BOARD OF ZONING APPEAL FOR THE

CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

## GENERAL HEARING

THURSDAY, MAY 12, 2016 7:00 p.m.
in
Citywide Senior Center 806 Massachusetts Avenue, First Floor Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Constantine Alexander, Chair Brendan Sullivan, Vice Chair

Thomas Scott, Member
Janet Green, Member George S. Best, Associate Member
Alison Hammer, Associate Member

Sean O'Grady, Zoning Specialist

REPORTERS, INC.
CAPTURING THE OFFICIAL RECORD
617.786.7783/617.639.0396 (Fax)
www.reportersinc.com


## PROCEEDINGS

$* * * * *$
(7:00 p.m.)
(Sitting Members Case BZA-009297-2016: Constantine Alexander, Brendan Sullivan, Thomas Scott, Janet Green, Alison Hammer.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: The Chair will call this meeting of the Board of Zoning Appeals to order. And as is our custom, we will begin with continued cases. These are cases that started at an earlier date and for one reason or another were continued until tonight. First case I'm going to call is case No. 009297, 17-19 Pemberton Street.

The Chair would report that we are in receipt of a letter from Timothy Sheehan, who I believe is the project designer for this project. A request for withdrawal on this case. (Reading) We have decided to withdraw our variance and remove our job from the BZA hearing on May 12th. We intend to finish the work without the variance and make required changes to achieve same.

Okay. All those in favor of accepting the request for withdrawal say "Aye."
(Aye.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Five in favor. Case
withdrawn.
(Alexander, Sullivan, Scott, Green, Hammer. )
(7:05 p.m.)
(Sitting Members: Constantine Alexander, Brendan Sullivan, Thomas Scott, Janet Green, Alison Hammer.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: The Chair will next call
case number -- wait a minute, I didn't begin with the one thing I didn't say.

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 Char may impose as to the number, placement, and operation of equipment used so as to not 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 inform those of you in the audience that a recording is being made. That's a recording device right there. In addition, our stenographer also makes a recording of the hearing to assist herself when she types out the transcript to fill in the blanks and the things she didn't get. So there are two different transcriptions being made of this hearing or recordings. I'm sorry, recordings made of this hearing.
So you've all been suitably warned and now I'll
move on.
(7:05 p.m.)
(Sitting Members Case BZA-009695-2016: Constantine

Alexander, Brendan Sullivan, Thomas Scott, Janet Green, Alison Hammer.) CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: The Chair will call case No. 009695, 1 Brattle Square.
matter?
(No Response.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: The Chair notes that there is no one wishing to be heard.

The Chair would report that we are in receipt of a letter from Richard M. Sousa, counsel for the petitioner who is or which is T-Mobile. (Reading) By this letter the applicant respectfully requests the Board to continue the public hearing for the above-referenced matter scheduled for Thursday, May 12, 2016, at seven p.m. to its next available public hearing date. The applicant is requesting a continuance in order to perfect public notice for the proposed installation. And based on this request we understand the applicant's representative need not appear to the hearing, which is true. And the perfecting of public notice is the fact that they did not put a public notice at all. So that's what they've got to perfect.

Anyway, what's the next available date?

SEAN O'GRADY: May 26th.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: May 26th.

This is a case not heard so we don't have to worry about who can be here and who can't.

The Chair moves that this case be continued as a case not heard to seven p.m. on May 26 th subject to the following conditions:

That a petitioner file a waiver for a time of decision, which it already has.

That the petitioner, this time, comply with our notice requirements, which means that the sign needs to be posted on the property for the 14 days prior to May 26th.

And that to the extent that the petitioner is going to modify its plans or dimensional requirements before that hearing, that those modified items must be in our file no later than five p.m. on the Monday before May 26th.

All those in favor of continuing the case on this basis say "Aye."
(Aye.) CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Case continued to May

26th.
(Alexander, Sullivan, Scott, Green, Hammer.)
(7:10 p.m.)
(Sitting Members Case BZA-009301-2016: Constantine

Alexander, Brendan Sullivan, Thomas Scott, Janet Green, Alison Hammer.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: The Chair will call 147
prospect Street.

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

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Good evening, Mr. Chair and Members of the Board. For the record, attorney Sean Hope, Hope Legal Offices in Cambridge. We're here tonight on behalf of the petitioner. We have Marcia Kirssin and we also have Mahmood Firouzbakht. We want to thank the Board for allowing us to continue this case.

We want to thank the Board for allowing us to continue this case. At the last hearing I think we focussed on the personal hardship of the owner. While we think that has some bearing to the context of why we're here, it did not speak to the Board's jurisdiction nor did it speak to Chapter 40-A and what the criteria the Board needs to use in which to make a decision.

So we respectfully ask that you will indulge us while we refocus our efforts to actually focus on the facts and circumstances which we believe will be appropriate for a hardship. I'm going to go through some of the criteria. Some stuff you've heard but we think you heard it in a different context as well as --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Just what you have up here on the other board is the same as you have attached to the letters you've sent?

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Yes.

MARK BOYES-WATSON: In general those are
my legends. Yes, underlying drawings are the same.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: We work from these is the
same of what you're doing?

MARK BOYES-WATSON: Exactly. There is going to be an exception actually which is something that came up.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay. Bring it up at the time.

MARK BOYES-WATSON: We'll bring it up, right, the one exception.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: So to begin with I'd like to provide a little context. At the last hearing there was a lot going on. If you look at the application itself, there are a series of variances and Special Permits. I like to focus in on the two primary pieces which I would call the setback variances and also the binding restrictions that are a result of the Mid-Cambridge review.

For setbacks, I think it's important to note and really looking at the existing conditions. So the lot and
the structure on its own already is non-conforming. The house is within the 30 -foot setback, and it's also justified all the way to the right, so it's within the right foot -- the right side setback. In terms of the requirements of Article 5, the dimensional table, we are in compliance with everything but setbacks. So just overview. The number of units were compliant. It allows three, we're providing four.

MARK BOYES-WATSON: It allows four we're providing three.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Excuse me. It allows four, we're providing three, that's right.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Let me stop you right
there.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Yeah.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: You've said this the last
time. And my problem with that statement is that -- if density were the only requirements for our Zoning Ordinance,
you could, you could put three units on there, but you've got to also comply with the rest of our Ordinance; namely, setbacks and anything else, open space.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Right. And so my point of bringing up context was in a series of things that are in Article 5 dimensional tables. We're complying with all of those on the proposed plans but for setbacks. CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: So I don't have to go through each and every element, but there are listing five key elements: Height, open space, lot area per dwelling unit, and we comply with all of those except for setbacks.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Right.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: I just wanted to give that
piece of context.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yes.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: So as I said, the existing structure itself is non-compliant within the setbacks. Now,
normally in a C-1 District you have a 20 -foot setback. The reason why you have a 30 -foot setback is because of this long neck, and I think you call it the anatomy of the lot, you have this -- and it's 108 feet by 18 feet wide. So as we pointed out last time, so this is really the area of the lot that drives the setbacks because of the setbacks are increased because of the length of the lot. So it actually would be 172-foot dimension is actually a 65-foot lot. So when you take that back square, that's about 65 feet, 30 feet of that or half of that is actually not buildable.

That is only as a result of that long neck and the length of the lot itself.

I would say so our hardship, as we talk about it,
is really the result of this unusual dimension. Now this dimension and this length of this neck that's not readily available in the district as a condition that is unique to this site and that's one of the requirements of the second test of the hardship. So this is not a -- it's not a lot
with several long driveways, this is not a driveway.

