties he's owned in the City
of Cambridge. He's, you know, pointed out to me that he
pulled permit in 2013 for work. He pulled permits in 2014
for work. He did pull a permit for the siding work that was
done in the summer. You've asked the question which I think
is a very good question, which is well, why should we let do
you this? Again, you have the benefit of having driven by
the property. I just didn't have an opportunity to do that.
From what I understand, of course it was probably a smaller
deck than what you might see today than something that was
built. I think the answer to the question is well, why
shouldn't we make you go back to what was done before? And
nobody wants an emergency situation. But God forbid we have
an emergency situation, there's a fire or some other
emergency situation, and people need to get out of the
house, especially where there's testimony from both homeowners that the staircases are narrow both in the front and in the back. I think if people need to get out of the building with a larger staircase and a wider staircase, it would make it easier for people to do that, especially if you have multiple people living in the unit. My client to make a good faith attempt prior to coming here to go around and speak to all the abutters. Some of the people he was not able to get in touch. People were busy, going here, they're going there, and so they weren't home. However, he did speak to a few people who signed the petition that we prepared.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Right.

ATTORNEY JACK MILGRAM: I believe one in the front, one in the back, and one on the side. You know, to the best of our knowledge there isn't any, you know, opposition from the abutters to this. You know, my client has indicated to the Board that he's, you know, he's
apologized for what happened.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Do you own any other property in Cambridge or outside of Cambridge?

SHIH-CHEN HSU: Yes, I live in Weston, in suburban there, yes.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Rental property?

SHIH-CHEN HSU: My own property.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Oh, your own property. Do you have any other rental properties in Cambridge?

SHIH-CHEN HSU: Yes, I own one other rental property in Cambridge, and I always pull the permit. I have a perfect record. Every time I pull the permit.

ANDREA HICKEY: I'm thinking a little bit about if you came in the right order, would I have approved this?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And the answer is yes, isn't it?

ANDREA HICKEY: It's --

PATRICK TEDESCO: I'm thinking the same thing.
ANDREA HICKEY: It's close to that lot line. I'm not sure that it is necessary, the bigger deck, for safety purposes. I'm certain that it's more convenient. It's not a slam dunk for me that I would have approved this if they came in proper order.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Go back to the comment I made earlier, what about if we require them to reduce the size of the deck, getting it back to the lot line? And still have their new staircase --

ANDREA HICKEY: If it was where it was, I'd have no grounds to object.

SHIH-CHEN HSU: The new --

ATTORNEY JACK MILGRAM: One at a time. One at a time.

SUSAN HSU: Me first. See, because we can see the door, okay? And then because the original deck was small, so when you pull the mattress up, right, it cannot turn because you need to turn in order to get the door in,
because the door is small, and the back door is small. So you need to pull it up and then turn and then get in.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Understood you may need a bigger staircase than you had before.

PATRICK TEDESCO: But actually the staircase didn't get bigger.

SHIH-CHEN HSU: The staircase was in original position. Original staircase is right next to both. The deck is recessed from the staircase.

PATRICK TEDESCO: I understand. What I'm asking myself similar, similar to you, Andrea, is that if you came in and made a compelling argument that the hardship was the inability to move furniture up and down the three decker stairs, which I appreciate because I live in a three decker, for a transient population. And the placement of the bulkhead and the placement of the air handling unit meant that you should safely extend the deck to the west or to the left so that you could access that side free and clear from
the driveway to hoist furniture up, I could probably buy that as a hardship. I have a tougher time, you know, with the additional three feet toward the property line, but --

SHIH-CHEN HSU: Additional bulkhead is less than one foot.

PATRICK TEDESCO: But, again, without abutters complaint I probably would be okay with that. So, you know, I don't want to -- I'm just, that's what I'm struggling with, right? You know, the stair did not get bigger. Let's not talk about safety. The only safety issue I see is hoisting furniture on the deck which is difficult to access because of the bulkhead and the air handling unit.

JANET GREEN: Yes. On the other hand, people have been getting up there, right? I mean --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yeah.

JANET GREEN: -- people have been living there.