Also this 108-foot dimension is not buildable
whatsoever. It has a series of trees and existing parking spaces. I think in many ways you can analogize that to a condition if that was an area that were wetlands, let's say, or if that had -- that area was covered with shale underneath the soil, and because either the soil conditions or wetlands or some other conditions, those are all elements of Chapter 40-A, you could not build on that. So that you are relegated to be able to build on what was in the buildable portion of the lot. And as I pointed out with that 30 -foot setback and also with the side yard setback, you have a very small buildable footprint.

The other element that is driving this hardship is the Mid-Cambridge Neighborhood Commission are binding, binding review and approval. Now, I understand that sometimes Boards are in conflict and, you know, the Board has a different charter than the Mid-Cambridge, but I think
it's important to note the Mid-Cambridge criteria is really aimed at protecting neighborhoods. They talk about if you look in the criteria, which I listed in the application, it's about avoiding excess in-fill, making sure a new construction is compatible with existing buildings, and it also talks about preserving historic structures. I bring that up in context to say by the time we get to the Zoning Board after going through Mid-Cambridge, we went there a robust neighborhood review, and so it's not only about the design of structures, but they also look to make sure that the size and the massing of the structures are compatible with what's existing.

But unique to this case was when we looked about relocating the site, they didn't just want us to relocate a similar facade, they actually wanted us to reconstruct. CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: You mean the site, relocating the site, relocating the structure.

MARK BOYES-WATSON: Yes, on the site.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: On the site.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Yes. We're relocating on the site. They wanted us to restore it, to almost rebuild it in a way so that it was visible from the public way. In order to do that, in and of itself, it would trigger zoning relief. Now what we did was is in preparation to support this, there's already cost in relocating a house. And if you were maybe building a modern house with modern -- without such a steep pitch, that actually utilized most of the floor plate, you wouldn't be -- the hardship probably wouldn't be as significant. What you're really building is you're building a house, even though it's two-and-a-half stories, the square footage is roughly -- I think I it's like closer to 1700 square feet. It's not what you would do if you were building a two-and-a-half story new house. Then if you were building a modern house, you would use things like hardy planks. You would use materials that would save you money. These things are not available with
the Mid-Cambridge -- with this restriction. So they want historic materials, clapboard, and we actually supplied an engineering report that doesn't necessarily detail the type of materials, but it talks about the cost of rebuilding this house in such a way that it would meet their approval.

So one of the aspects that we didn't bring up last time, that I think is important, is that the cost of being able to reconstruct and rebuild this house up to the Mid-Cambridge restrictions, in reality, does require additional density. Now, when you look at how much you're going to build, we actually looked at it to see what does the lot allow. Not just taking the lot area per dwelling unit and plop in four units. We said, well, what could you do on this site and meet all the dimensional requirements of Article 5? And so when we did that, we came up with, and I think we presented in the file what we believe, and we have tested this, is a three-unit proposal that meets the requirements of Article 5. And so be able to fit that in
the lot. Now the lot is quite peculiar. You know, it has --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: You could meet all the requirements you're saying as a matter of right you could build --

MARK BOYES-WATSON: Three units.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Have you gotten Ranjit to sign off on this?

MARK BOYES-WATSON: We've got two versions. Ranjit is not quite sure.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: So, you know, three months ago when we met with them, you know, one of the things, maybe you can point to the setback that I --

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Can I see the plan, Gus, the plan that was submitted?

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: So that setback -- you point to it again. So that setback, it came up is that a front or is that a side? If that's a front yard setback, then it's
well beyond the ten-foot minimum setback and can you bring it up all the way to the front. And so we presume because that actually gave us the best footprint to be able to build three connected townhouses or constructed houses, so that was a setback. If you take the other view and you say that's a side yard setback, which actually pushes the house back, and we came up and we have a plan here today that shows you can still build three townhouses and meet all the requirements of Article 5. The point of that is not that this is what we want to build. We're not even saying that this is what the neighbors would support. It's the idea you look at you're going to add density. And you say we take open space and all the other requirements of the Ordinance. Contextually I think the only equitable and fair way to say what should be allowed that's not subjective, would be to say what's the directive could you actually put on the lot and meet all the requirements of the Ordinance.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Let me stop you right there.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Yeah.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Sheet $04-\mathrm{B}$ is that what you're saying you can build as-of-right in the submittal?

MARK BOYES-WATSON: That's the one, when we -- can

I answer that?

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Yes or no, either it is or it's not.

MARK BOYES-WATSON: Well, I wish life was as
simple as that. So, we submitted that after extensive
review with the Commissioner about how to interpret this
lot, which is actually a tricky lot because it's not even
that obvious what the front yard is and what the side yard is.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Is it a yes, you can build this
as-of-right or no?

MARK BOYES-WATSON: Yes. It's, it's -- I'll tell
you what --

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: You're asking about that
plan.

MARK BOYES-WATSON: If you've got everything
that's in the file, because this the -- the answer would be yes --

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: What I really don't appreciate, right, what I really don't appreciate and I'm not yelling at you --

MARK BOYES-WATSON: Okay, that's fine.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: -- let's not get into that business.

MARK BOYES-WATSON: No, no.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: -- is I went through the transcripts of the last hearing multiple times --

MARK BOYES-WATSON: Yeah.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: -- and unfortunately a lot of questions were asked and they really weren't answered. CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: They weren't answered.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: All right? It went off on
another tangent. We can't really get a straight answer. Janet asked you: Is it this or is it that? And you basically came back and said, yeah. Didn't really answer the question. So, again, I'm trying to nail this down without a whole lot of fluff, if you will.

MARK BOYES-WATSON: So shall we take just that particular question then and I'll answer it slowly. CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Can I comment if you don't mind?

MARK BOYES-WATSON: Yeah, yeah, no, sure.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I think we're going off on the wrong track, which is the reason $I$ don't want to make a comment right now.

In your dealings with neighbors and your dealings with Mid-Cambridge, you presented this project as a binary proposition; we can build as a matter of right, and I'm not sure that's right -- correct, three-unit townhouse. Or we can save the existing structure and build a couple other
units, two other units on the property. Posed in this way, the answer is obvious. Sure, we want to save the existing structure and the Zoning Board will just go along with this and it will be fine, everybody will be happy. My problem, and maybe I didn't express this clearly last time as I'm going to do right now. This is not a binary decision. There are others -- we're not here, I'm not here to force you to tear down that structure and build it if you could get Mid-Cambridge to let you do it to build your three-unit townhouse. I'm trying to find out if there is a proposition that allows the existing structure to be saved and moved to where Mid-Cambridge wants it, where there's additional housing on the property but is not two units? Why not -- and I posed the issue, why not one unit? And when I -- and I thought the answer might be well, we can't do it. It's not economical. We can't make a profit. When I asked the question, this question $I$ asked $I$ just said right now at the last hearing, you said to me, oh, you could put one unit
on there, it makes the project a lot more marginal. Those were your exact words. Well, yes, it does, of course, two units -- one unit makes the project more marginal than two units. But it doesn't make it unprofitable, at least that's not what I've heard. So the fact of the matter it makes it more marginal, I understand from your perspective, or your perspective as a developer, you want less marginal --

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: With all due respect, you
know, Mr. Boyes-Watson is not the developer, and so I think coming from can you build it and I just --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I know. But I made that point the last time and I asked you to come back or I don't know if I asked you, but I expect you to come back with something. Nothing. This thing is all silent. Your new submission is silent on this point. All you're saying is we're -- the devil made us do it -ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: No.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Mid-Cambridge is -- let
me finish.