It's possible, not maybe the best.

SHIH-CHEN HSU: The position of the stair is the
same, and actually the position of stair is right next to property line.

PATRICK TEDESCO: I understand.

SHIH-CHEN HSU: The deck is recessed from the property line. It's not go all the way to the -- it's recessed. Because the stairs, the same footprint (inaudible) issues but there is some handrail there and -- but we -- this one of one-foot extension, less than one foot from the old deck allow us to have this handrail there. Not intentional --

PATRICK TEDESCO: I understand the detail, yeah.

SHIH-CHEN HSU: And, again, we really sorry for this one.

PATRICK TEDESCO: And the last thing I'll say -- I'm sorry.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: We have to bring this matter to a conclusion anyway.

PATRICK TEDESCO: It's not, I don't understand
your comment about, I'm sorry, where are the drawings? Your comment about the deck not extending toward the property line when this drawing shows --

SHIH-CHEN HSU: I said one foot extension toward the property line.

PATRICK TEDESCO: Yes, but it did extend.

SHIH-CHEN HSU: By one foot, yeah. Because handrail in those positions.

JANET GREEN: And what's this?

PATRICK TEDESCO: That's new --

JANET GREEN: Extended here and there.

PATRICK TEDESCO: Yeah. And the bulkhead's here.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Well, I'm not of a mind to give a free pass tonight.

ANDREA HICKEY: I'm not either.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I think we're going to have to continue this case. You're going to have to come back with another proposal that shows a reduction in the
decks that what you built now that didn't comply with our law, what's in there. Come up with another proposal that's less deck, and particularly better with regard to setbacks, and we'll consider that. In the meantime you are in violation of our Building Code by what you've done. You did something you should not have done and I'm not of a mind to bless it tonight.

PATRICK TEDESCO: Would you consider, and it would be at their risk of course, that they come back seeking a Variance for what they did?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Sure.

PATRICK TEDESCO: That's their choice.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yeah. Counsel can advise them on that.

PATRICK TEDESCO: But if you are denied, you have to tear it down.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yes.

PATRICK TEDESCO: Not the stair.
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: The stair is okay.

Anyway that's what I would do. Now if we continue this case, it will be a case heard and Janet's not available for the next, after February 1st, the next four sessions. So if we continued it, we would continue it to the second hearing in April, which gives you more time to think about what you want to do and come up with plans.

Is that the sense of the Board?

JANET GREEN: There was time on February 1st.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: February 1st is the only time. That's too close.

JANET GREEN: Oh, that's too close.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yeah, it's only two weeks from now basically. No, it's more than two weeks.

ANDREA HICKEY: Just a point of clarification.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yeah.

ANDREA HICKEY: If they were to just voluntarily agree to remove the part of the deck that extends beyond
what was there, would they need relief?

PATRICK TEDESCO: Yes.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yes, because it's non-conforming.

PATRICK TEDESCO: It's FAR.

ANDREA HICKEY: Okay. All right.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Well, actually I miscounted on the time. We could do it on February 1st, because that's about three weeks from now.

Can everybody make February 1st?

ANDREA HICKEY: I'll tell you in a minute.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay, we're going to continue this case which means nothing has happened, and I want you to rethink about doing something with that deck to restore as close to what it was before and satisfying the issues about the staircase. But this deck as you now have, not likely to survive. You're going to have to do something. So I'll give you a time -- we'll give you the
time to figure that out what you want to do. What that means, though, is that you'll have to have new plans with regard to your revised deck in our files by no later than five p.m. on the Monday before February 1st. That's our rules. It's not anything special for you, that's our rules.

ATTORNEY JACK MILGRAM: So let's see what date that is.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: That's a Thursday. It's always a Thursday. The Monday before is obviously sometime in January.

JANET GREEN: 29th is the Monday before.

ATTORNEY JACK MILGRAM: The 29th.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: If not, we'll have to go into the end of April unless you want to go and have a case with only four of us. Remember, you're going to need to get all four votes then. Shouldn't be a big deal to figure out what you're going to do.

ATTORNEY JACK MILGRAM: That's February 1st?
SHIH-CHEN HSU: Yes.

ATTORNEY JACK MILGRAM: All right.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay. We'll continue to February 1st. You'll have new plans for the deck, modified deck, and dimensional form. Your dimensional form is incorrect. The second and third floor decks add FAR. And if you extend the deck, increase the deck, they've increased the FAR and they've further increased their nonconformance with the zoning. It's not fatal. But something has got to be done. You're going to have to help them or a contractor prepare an accurate dimensional form with the revised plans. You might as well draw up new plans to start with anyway or come up with some ideas. But that's for you to worry about. So February 1st?

SHIH-CHEN HSU: Yes.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And there's going to be three requirements and I'll make the motion. I'll make the motion anyway.
The Chair moves that we continue this case as a case heard until seven p.m., it won't be as late as this, on February 1st subject to the following conditions:

One, that you sign a waiver of time for decision, because we're extending it, and we have the waiver right there.

Two, that the posting sign that's there now be modified to reflect the new date and the new time. And that's got to be maintained for the 14 days before February 1st. So you can either get a new sign from Inspectional Services or you get a magic marker and you just change the sign.

And the third is, your new plans, they're going to be new plans, and any revised dimensional form must be in our files no later than five p.m. on the Monday before February 1st, whatever that date is. I don't know what it is off the top of my head. And that's for the purpose of allowing people in the city to see what's being proposed.
ATTORNEY JACK MILGRAM: That's understood. That's fine.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay.

All those in favor on that basis?

(Show of hands.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Five in favor.

(Alexander, Green, Hickey, Tedesco, Best.)

* * * * *

(11:40 p.m.)
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: The Chair will call case No. 015061, 294-302 Windsor Street.

Is there anyone here wishing to be heard on this matter?

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. For the record, attorney Sean Hope, Hope Legal Law Offices. I'm here on behalf of the petitioner.

Can you say and spell your name for the record, please.


BETYA TODOROVA: And Betya, it's my first name. B-E-T-Y-A. Todorova is the last name. T-O-D-O-R-O-V-A.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: This is an application
requesting a Variance. This is a mixed use building at the corner of Windsor Street and Hampshire. This is a site where they had a former barber shop for many years that was deteriorating in terms of not being economically feasible and finally closed. So the owner and the applicant had connected about running -- and this is, it's like a -- similar to a Brookline lunch on Brookline Street, so it's more breakfast, lunch, and brunch. The hours roughly are going to be from six to six. So they're looking to -- it's a 20-seat restaurant. And the focus is going to be vegan food. So one of the benefits of this type of restaurant use there is they don't need heavy ovens or Fryolators. It's going to be all steam. And things are going to be done using some steam convection.

BETYA Todorova: Yeah, like a steam.

Attorney Sean Hope: Because of the residential above --

Constantine Alexander: That's the question I was
going to raise is the residence above and what's the impact of a cooking establishment?

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: That's right. Yeah, so if you've been to Life Alive as well, they have the kind of same operation where you take the raw vegetables and you steam them up and you prepare them. This is the type of cuisine Betya has had six or seven years of experience --

BETYA TODOROVA: Yes.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: -- working in this type of operation. So this is an area that with Lord Hobo there is more and more foot traffic, but it's further away from the train so they really would have to rely on neighborhood foot traffic. And the hours they, you know, I know the hours is not necessarily the purview for this Board, but I think that the concept is driven by the idea that they're going to get some foot traffic from the neighborhood, but they're not looking for a large dinner crowd, but it's more breakfast, brunch, and lunch.
And the hardship is the fact that the building, especially this first floor was at the street, zero setback, and not conducive to residential purposes.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: That's what it's all about.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Yeah.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay. Questions from members of the Board?

ANDREA HICKEY: No.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Is there anyone here wishing to be heard on this matter?

(No Response.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: No.

Okay, I don't think we have any letters, and I don't even have the file.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: I think there is a letter from the East Cambridge Business Association.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay.
JOHN HAWKINSON: What's the name of the establishment.