Mid-Cambridge is forcing us or requiring us, is a better word. Requiring us to move to -- preserve the structure and move it. And beyond that I don't think Mid-Cambridge cares to -- whether there's two units or one unit on the property beyond that. They may care about how it's going to look or the like. And what I'm trying to find out is -- because I think, in my opinion, one unit plus moving this structure is a better solution for the City of Cambridge than what you're proposing. It will have additional housing, one unit. It will save the existing structure, relocate it, which is what Mid-Cambridge wants, and it would allow more open space on the lot, which I think is particularly desirable with regard to the old structure, more greenery around it, the better it is. So I have never heard why you can't do that other than the fact that you won't deal with that issue. You really -- the only issue you want to deal with is you want your two units because
you'll make more money to it. I understand that. I don't object to that. But I have -- let me finish.

But I have -- we come -- this Board, I certainly come from a different perspective. We look at it not to maximize profit. We look at it allowing you to make a profit, but build us a -- develop this property in a way that's better for the City of Cambridge than what you're proposing. And I have yet to hear a reason why that's not the case. And that's my problem.

Now you can speak.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: No, and your point is well
taken. I disagree. I think that we actually put in a structural report and we had them detail it that was in the file. I thought we had done that specifically to address the cost of moving and rebuilding the house.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yes, but it
doesn't affect -- but you're building another unit on that
property, or at least one, in my view if it goes through or
two if yours goes through, and you're going to make a profit on that. At the end of the day the cost of buying the property plus the cost of refurbishing --

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: I understand.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: You understand where I'm
coming --

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: I do. Frankly I'm a little bit uncomfortable with us trying to do a pro forma of how much a petitioner is supposed to make versus not. But I can say this is not your standard house where you're just building a house and you're saying one house equals one house, or one house equals a house and a half. We're talking about an historic structure. The whole point of the structural report was actually try to detail for the Board the extensive cost. And in my supportive -- amended supporting statement I tried to highlight without overexaggerating but without adding numbers, because I don't think the numbers are exactly relevant, this is not just
building one house and offsetting by building another house and making some money. I think we've never just said that -- at least it's never been out of my mouth, just about making more profit. I think this is an extreme cost to relocate this house. I would say it is. And I really -- I mean the reason we put the structural report is because we're actually trying to say well, this is not in comparison to your building a two-and-a-half story modern house with hardy plank and all those other costs.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: So but as a gut rehab, and, again, I'm in the business, so you're talking to somebody who knows different, right?

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Sure.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Right? Who knows better. And
we would advise somebody knock down the house and build brand new. It's easier, faster, cheaper. Okay?

No, we want to do a gut rehab, we want to restore. It's going to cost you more money, but that's what we want.

I'm sure you do plenty of it. Dinsmore Court, Walden

Street, all right. So I read the report and, again, I said the same -- sure, I would say the same thing. But it's not analogous to what we're doing here.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And, again, I'm not
looking to get into your --

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: And in order to build that, I
can answer the question that $I$ asked is that no, you could not build this as-of-right because you would have to go and get a demolition permit for that house which would be a very difficult obtaining.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Okay.

MARK BOYES-WATSON: You're going to --

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: I just want to make one
point. I think the point we are making in the application and I think the point we are making to you. Maybe to your point, knocking the house down and rebuilding would be much less expensive. We are not allowed to do that. We are
building and restoring and using materials that we would never use in the modern day to make a profit.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: But that's the area that you're
in. That's the area that was bought. That's the
understanding. Those are the incumbrances.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And, and, and
understanding all of that --

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Yeah.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I don't want to get into
your financial statements --

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: No, I just want to respond.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: The hardship, if doing
with one unit means you can't do -- save that structure and develop the property, it's uneconomical, you'll lose money, that's a hardship. But the hardship is not we're not going to make as much money as we like to make. That's not the hardship. And that's the underlying thrust of your presentation and that's what $I$ have a problem with.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: What I think the structural
engineer's report, and I'm just telling you what we think it means, if you don't think it means the same thing. We were trying to, we were trying to express that the cost of relocating and restoring this house demands additional economic development on the site to offset that cost.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yes, it does.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: And I just think a comparison of building one house -- I feel like the comparisons being thrown around are making assumptions that we're not making. I'm just saying we're not making those same assumptions.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And I'm making the same points. I understand what you said, and I am willing, myself, to support another unit on that property and give you zoning relief to allow that because that will help finance the restoration of the old structure, and at the end of the day we'll have -- the City of Cambridge will have two units -- not affordable, but inhabitable units on the
property, will have a bit of open space in a congested neighborhood. And I think it comes out all right. MARK BOYES-WATSON: The bit --

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Let me make one more point.

I just, I have to say, you know, when you're looking at this lot and somehow you have this subjective notion that two units are better than three, I really feel like the only fair way to do this is to look at what the Ordinance allows. Instead of saying you're talking about open space. We meet the open space. We supplied an alternative plan that even provides ten percent more than even what's there. So, three units is allowed. Okay. Open space is allowed. Even if we did one unit, we would still need setback relief.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: That's right.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: So the idea that two is
better than three, to me, is the Board or certain Board members looking at profit and deciding that's too much for you to make. If we were asking for -- if we were asking for
a variance for unit count, I would understand. You would say, hey, wait a minute, the Board says you can only do this many or setbacks or open space, we meet the open space. We even talked about lot coverage, which is not even in the Ordinance, the last hearing we talked about lot coverage. We have an example to talk about lot coverage, and to show that even with certain changes to the site, we still meet the lot coverage. So I have to say that when we're talking about two units is better than three, who is served? The Ordinance tells us how much open space a lot should have. It's not a subjective category. And I feel like what we're saying is it would be better for the City of Cambridge, well, shouldn't the Ordinance tell us what the City of Cambridge of a given lot --

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Yes, they do --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: The Ordinance is a
minimum. The open space requirement is the minimum.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: And we exceed the minimum.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I understand that. But
every lot is different and this is a different -- we all would agree, and one thing we could agree on, this is an unusual lot and with an unusual structure and we're all trying to come up with a solution that's in the best interest of Cambridge. In my view, still is because I haven't heard anything otherwise, if you can develop that lot, restore the building, move it, build another unit, I'm willing to grant you the zoning relief to allow you to do that, but when you say you want two units, what I think is -- in my opinion, less desirable, I'm not as willing to grant you the zoning relief that you're seeking. That's where I'm coming from. You won't listen to me.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: I mean, I've heard you and I'm just really trying to direct hopefully back to the Ordinance as the only equitable way. There's no way that it's -- to me it's there for one person and say, well, the Ordinance says 36 percent but I think 45 percent would be
better on this particular lot. We meet the open space. We meet the lot and dwelling unit counts, we're not asking for any of those things.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: You don't need other
things. So I'm saying the tradeoff is we'll give you the relief -- in my opinion, give you the relief that you can't comply with, in return for that, I want more open space.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: But you say other things, we don't meet one other thing which is setback. And setback would be required as is and even if we just built one unit, it still requires setback.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I understand that. And I said I would grant you the setback relief.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Okay. I was hoping that
showing that context of that would persuade you to say, hey, why is two -- why is three worse than two? If the Ordinance and all the other requirements of the Table of Dimensional Regulations says it's okay, that the Mid-Cambridge whose job
is to protect neighborhoods says it's okay, that the neighbors who are looking at this lot, have to live with it says it's okay, that's what I was hoping would persuade you. That the idea that we have costs, that we're showing, that we're highlighting costs, that this is not just building another single-family house. That this house is not going to have as much GFA as a normal two-and-a-half story house, you're not going to be able to get as much value out of that as we would if you were building normal two-and-a-half story house. Those factors altogether to me might persuade you to say, hey, maybe we shouldn't just settle for two -- I did hear you last hearing, you know, that was part of -- we didn't miss that. But I did -- when we continued to look at this, we thought maybe we would be able to persuade you given the context of all of these things, given that we do meet the shape of the lot. This is not something that doesn't even touch 40-A. It does touch 40-A. I think it touches it pretty directly, that you would be able to find
the hardship. And I think in terms of lot coverage, and I think I'll let Mark because I've talked too much, talk about the lot coverage and open space.

MARK BOYES-WATSON: What I wanted to do is quickly if I might answer the question about the submitted materials about the as-of-right, underlying three-unit zoning -CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: You know, I'm sorry -MARK BOYES-WATSON: Well, I might as well because it's kind of the notion --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay.

MARK BOYES-WATSON: Two seconds.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Give me a second and then you can go ahead.

MARK BOYES-WATSON: It's not as you said to the argument, because clearly you understood the notion that we are, that there are kind of ways that you could do this. This actually shows an increased setback here, because depending on whether the Commissioner finds that this is a
front set -- you can see that when you look here, this bit of the building is the front, because it faces the street. But when it goes behind this lot, is it a front or a side? So we actually have drawn it -- in your package we've drawn it as a side because the Commissioner felt -- as a front because that's what the Commissioner was thinking it was. But were it, and we don't even know, but we then have now illustrated it as a side so that we are talking apples and -- but it's still basically, you can build this thing, take away the structure, and if as indeed Mid-Cambridge were to submit such a thing. And I get on to my main thing. I just want to make a couple of points that may be illustrative that are related to that. Because I think we have two intersecting things that lead us to want to ask you to help us with the setbacks, just the setbacks on this site.

And there are two intersecting things. What Sean
has alluded to, and I'm just going to just do a couple of
things that help me understand why that might be warranted.

So, I actually here just extracted the neck, the so-called neck. And as you imagine just putting the neck here, for instance, right? And I didn't even use the whole thing. So now you can see that, you know, we have a huge rear yard setback, and the lot, the lot looks much more normal for a three or four-unit development. So what's interesting about that is that is, that is coming out of the shape of the lot. It's entirely to do with this very odd shaped lot. So that's the first idea.

The second idea actually comes from the second thing that's special to this lot. So there's a very special shape, but it also has this, it has this second oldest house in mid-Cambridge on it that is in very poor repair and we've heard all about that. Some interesting things about this house is that this house is fundamentally a bungalow, right? It's fundamentally very big on the first floor and gets a lot smaller very quickly as it goes up. So actually what
happens when you have a structure like that, unlike the structures that surround us, that stack up one floor, same size as the next, same size as the next, same -- what this does is it puts pressure on how close, how much lot
coverage, if you like, how much that historic house covers for the amount of space in the house. Which is kind of what Sean was just saying. So we have these intersecting things. So what $I$ wanted to sort of suggest is that -- well, first of all, what's interesting about this house, this house can't -- there's nowhere on this lot that this house can move into a conforming position. The footprint is actually bigger than the allowable buildable --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Plus Mid-Cambridge wants
you to have it there so they can see it from the street.

MARK BOYES-WATSON: So you can see, right.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I understand.

MARK BOYES-WATSON: So when we looked at and what
we came and asked for, and I'm hoping to also -- and I
apologize if we, you know, first of all, I apologize for last time, but there's nothing aggressive about this request. And I want to show you why we're asking, why we're only asking for setbacks, we're not asking for extra GFA or other units, is so, when you've got this big house that you want to have visible, currently it touches the lot line, right? So -- and it's currently quite close to this rear yard, we thought it reasonable that this house move into visibility with an increased setback than the existing and an increased setback, which actually further increased since we were last here. We've added a couple of feet to this rear yard. We just pushed the house a little bit further forward. We thought it reasonable to locate this, and that was reasonable relief to ask from the Board. So that, so that -- and the other thing, then, was what we've done since we were last here is that we've tried to increase this setback, also. And we actually pushed this house closer to this house. Actually, we, we actually made some bicycle
storage and so they physically touch now.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: That just allows you to manipulate the rules.

MARK BOYES-WATSON: Right. Well, not manipulate the rules --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: All right, take advantage.

MARK BOYES-WATSON: There's no
requirement -- right. There's no requirement to setback.

And in fact, this could go all the way to touch, but then
you lose the integrity so it's not really, you know, within the rules --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: It's clever --

MARK BOYES-WATSON: Except where we can't.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Clever architectural
design and I congratulate you.

MARK BOYES-WATSON: But what I wanted to do is not
so much dwell on that but dwell on the fact that we have
tried to come only with the things that we need, and only
where we need them. And what I'm trying to show is that because of the size of this, and the fact that it's really essentially a single-story house with a very -- that it's pushed this building closer to its lot lines. So this one we've already talked about. This one, indeed, is also pushed closer to its lot line. And we understand that we're asking for your help. But that -- the reason that it's being close to its lot line is this unusually shaped lot. The neck, right? So you can just see what an effect this thing has, I don't care where you put it. But were this a normal lot, we would have it.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Keep holding that to the back because I think when you have that there, you wouldn't need the 30 -foot setback.

MARK BOYES-WATSON: No, it would make life a lot easier.

So all I'm saying is that I'm saying -- and really, I'm not saying that -- we're trying to build what's
allowed on the lot. We're trying to absorb the energy of saving this historic house, which we are thrilled to do and Mahmood has wanted to do from the very beginning regardless of what Historic said, because it's the right thing to do and indeed everybody wants it saved. From those two factors, from that historic house and its slightly oversized footprint, you would never build -- I haven't built a structure that was like that in C-1 my whole career, right? It's unusual and it's an old house. So we have this and we have our missing square footage if you like.

What Sean also referred to about that missing
square footage, which I think is an interesting
factor -- square footage on the lot is that actually -- in other words, that the neck is not available to help with the setbacks. But actually interestingly, and it came up, and apologize if there were questions that I didn't answer, I think I wasn't on my best form, too much blood in the head.

But actually I was asked at that last hearing, but I didn't
know technically the answer, whether, you know, given the neck is not used, whether actually this appeared to be like an overdevelopment of the residual lot if you like. So we did, Heather went back -- Heather from my office went back and recalculated this. And actually what's interesting about this piece here, is this meets C-1 open space requirements and lot coverage which is -- and we have -- these are the calculations. So it's interesting that actually even if you absent the neck, the actual built density here, now there is no parking on this piece, is actually compliant to C-1.

So anyway, that's only to say, and it's not to sort of to say anything except this, is that we have tried to limit the relief requested as much as we can here and do it only where it's being -- that the hardship as it were, has come from the saving of the house and the shape of the lot. That's really the deal. That's what we were trying to do and no more.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Could that house be sold as is
and rehabbed into a residence as is?

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: I mean I guess to answer
your questions around whether that --

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Someone could buy that house
and restore it and live it?

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: Someone at great expense
could do it and that certainly would create a financial hardship for the current owner if that were to be.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Well, again, if that that's off the table --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: No, no, that's off the
table. That's not relevant.