BETYA TODOROVA: Gypsy Cafe.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: We do have some. We have a letter from a Chris Scott at 22 Portsmouth Street.

(Reading) I'm a resident of Portsmouth Street, directly across from the proposed cafe, on the corner of Hampshire and Windsor. I'm in full support of the cafe thinking it would be fantastic for neighborhood. While sandwiched between amenity hubs, the neighborhood has far fewer cafe amenities than any other areas of the city, and it will be a welcome addition.

A letter from Margie Comcast who resides at 74 Plymouth Street. (Reading) I would like to add my support to the application to open up a coffee shop or cafe at the corner of Hampshire and Windsor Street. I grew up on Plymouth Street and remember there being a number of different shops at this corner. The return of a coffee shop
would be a welcome addition to the neighborhood and could breathe some additional life into this retail cluster.

And a letter from the East Cambridge Business Association. (Reading) On behalf of the East Cambridge Business Association we would like to lend our support for your application. The corner of Hampshire and Windsor is an ideal location for this use. There are other active uses at this intersection that could benefit from the time, day, and weekend foot traffic a coffee shop could attract.

Oh, my goodness we have another letter. The last letter, hopefully, from Angelo Logiudice, L-O-G-I-U-D-I-C-E who resides at -- it doesn't say. Oh, no. (Reading) I am writing to strongly object the proposed petition to convert blah, blah, blah. My concerns are increased level of noise and parking in a highly residential area. I live across the street from the proposed cafe. Since the location is directly opposite the Lord Hobo restaurant and bar which is and has been a problem with noise at night, I am deeply
concerned that this coffee shop would add to that existing problem with people smoking and congregating outside the shop. The noise results in disturbance of the peace and restless sleep especially at night. In addition, parking in the area is not adequate as it is in the neighborhood. I'm a senior citizen, longtime resident in this area. I cannot attend the meeting, etcetera, etcetera. The address is 89A Hampshire Street and that's it.

Now it seems to me that this gentleman's concerns can be addressed by the fact that if we limited the hours to not later than six at night and if we limit the no cooking -- no ovens or other cooking equipment, that should avoid the congregation -- the problems that he identifies.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: I think that might be acceptable. I think the only reference to Lord Hobo, they have a full alcohol license.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Oh, yeah.

JANET GREEN: It's like Lord Hobo, vegan coffee
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: The reason I raise this a little bit, this is instructive. We gave a Use Variance on Western Avenue some years ago for a cafe --

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Yeah.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: -- coffee shop. Well, six months later it was a full scale Mexican restaurant serving alcohol.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: I remember that.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And I don't want to have that happen again. For some reason the Inspectional Services never put a cease and desist order out, and I think they should. Be that -- that's not for tonight.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: I understand.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Anyway, so I think I would limit the hours to no later than six p.m., and the nature of the equipment in there doesn't provide odors, I think we're okay. People agree.
ANDREA HICKEY: I do, yeah. It seems to me that
this would be more of a neighborhood place as well. In
terms of the comment from the gentleman regarding parking
and congestion, it seems to me just knowing the neighborhood
that people will be walking there.

BETYA TODOROVA: Or biking.

ANDREA HICKEY: Yeah.

BETYA TODOROVA: And young people.

SAYED MOUSAWI: But can I make a small request, please.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Go ahead.

SAYED MOUSAWI: Is there a way to make it to seven p.m.? People usually get out of work like by --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I don't have a problem with seven p.m.

ANDREA HICKEY: I have no problem.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: It's not ten or eleven p.m.
SAYED MOUSAWI: Six p.m. might be --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: No, no, that's what your counsel told me.

SAYED MOUSAWI: It's just suggested. It will not go until ten p.m. that's for sure.

ANDREA HICKEY: I have no issue with seven as an outside time frame.

PATRICK TEDESCO: The limits on loading in the morning, right, you can't load, you can't deliver goods and idle trucks, is it before seven, Sean?

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Yeah, before seven.

PATRICK TEDESCO: That's just par for the course for the Licensing Board.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Is that a city requirement or should we make that a condition?

PATRICK TEDESCO: I think it's part of the Licensing Board, right?