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: I guess in terms of the case that's pending before you, it would not be financially feasible for me as the developer to develop this property as a single-family. I couldn't do it. I just -- the numbers would not work. I -- and also just an additional unit, it
wouldn't be possible for me to do it.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: You know, the house on corner
of Harvard and Hancock that they are restoring, we gave them some relief for some minor stuff and, again, that was a pretty rundown house and an elderly person came in and wants to live there and is restoring it. And it's going to be a very nice project. So we've gone from yes, it can be bought. And, again, I go back to the River Street thing, if you could buy it for a dollar, is it viable? Yes. If you had to pay a million dollars for it, is it viable? The answer is probably no. So it's somewhere in between and that's, again, it gets back to finances and dollars and cents, which really cannot be part of our consideration.

So, I guess through all this fluff and everything,

I can see that there is an interest in preserving the house and that the house to be moved would impact some setbacks. It's non-conforming now, and that as a -- again, tradeoff, and I think go back to your thinking is that one additional
structure would be the tradeoff to preserve that house and to have a viable project.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: That's where we're coming from. And --

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: (Inaudible).

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: If you want zoning relief,
we give -- I mean, our Board will consider giving you zoning relief in the context of what's best for the City. In my humble opinion, may be an incorrect opinion, this project is not what's best for the City. If there's an alternative project that's doable, and I've heard you can do an alternative project. And I think if you took that drawing and you took that double, the two units over there and you made it much smaller, you'd have a much more attractive lot, and particularly in terms of the impact on the people behind you. And I have not yet heard why you won't do that. You just keep talking around it and you talk about other things, and we can build three-unit townhouses as a matter of right.

That's not before us tonight. Maybe you're right, maybe not. Do you want to build a three-unit townhouse and you can do it as a matter of right? Go ahead, that's your privilege. If you can get by Cambridge Historical, that's your Constitutional right. But you're not going to do that and we don't want you to do that. We want you to do something that at least in our opinion, or at least in my opinion, is in the best interest of the City. And just because you meet the minimum requirement for open space, that's what developers do all the time. You look for the minimum, you have to satisfy. Which is why -- don't --

MARK BOYES-WATSON: We exceed the requirements.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I know. But if we have a
right -- if you want relief, there are tradeoffs in there.

And that's the tradeoff that I see that I haven't been persuaded that should not be on the table. That's my problem.

MARK BOYES-WATSON: The thing that I'm confused
about is that I understand the River Street thing is a different case where the unit count was increased and the GFA was increased over what's -- that's not the case here. This is, the Cambridge Zoning says that this amount of development or the normal would be allowed. And what we've said is that this isn't a normal lot. So -- and I understand that you have full discretion. You do not have to approve this plan. But it seems to me that in the context of having spent time, you know, months and months working with neighbors to make sure that those setback impacts that we are coming to you to ask for relief for, are not, are not causing them, you know, substantial harm, that they're okay with it, working, working, working to do that, that, you know, we're just trying to -- we're asking you for -- on that thing which we vetted through the process, and that's the only thing that we're asking for.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And that goes back to my
initial comment. You've presented the neighbors and
presumably Cambridge Historical with a binary solution.

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: Mr. Chair, can I --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Go ahead.

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: On that point, I mean, I did the outreach, and there are neighbors here in the crowd, it was never presented to the neighbors in the room or any of the neighbors in that form. When we originally presented the project, we actually hadn't really fully developed what the, you know, as-of-right or, you know, non-zoning relief option would look like. We really further developed that after the first hearing where we thought we need to look at that more closely because frankly we'll use that as a guide as to what would be permitted should we -- should we choose not to appear before this Board and decide we're gonna go, we're gonna go fight this battle at Mid-Cambridge and see if they'll approve the demolition of that building. And if they do, then we'll build this sort of more massive townhouse structure, which I think everyone in here can
agree that that would not be the favorable outcome. And so what we've tried to do is come up with a proposal that balances all those needs, the City's needs, the neighbors' needs, and the need of the current owner and the need of the developer because this is a very risky proposition.

Certainly there is a profit motive, but certainly there is a risk associated with taking a project like this on as well.

So you certainly need a healthy margin as Brendan can understand, you need a margin, and that second -- that third unit is the margin in order to be able to undertake a project like this that's complicated. It's complex. To move that house to preserve it in the way as Mid-Cambridge has required us to do so is a costly undertaking, and it's a very complicated site to work within. So those are the costs. And that's what makes it not feasible for me as a developer to undertake this project and only build a second unit in order to justify preserving, you know, the historic
house. And so that, that's why we've done all this work
with the neighbors and with Mid-Cambridge to come up with a project that within the dimensional requirements of the code is fairly reasonable, is appropriate. And so I guess -- but in a different form. So -- and we've only developed that as-of-right to make that case I guess more clear tonight that that option is available. No one wants that option. But should this go in the wrong direction tonight, I mean that becomes more of an option I guess that we'll have to, you know, be looked at. I don't think it's in the benefit of the City to end there. And when we talk about, you know, the needs of the City, we're talking about a housing crisis that's, you know.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Affordable housing crisis.

And this is not affordable housing. Let's not go down that.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: It has to do with the housing
stock and number of units. I know it's not going to be solved by one unit, but I do think the idea is that we do need more housing.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I'd be more persuaded --

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: That's a red herring. That's a red herring that comment.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I do, too.

I would be more persuaded or I'd be more willing to entertain what you're saying is if you came in to me with a three-unit townhouse as of right and Ranjit said to me, said to this Board, that can be built as a matter of right. He does have the right to do this.

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: I mean, he said that.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: No, he did not.

SEAN O'GRADY: I should interject at this point. The Commissioner has reviewed the as-of-right that's in the file and determined that it's not as-of-right.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: I thought we didn't want to go there.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I didn't want to go there either.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Well, so we went there. We
went there so let's talk about that. So the issue that you --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: No, let's not talk about three units as a matter of right.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: No, I just want to answer this question.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Oh, okay.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Because we went and met with the Commissioner and we developed this thinking, this was as of right. I think the question comes down to this front yard setback right here. And is this a front or is it a side? What we showed -- so when we showed our as-of-right scheme, we had the three townhouses right up against this line. So there was less than a ten yard front setback. If this is a front, we're fine. When I met with him, when we talked, because this is a complicated site, we left with the understanding that this was a front and this was a front.

Now, if, you know, that was a discretion. If this is a side yard setback, right, then what we showed in the file does not meet the Ordinance requirements. We have a plan, and we did this tonight to show that -- and we can show it to you, that if you move the house back to meet this as a side yard setback, we can still do three townhouses. The idea is we can fit, we can mangle it up to fit three townhouses on there without meeting all of the requirements of the Ordinance. I don't want to use as-of-right because there's other things down the road, landmarking and other things. So I think the idea that we can't build three townhouses, it doesn't fit because of what we've shown and the file doesn't fit, this was -- this is a complicated lot, but we did this thinking this is a front yard setback. We have a plan here you can look at, but if this is a side yard setback, we can meet that. That's what $I$ thought the issue was. If there's a different issue --

SEAN O'GRADY: Yeah, no. If it's a front yard
setback, what's the front yard setback?

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: From the street, ten feet, that's the setback, not from the property line.

SEAN O'GRADY: Look, you can either have that as a front yard setback and use a front yard setback or it's a side yard setback.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: But doesn't the front yard setback --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Can I stop this
discussion? We're not going to decide tonight whether you can build a three-unit townhouse, which you said you don't want to build and we don't want you to build, you can do as a matter of right. If you want to present that as support, I want -- I don't want to debate tonight about it. I want to hear Ranjit either come down here or write a letter saying I looked at these plans and these are the plans attached, and yes, can you build this as a matter of right. That would be relevant to me. But short of that I'm not
going to try to decide this tonight because I think we're just wasting our time.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: No, I don't want to take up more time.

Are you saying would you be persuaded -CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I think -- go ahead, I'm sorry.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: -- that if we can show an as-of-right, because I'm pretty confident we can come up with an as-of-right scheme meeting all the requirements of the Ordinance, that that would bear on your feeling of three units? Because your other comments didn't seem to be dealing with whether or not as of right. You just said if you want to build it, can you build that. You had said that you thought two units were more appropriate on this lot than three. So I don't want to counsel my client to go and continue to come back -- know what we can do. I'm fairly confident, it may not be the best house, it may not even be
as big as we proposed, we can come up with three townhouse units that meets the requirements. And so if we take two or three weeks to do that, to come back, but yet we're still going to be stuck on these other issues, that's why I'm asking you, is it --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: For me to make, I'm
talking for myself, to make a rational decision, a reasonable decision, $I$ need that piece of information. I need it.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: But that predicates on the house coming down?

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Of course.

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: That's right.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Is that right?

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: Yeah.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Okay, so then you would have to
get a sign off from Ranjit but also from Historical saying
we will allow you a demo.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: In the context of this Board whenever you use as-of-right it means the Ordinance. There could be other things down the road. There could be building -- I mean --

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: But you know what, and again, I was not part of the community thing, what have you. And, again, going through transcripts, if I just read that as somebody who wasn't at the hearing, and to be honest with you I was very confused by what I heard the first presentation, is that we can do this as of right, we can build four units, that's what the Ordinance allows us. And then all of a sudden everybody on the abutters says oh, my Lord, four units. We can do that as of right. However, if we did three units like this and move that house, it would be a lot better, wouldn't it?

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Your reading is from what --

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: With all due respect --

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: All right? Because there was a
square that was plunked down on the middle of that board.

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: With all due respect, Brendan, that is not how I --

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: I'm not trying to cast
dispersions.

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: No, but the neighbors are here. I mean, when I presented what I presented to the neighbors --

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: But what I'm saying is what you're saying is as of right --

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: As can you be --

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Three units.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: All right? And you're saying
as of right, but then also then, however, there's also however.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: But I have to say frankly whenever you talk about as-of-right, you're talking about Zoning Board, you're talking about Zoning Ordinance --

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: And as-of-right to me means
that I can take a plan, and it was right in here where you said you can take the plan in and get a building permit on it, the one that you were presenting and that is not true.

MARK BOYES-WATSON: You know what I did that based on, Brendan --

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: But that's not a true
statement.

MARK BOYES-WATSON: No, but I'm going to answer
this. Because, you know --

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Now I'm starting to yell.

MARK BOYES-WATSON: Every single dimension in
here. Every single -- do you know how many times we met with Ranjit on this project? You think I'm drawing things just for fun? This is a very complicated thing. He reversed himself. You'll find in our submission has that called out as a front yard. I'm doing it in very close coordination, but I want -- I, as Mahmood, want to be as
transparent as $I$ possibly can. It is not in my interest to hoodwink anybody into anything.

So when we submit that, we fully believe, we -- I went with Sean, we sat with the Commissioner, and he did indeed yesterday inform Sean that he was a little worried about that. And in fact we did a further plan, which actually is -- would work dimensionally if you did switch it to a front -- because you can always make it sort of, you know, just need to know, but he had previously said it to us and that's why we did it that way. We presented it to him. We drew it and presented it and we came back again. So we didn't, we didn't -- we never said we would do four either. We only said we would do three. But nobody was threatening anybody. What we're trying to do is get a very complicated, expensive, tricky project done. Remember, this project also includes the complete restoration of the lane and all of that. This is not an easy project that Mahmood has undertaken. And when I sound like I'm advocating like I'm a
developer, I'm just the architect. But I'm just telling you all I'm doing is trying to bring all my skill to try to make this work. And I like working with this Board, I think this Board is really smart, and I totally get the idea, don't come and ruin my City with your developments. I totally get that and I'm a believer, but -- and that is precisely what we're doing here. We are trying to get enough development on this lot that Mahmood can afford to do the project, and we're trying to do it in a way that's just not okay with the neighbors but really meets some of the primary goals. It meets preservation goals of the Mid-Cambridge Historic District.

It meets, it meets open space goals.

It meets density goals that are enshrined in the Ordinance.

It meets all of these things. It does not meet setback. So we're here asking you about setback, and asking to let us, you know, restore this house, you know, in an
economically viable manner. That's all we're doing. It's no who not under the table deals, nothing. That's all we're asking.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And all we're saying, at least what I'm saying is, we want you to save the house. We're not looking to make you --

MARK BOYES-WATSON: How do you know that? I mean Mahmood knows that.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I said it the last time.

MARK BOYES-WATSON: You want that, but how do you know you can do it?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Because you told me the last time you could do it. That's the one reason.

MARK BOYES-WATSON: The bank won't finance it.

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: If you take out the reality of the cost of land and the cost of construction, yeah, we can do anything there. But then we're dealing with the reality that it's incredibly expensive to construct in the

City of Cambridge, as Brendan knows, and in particular this site is so complicated that it doubles certain -- triples certain of your costs that you would otherwise not have to bear in a typical construction site, and that's the hardship that, you know, we're faced with. And in asking for that third unit, four which we don't, you know, four which we need setback relief. CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: You still are skirting around an issue. More expensive. I understand that. I think I acknowledged that 20 minutes ago, but does it make the project undoable?

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: For me it does.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Well, maybe for you, but
maybe another developer it doesn't. If we're going to get a better project for the City at the end of the day, in my judgement --

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: That's the hard part.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: -- and it's one unit, if
someone wants to take it on, take it on, maybe that's where it's got to go. But I'm not -- you know, I'm hearing too many different stories. That makes me very uncomfortable. I heard the story it was you can do it more marginal but you can do it. No, it makes it more expensive. Now I'm hearing maybe it makes it unbuildable. Maybe you don't want to do it, and I understand it. You're a businessman, you do what you got to do. But there are other businessmen out there who might do the same project, take your plans and build one unit and get relief.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: So it sounds like short of opening up the books for the Board and then us hashing out a pro forma, there's really no way to convince enough board members that the cost is enough to restore this house to support two more units. I mean, that's what it really comes down to. And, you know, there's no other way to do that and so, you know, I mean I think we've heard what --
you can get Brendan or one of the other members that say they're in support of project anyway. I'm not there yet. I'm not there yet because I've just heard too many different stories.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Fair enough. I mean, from the person who actually knows those numbers, what Mark and I say about what's feasible to me is just as good as these blocks here. I mean, this is the person who actually knows the numbers, who is going to take the risk, I think what he says in terms of economically viable has to stand for something. That said, I think that, you know, I take responsibility if Ranjit wasn't convinced by what we did, I was hoping that that was set coming in. I didn't think about this last wrinkle. I heard about this wrinkle, about there may be some question about the setbacks, we went and we did it but it wasn't in the file so it wasn't already clear to the Board coming in. And if that would somehow shape a third unit to be more palatable, you know, than it's
up -- Mahmood's decision. But if it's still going to come down to how do you prove that this is not economic viable and enough of the board members feel like it's a better for the City to have two than three units, than I don't really -- I don't know how -- I think I've seen enough cases to know that's not something more time can overcome. So I know we haven't heard public comment, but I think we've laid out everything that we can lay out at least at this point, and maybe some closing pieces but I want to be respectful of the Board's time as well.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Appreciate that comment.