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Yeah. I mean well, I mean,
you can put -- but the Licensing Board would also put that condition. They'll pick up the trash and the loading and these other things that when we get our CV license.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I think we can let the Licensing Board handle it.

PATRICK TEDESCO: Yeah. No, I just know it was an issue with Clover. It's a very different thing.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: That's right, because they're doing manufacturing food and commissary style.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay. The Chair moves that this Board makes the following findings with regard to the Use Variance being sought:

That a literal enforcement of the provisions of the Ordinance would involve a substantial hardship.

Such hardship being that these premises are not suitable for residential use as the area is zoned for.

That the hardship is owing to the fact that the nature of the use of the building is such that if -- the
hardship is owing to the fact that this is not -- this building is for a long time been used for a non-conforming purposes, for all that is being sought is to continue this non-conforming commercial use of the property.

And that relief may be granted without substantial detriment to the public good or nullifying or substantially derogating from the intent or purpose of the Ordinance.

So on the basis of these findings, the Chair moves that we grant the Variance requested subject to the following conditions:

That the property will not be open for business later than seven p.m.

That within the property there will be no stoves or other ovens or other cooking, large scale cooking activities.

SAYED MOUSAWI: What about a press oven for example?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: That's not an oven.
SAYED MOUSAWI: It's not heavy equipment.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I should, other activity that would provide strong odors in the area.

SAYED MOUSAWI: Oh, okay.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: All those in favor please say "Aye."

(Aye.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Five in favor. Good luck.

(Alexander, Green, Hickey, Tedesco, Best.)

* * * * *

(11:50 p.m.)

(Sitting Members Case No. BZA-015090-2017: Constantine Alexander, Janet Green, Andrea A. Hickey, Patrick Tedesco, George S. Best.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: The Chair will call case

ATTORNEY DANIEL GLISSMAN: Good evening.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Good evening.

ATTORNEY DANIEL GLISSMAN: Good evening, members of the Board. Daniel Glissman here on behalf of T-Mobile, attorney from Prince, Lobel, Tye, here as part of a systemwide upgrade for T-Mobile, part of the L700 network upgrade, which this Board is quite familiar with.


T-Mobile currently operates eight antennas on the roof, two of which are roof mounted, the rest of which are facade mounted. They're proposing to swap out four of the existing antennas with the newest model of air antennas. These new antennas are only about half an inch wider and 0.9 inches in length longer.

I'd be happy to answer any questions by the Board, but in deference to --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Do we have any comments
from the Planning Board? I don't think so.

ATTORNEY DANIEL GLISSMAN: They did issue a letter, but their letter was no comments.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay. There's nothing in our files.

Questions from members of the Board? We can see the photo simulations, and basically the appearance will be the same afterwards as will be before as far as I can tell anyway. So I have no problems.

Do you want to comment?

ATTORNEY BRIAN GROSSMAN: I think it's great.

ATTORNEY DANIEL GLISSMAN: Thank you.

ATTORNEY BRIAN GROSSMAN: And I think my colleague did an excellent job.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay. I think we're ready for a motion. Are we or not? I don't want to rush you.

ANDREA HICKEY: Yeah.

JANET GREEN: Yeah.
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: The Chair moves we make the following findings with regard to the Special Permit being sought:

That the requirements of the Ordinance cannot be met without, and at least from the opinion of our Legal Department, without the Special Permit.

That traffic generated or patterns of access or egress will not cause congestion, hazard, or substantial change in established neighborhood character.

That the operation of -- continued operation of or development adjacent uses as permitted in the Ordinance will not be adversely affected by what you propose to do.

No nuisance or hazard will be created to the detriment of the health, safety, and/or welfare of the occupant of the proposed use or the citizens of the city.

And that for other reasons that what is being proposed will not impair the integrity of the district or adjoining district or otherwise derogate from the intent and
purpose of this Ordinance.

And finally, a final finding, the Board also finds that the modification of its existing telecommunication facility at the site proposed by the petitioner does not substantially change the physical dimensions of the existing wireless tower or base station at such facility within the meaning of 6409(a) of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012, also known as The Spectrum Act.