Any further comments from members of the Board at this point?

JANET GREEN: You know, I do because I'm not considering the concept of what could be built as of right. That's not -- I'm not in that argument. I'm not in that argument about how much it costs. It's not in my area. I don't know. But I do hear several things that compel me to
approve this project. One is that I do think that restoration and preservation is important for the City, and I feel like it's an incredibly expensive to do.

I feel like the comment about how hard it is to do construction and that sort of thing in this particular site, I don't know enough to be able to say whether I think that's a strong argument or not, that would be up to people who do that construction, because it's a pretty narrow driveway to me to be driving all the way back and forth. But I think that the neighbors in favor of this project, and we haven't heard tonight, but we heard last time and we also -- I read a lot of letters, new letters in the file in favor of the project. I think the fact that there's in fact more than needed or zone need for open space, and I feel like the issue, the true issue is, for me, is do we think there is a hardship that enables us to accept the setback needs that they have? And I feel that the shape of the lot is that kind of hardship. And we've considered shape of lot before
in thinking about those things, and to me is a very
difficult lot, and if ever there's a shape of a lot, this would be it.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Janet, if I may.

JANET GREEN: Yeah.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I think you're confusing two conditions.

JANET GREEN: Okay.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: There is a substantial
hardship and there are special conditions affecting the lot.

I don't think anybody, certainly I don't, quarrel with the notion that there are special conditions affecting this lot. That requirement's met. It is a substantial hardship. And the hardship it would seem to me is that this lot cannot be developed and preserve the historical structure without Zoning relief is why you grant Zoning relief. But if what I'm hearing, and as I said I'm hearing many different stories, this could be done economically and you can make a
profit on it, risky, but it can be done. I don't see where the substantial hardship is. There's no substantial hardship.

The fact that this presentation came in tonight with well, the substantial hardship is Mid-Cambridge is forcing us, not forcing us, they're requiring us to maintain the existing structure. That's true. And that, but that's just where Historical's coming from. But Historical wouldn't care, I don't think, if we had two units on the lot or one unit besides the structure. That's for us to do, a Zoning Board to do, and that's what we're wrestling with tonight.

JANET GREEN: And I think that's taking into consideration the money aspect of it.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: That's what the hardship
is. Substantial hardship -- financial hardship I think is a word. Let me see. No, just substantial hardship, financial or otherwise.

JANET GREEN: Financial or otherwise. So it could be financial hardship.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yeah, sure.

JANET GREEN: But it could be otherwise.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yeah.

JANET GREEN: And the otherwise could be the need to move the house and preserve the old house. I mean that's just -- that's how I saw it. I looked at the plans. I thought they were lovely. I thought they were an addition to the neighborhood. I thought there's been an interest in having more houses, people living on that street in those areas, so I would -- I just felt really strongly in favor of it.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you. Anyone else before we open it up?

ALISON HAMMER: I guess I have one question both for my fellow board members and these folks over here, is did you guys feel that it, you know, I keep hearing from our
side of the table that there's concerns about kind of open space as well as kind of an account, you know, and I was a little bit surprised that there were no significant changes made even though I do generally support the project and understand the hardships. So, you know, I'm wondering for both sides if there's maybe some sort of compromise position where the, where the new building gets smaller but not lesser in unit count. Would that maybe satisfy my fellow board members to some extent and would that be feasible from your end?

MARK BOYES-WATSON: One thing I would
say -- actually, we didn't present but we actually did increase the amount of -- we actually have an alternate scheme that actually increases the amount of open space of up to 41 percent from the 40 which we didn't get to yet and which involved a reconfiguration of the driveway and I can show, it was in your packet as an option. Again, just trying to find every way we can to get this closer to the
standard you'd like to see it, and I could go through that if it was helpful, but we, we -- we did look at that.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: I think to speak directly to your question, we didn't explore in plan making a smaller, two additional unit house. And I think it would be helpful to the petitioner if there was some, you know, because it was the idea of going to one other house and we haven't talked about the size of just having two houses on the lot versus having three units, but a much smaller footprint. Because you could make two-bedroom houses, you can make three-bedroom houses then you can make different styles. CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And I would be very much -- I'm not wedded to the notion of one unit versus two units. I'm talking about the footprint of the structure. ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: That's helpful. CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: If you want to do two units and make the building smaller, personally very much open to that.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: That's helpful.

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: And to your point, I mean we did not reduce the footprint of the either structure. What we did do is we eliminated a parking space to increase the green, you know, green and open space. And then we also made adjustments on the driveway and the location, the siting of the structures to essentially address that concern. But in terms of reduction of the footprint, I mean the concern there was we really can't touch the footprint of the historic house so that stays. CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: We understand that.

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: The concern with reducing the footprint of the other structures that then it becomes not practical to not have the two units there. And Mark is a very talented architect, and so we struggled with that. Can we make that work? Can it be viable? Because at a certain point when you have units that are so small in their footprint then they become not marketable and then, then you
have the same difficulty of does this project make sense then and that was the balancing act. And but certainly if that's something that the Board would maybe give us some guidance as to, that being a worldly thing to look at, we can look at that more closely given that we have done, made some improvements in the open space.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: This board member would support you do doing that and looking at that. Because, again, my issue is not the number of units, it's the footprint of the two units that you were proposing. If you could come up with something that would create more open space but that's two units still? That that's fine by me anyway. Depending on what you show. Yeah, as a concept, I don't have a problem with that.

THOMAS SCOTT: I mean, I think contextually and from a massing standpoint the proposed project is not overbearing or significant. In fact, both buildings are significantly smaller than any other building around it.

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: Yeah.

THOMAS SCOTT: The fact that you meet the open space criteria, even though it's a minimum criteria, in fact you stated it was ten percent over that, is encouraging I think. I think financially I can't imagine this project happening without the additional two units. I just -- I buy what you're saying and I understand it. I'm an architect, too, and I really think that's a critical, critical point. And, you know, yes, there might be others out there that could afford this project, but, you know, I doubt that there are very many who would undertake it. And I think the significance of moving that historical house, it's the second oldest house in Cambridge, and restoring it, is just a huge win for the city. You know, I think, I think the, I think the massing of the project is very nicely done and I'm in favor of it.

> CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay.

Anything else from the Board members before I open
it up to public testimony?
(No Response.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I guess not.

Sir.

CHARLES SULLIVAN: I'm Charles Sullivan. I'm
director of the Cambridge Historical Commission, and it
takes a lot to get me on this side of the partition. So I
want to speak to two points:

One is the historic significance of the house, and the second is the Mid-Cambridge Neighborhood Commission process. The house was built in 1819. It was built on Harvard Street up the corner of Prospect, was moved here in 1837. It's about the sixth or seventh oldest house in Cambridgeport. That means everything east of Harvard Yard is pretty large area of the city. The only other older houses is a small grouping of them on Auburn Street around Salem Street where there are some houses that are about ten years old, earliest settlement of Cambridgeport. This is
opening up a whole new area of Cambridgeport near Summit Park that was the Broadway Common, originally a burying ground. The owner was a significant figure in Cambridgeport history; superintendent of the cemetery that occupied Senate Park before the Civil War and so on and on. And it's also architecturally practically unique in Cambridge. There's one rather similar house with that undercut front porch on Mount Auburn Street that's about 20 years later than this. We don't know of another house of this design of this period anywhere that may have roots in other parts of the U.S. We just are not sure about it. The house is in very fragile condition. It's been open to the weather. It's unoccupied. It's -- we've been inside it. It's -- it's really at risk. It's at risk from trespassers. It's at risk from just deterioration from the overgrown trees that are around the property. It's not a situation that we think will very much delay. So it is definitely a priority for the Historical Commission to preserve houses of this character and age
especially in this part of the city.