Based on these findings the Chair moves that we grant the Special Permit subject to the following conditions:

That the work proceed in accordance with the plans -- one, that the work proceed in accordance with the plans submitted by the petitioner and initialled by the Chair.

Two, that upon completion of the work, the physical appearance and visual impact of the proposed work will be consistent with the photo simulations submitted by
the petitioner and initialled by the Chair.

Two, that the petitioner shall at all times maintain the proposed work so that its physical appearance and visual impact will remain consistent with the photo simulations previously referred to.

Four, that should the petitioner cease to utilize the equipment approved tonight for a continuous period of six months or more, it shall promptly thereafter remove such equipment and restore the building on which it is located to its prior condition and appearance to the extent reasonably practicable.

And, five, that the petitioner is in compliance with and will continue to comply with all in respects the conditions imposed by this Board with regard to previous Special Permits granted to the petitioner with regard to the site in question.

And then we usually have this long horrendous thing about electromagnetic waves. You know what it is. Is
it okay if we incorporate it by reference?

ATTORNEY DANIEL GLISSMAN: Absolutely.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay.

(Inasmuch as the health effects of the transmission of electromagnetic energy waves is a matter of ongoing societal concern and scientific study, the Special Permit is also subject to the following conditions:

One, the petitioner shall file with the Inspectional Services Department each report it files with the federal authorities regarding electromagnetic energy waves emissions emanating from all of the petitioner's equipment on the site. Each such report shall be filed with the Inspectional Services Department no later than ten business days after the report has been filed with the federal authorities. Failure to timely file any such report with the Inspectional Services Department shall ipso facto terminate the Special Permit granted tonight.

Two, in the event that at any time federal
authorities notify the petitioner that its equipment on the site, including but not limited to the equipment permitted by the Special Permit granted tonight, fails to comply with requirements of law or governmental regulation, whether with regard to the emissions of electromagnetic energy waves or otherwise, the petitioner within ten business days of receipt of notification of such failure shall file with the Inspectional Services Department a report disclosing in reasonable detail that such failure has occurred and the basis for such claimed failure, and sixty calendar days after receipt by the petitioner of such notification of failure, the Special Permit granted tonight shall ipso facto terminate.

Three, to the extent that a Special Permit has terminated pursuant to the foregoing paragraphs 1 and 2, the petitioner may apply to this Board for a new Special Permit, provided that the public notice concerning such application discloses in reasonable detail that the application has been
filed because of a termination of Special permit pursuant to paragraphs 1 and 2 above.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: All those in favor of granting the Special Permit, please say "Aye."

(Aye.)

(Alexander, Green, Hickey, Tedesco, Best.)

* * * * *
(11:55 p.m.)

(Sitting Members Case BZA-015044-2017: Constantine Alexander, Janet Green, Andrea A. Hickey, Patrick Tedesco, George S. Best.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: You have photo simulations or new ones?

ATTORNEY BRIAN GROSSMAN: There's ones in there but --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: That's okay.

ATTORNEY BRIAN GROSSMAN: -- it's actually just a photo of the existing conditions. Because everything is behind the screen wall.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I was going to ask you that. When I read it, everything is behind the screen wall. It said no visual impact whatsoever.
ATTORNEY BRIAN GROSSMAN: Correct.

Brian Grossman. Anderson and Krieger on behalf of the applicant, New Cingular Wireless, PCS, LLC. Also known as AT&T.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I haven't called the case yet. Let me call the case.

The Chair calls case No. 015044, Five Cambridge Parkway. And here you've given us the information. Okay, so you're going to replace -- well, go ahead.

ATTORNEY BRIAN GROSSMAN: AT&T has an existing site on the building. There is one sector that is ballast mounted, but there are no changes to the sector. There's only one sector that's being changed. Two antennas are being replaced, one being relocated. But all of that takes place behind the screen wall along with the addition of some remote radio heads and some other minor equipment. Again, still all behind that screen wall.

PATRICK TEDESCO: And the attachments don't
penetrate the screen?

ATTORNEY BRIAN GROSSMAN: No.

PATRICK TEDESCO: They're attached to the screen supports?

ATTORNEY BRIAN GROSSMAN: Correct.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay, ready for a vote?

JANET GREEN: Ready.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: This is a Special Permit. We have to make all of these various findings.

That it appears the requirements of the Ordinance cannot be met without the Special Permit you are speaking.

That traffic generated or patterns of access or egress will not cause congestion, hazard, or substantial change in established neighborhood character.

That the continued operation of development of adjacent uses as permitted in the Ordinance will not be adversely affected by the nature of the proposed use.

And that no nuisance or hazard will be created to
the detriment of the health, safety, and/or welfare of the occupant of the proposed use or the citizens of the city.

And that generally what is being proposed will not impair the integrity of the district or otherwise derogate from the intent and purposes of the Ordinance.

Further, we find that the modification of this existing telecommunication facility at the proposed site by the petitioner does not substantially change the physical dimensions of the existing wireless tower or base station at such facility within the meaning of section 6409(a) of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012, also known as The Spectrum Act.

Based on these findings, the Chair moves that the petitioner be granted the Special Permit it is seeking subject to the following conditions:

One, that the work proceed in accordance with the plans submitted by the petitioner and initialled by the Chair. And that's in here. I'll dig them out.
Two, that upon completion of the work, the physical appearance, and visual impact of the proposed work will be consistent with the photo simulations submitted by the petitioner.

Three, that the petitioner shall at all times maintain the proposed work so that its physical appearance and visual impact will remain consistent with the photo simulations previously referred to.

Four, that should the petitioner cease to utilize the equipment approved tonight for a continuous period of six months or more, it shall promptly thereafter remove such equipment and restore the building on which it is located to its prior condition and appearance to the extent reasonably practical.

And lastly, that the petitioner is in compliance with, and will continue to comply with in all respects, the conditions imposed by this Board with regard to previous Special Permits granted to the petitioner with regard to the
site in question.

And the last thing, we'll incorporate the usual stuff about the Spectrum Act.

(Inasmuch as the health effects of the transmission of electromagnetic energy waves is a matter of ongoing societal concern and scientific study, the Special Permit is also subject to the following conditions:

One, the petitioner shall file with the Inspectional Services Department each report it files with the federal authorities regarding electromagnetic energy waves emissions emanating from all of the petitioner's equipment on the site. Each such report shall be filed with the Inspectional Services Department no later than ten business days after the report has been filed with the federal authorities. Failure to timely file any such report with the Inspectional Services Department shall ipso facto terminate the Special Permit granted tonight.

Two, in the event that at any time federal
authorities notify the petitioner that its equipment on the site, including but not limited to the equipment permitted by the Special Permit granted tonight, fails to comply with requirements of law or governmental regulation, whether with regard to the emissions of electromagnetic energy waves or otherwise, the petitioner within ten business days of receipt of notification of such failure shall file with the Inspectional Services Department a report disclosing in reasonable detail that such failure has occurred and the basis for such claimed failure, and sixty calendar days after receipt by the petitioner of such notification of failure, the Special Permit granted tonight shall ipso facto terminate.

Three, to the extent that a Special Permit has terminated pursuant to the foregoing paragraphs 1 and 2, the petitioner may apply to this Board for a new Special Permit, provided that the public notice concerning such application discloses in reasonable detail that the application has been
filed because of a termination of Special permit pursuant to paragraphs 1 and 2 above.)

ATTORNEY BRIAN GROSSMAN: Understood.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: All those in favor please say "Aye."

(Aye.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Five in favor.

ATTORNEY BRIAN GROSSMAN: Thank you.

(Alexander, Green, Hickey, Tedesco, Best.)

* * * * *

(12:00 a.m.)

(Sitting Members Case BZA-015129-2017: Constantine Alexander, Janet Green, Andrea A. Hickey, Patrick Tedesco, George S. Best.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: The Chair will call case No. 015129, 5 Callender Street.
Is there anyone here wish being to heard on this matter? Give your name to the stenographer.

DARRIN KORTE: My name is Darrin Korte, D-A-R-R-I-N K-O-R-T-E. I'm the Executive Director Cambridge Community Center which is located at 5 Callender Street. We're applying to continue our winter farmer's market that we've run there for the past six years now.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Six years.

DARRIN KORTE: So going into our seventh year we would like to continue doing this. We've seen a lot of benefits for the organization, including increased visibility to the community and the important work that we do.

Increased knowledge and engagement with the community.

It's mission aligned to promote community cooperation and unity by offering social and cultural activities.
Would provide workforce development opportunities for teens that we serve through the market.

It aligns with our goal to be a good neighbor and set example of environmentally sustainable behavior through our practices.

And through the market we've identified partners, volunteers, donors, friends, and grown our community in a very cool and organic way. I don't know if any of you have been there --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I've been there.

DARRIN KORTE: But it is a really great experience.

And then the benefit for the community that we've seen is provide a locally grown produce for community members and food. And we of course have SNAP EBT matching. So we do everything we can to make the products that are brought into the market as affordable as possible to everybody in our surrounding community. And as I said, for
the community it's become a tradition of sorts and a place where people come together every Saturday, and we would greatly appreciate your consideration.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: In the past, the reason you were here before us is because this is a residential district.

DARRIN KORTE: Right.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: You're conducting a business. The first time around we gave you a Variance for one year because we were concerned of the impact on the neighborhood. All went well.

Second time around we gave you a five year extension. And that five years expired which is why you're here tonight.

DARRIN KORTE: Right.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I believe that we don't need to put any time frames on any longer.

JANET GREEN: I agree.
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Just give a Variance and nice seeing you, but we don't need to see you again.

DARRIN KORTE: Well, this is my first time doing this. I became the ED only two years ago. So I was grandfathered into the Variance we already gotten.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay, the Chair moves that we grant the Variance requested to continue to operate this farmer's market. And in connection with that we can incorporate all the findings that we made the last two times in granting the Variance.

The condition -- nothing has changed. So whatever we had before, it's incorporated by reference.

All those in favor of granting the Variance on this basis please say "Aye."

(Aye.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Five in favor.

(Alexander, Green, Hickey, Tedesco, Best.)

* * * * *
(12:05 a.m.)

(Sitting Members Case BZA-015150-2017: Constantine Alexander, Janet Green, Andrea A. Hickey, Patrick Tedesco, George S. Best.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: The Chair will call case No. 015150, 18 Perry Street.

Is there anyone here wishing to be heard on this matter?

(No Response.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: There is no one here.

We are in receipt of a letter from the architect for the project. (Reading) I would like to request a continuance to the next available hearing for our case. The reason is that the property owner is out of the country and was unable to return in time for this date. I've advised here that it would be preferable for her to be in attendance. If possible to schedule January 25th would be
grateful -- we would be grateful.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: There's no hearing on January 25th.

JANET GREEN: February 1st.

SISIA DAGLIAN: February 1st.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: February 1st, right. So we'll continue to February 1st. We have room on the calendar, don't we?

SISIA DAGLIAN: We have six regular cases and one continued so far.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay, we're all set then. The Chair moves that -- do we have a waiver of time for decision? Has he signed? Has Edrick signed one?

SISIA DAGLIAN: I don't know. It would be in the file if it were.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yeah, you're right. It would be. Apparently not. Okay.

The Chair moves that we continue this case as a
case not heard until seven p.m. on February 1st subject to the following conditions:

That the petitioner sign a waiver of time for a decision. Petitioner or her representative.

Two, that the posting sign be modified to reflect the new date and the new time, seven p.m. on February 1st, and that the sign be maintained for the 14 days required by our Ordinance.

And lastly, that to the extent that the plans or dimensional form that's already in our files is modified, that these modified forms must be in our files no later than five p.m. on the Monday before the February 1st.

All those in favor please say "Aye."

(Aye.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Five in favor. Meeting's adjourned.

(Alexander, Green, Hickey, Tedesco, Best.)

(Whereupon, at 12:10 a.m., the
Board of Zoning Appeals Adjourned.

* * * * *

* * * * *
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