So the second thing I wanted to speak about was the Mid-Cambridge process. Mid-Cambridge NCA Commission was established in 1982 specifically to deal with in-fill. After the establishment of the Townhouse Ordinance in about 1976 that encouraged townhouse construction, we had townhouses appearing in back yards, front yards, replacing older buildings, all over Mid-Cambridge, and the NCA Commission was seen as a way to get in-fill development under control because it was in an authority to be more restrictive to impose greater setback requirements, greater height requirements, and density requirements than the zoning allowed.

And so the Mid-Cambridge Commission has been working on in-fill issues and many other issues in the neighborhood for over 30 years. When this application came in, it was seen as pretty much an a godsend, but because here at last was a property owner, a perspective property
owner who was willing or had the courage to take on a money pit, a real wreck of a house, and a very unpromising situation. And we didn't think that this was, you know -- in a perfect world, and of course this is Cambridge in 2016, there's a lot of money chasing real estate here, and sure, probably there is someone out there who might take on this property as a single-family house and restore it. Even though it backs up to a gas station, it's just off Broadway and Prospect Street, two of the most busy streets in the city. A lot of reasons why most people would not be interested in having a single-family home here. But the application that came in was pretty much what you've seen. The Mid-Cambridge Commission's brief is to find whether or not a project is appropriate. And they found that the project with then involved moving the house, that was their request, to put it in the public view, it seemed to work best for the project as a whole. They were not disturbed by the two units that were proposed as a separate structure.

They did not consider it to be excess in-fill. They considered it to be appropriate. So their consideration is entirely qualitative, you know, it's not quantitative. We don't require that projects that come before the Commission be as-of-right by zoning. You know, we see -- usually we see these projects first, we decide if it's an appropriate thing, and then they take their chances with you.

Appropriateness here was measured in part by the restoration of the house, but also by the character of the proposed building. That architecturally it was felt that this was not incongruous to the neighborhood. It was not incongruous to the setting of the historic house, and that it was not in-fill. So the Commission issued a Certificate of Appropriateness. And I would -- you know, you have your brief and you have your statute. You know, we didn't consider the profit that the developer might make. That's not in our ordinance or statute.
or three units would be best for the site. You know, that's not our brief either.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Right.

CHARLES SULLIVAN: We considered whether this was
appropriate and really appropriate for the character of the property and for the character of the Mid-Cambridge neighborhood as a whole. So, that's how we saw it. And, you know, and I hope that, you know, within the constraints of the Zoning Ordinance that I hope the Board will allow a project that will preserve the house to go ahead, you know, whether it's this developer or some other, but there is some urgency here because the house is in very fragile condition. CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: First of all, thank you
for taking the time to come down. Speaking for myself certainly, I'm sure for other members of the board, we certainly very much appreciate all the work that you and the Cambridge Historical does for the City. You really provide a real service.

CHARLES SULLIVAN: Well, that goes both ways. We all find this grand use things exceedingly fine. CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you. CHARLES SULLIVAN: Thank you. CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Sir.

JEFF PURCELL: I am Jeff Purcell. I'm somewhat of a historian and I love the Cambridge Historical Society and I live not too far from the proposed project and I'm here because my wife and 14-year-old told me to come here. And because our neighborhood is too congested already and this is gonna mean less parking spaces. Our streets are going to mean more congestion. It's gonna mean less green space. And these guys have not, you know, I understand that they have not been very persuasive that this can't be done on a more reasonable basis.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you.

JEFF PURCELL: As you said and as you said, you can do this in a different way. It's all about money in the
end. And my 14-year-old and my wife don't want a ton of extra cars on our street and don't want less green space. That's it.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you very much.

Anyone else wishes to be heard? We have a lot of
letters which I'll get read into the record, I'm sorry. But if you want to speak, sir.

LAWRENCE BLUM: So my name is Lawrence Blum. I
live at 149. So we're the property between this property. CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Mr. Blum, maybe you can sit over here. It would be easier for us if you came closer.

LAWRENCE BLUM: So, I just want to say that as a neighbor, we do support this project. We've spoken with Mahmood many times and we trust him that he is, you know, that he's got a project. We very much support the historical preservation aspect of it. It's good for our little sub-neighborhood around 145,147 , and 149 . And we're
glad that our neighbor of many decades Ms. Kirssin is getting reasonable return. And we, we don't understand all the finances, but we support, we support them.

And also Mahmood has been very sensitive to our particular needs and has constructed something that's sufficiently distant from our backyard and fence and the height. He's been sort of sensitive about the height issues and the volume issues, and so we just want to say that we support him.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you. Thank you for taking the time to come down. You have a letter -- you are one of the signatories to the letter?

LAWRENCE BLUM: Yes.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I take it I don't have to read the letter? You made the points, or you want me to read the letter anyway?

JANET GREEN: Just read the signatures, who the people are.

LAWRENCE BLUM: There's a little more in the
letter.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay. I'll read who wrote the letter but I'm going to -- because we do have a number of other letters, I will not read the entire letter into the file which is lengthy but very well expressed in my judgment.

Anyone else? Ma'am.

ALINA BOSCH: My name is Alina Bosch. I live at 153-155 Prospect.

THE STENOGRAPHER: Spell it, please.

ALINA BOSCH: A-L-I-N-A B-O-S-C-H.

So I did not write a letter, but I have been here before to express my approval. I do say that Mahmood has been more than accommodating and constantly calling to make sure that I'm okay with the project and how it's going. Working in development myself, I'm well aware of how this process goes and I feel he's gone far and beyond anything
that I can imagine myself or anyone else doing for this project. I disagree with the parking and more cars because they've shown ample parking space and I think it would be a much improvement to have this extra parking spaces which they're putting in, and I do think that the complete look of the building they're proposing is very nice compared to what most developers might suggest to put on there. And my only suggestion would be that if you feel that, both you feel that the size of this whole building is larger than you think is appropriate, then maybe if they would reflect the shape of the original building to the new building with a more pitched roof, then maybe the size would appear smaller if that is something that is the big hang up. But
ultimately I think if there's any developer to do this project, it should be Mahmood and I -- from the financial aspect, I completely understand that without the third unit, it is not financially feasible. Currently I am lifting and moving a 1857 house and redoing the foundation. I know how
expensive it is and I have a lot more room to work with than he does. So I fully endorse this project and really hope to taking into consideration that the house is in very frail condition and needs basically immediate help before it falls apart.

So, yeah, that's it.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you again for coming down a second time.

Anyone else wishes to be heard?

BARBARA HAYES HARRISON: I live at 143. I abut
the property.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Your name, please?

BARBARA HAYES HARRISON: Barbara Hayes Harrison.

And I approve of this project because Marci needs, needs that help because she'd have to be preserved because it's an historical thing. I understand that. And he's agreeable to do that which no other people have ever stepped forward to say I'll take on this project, because it is an astronomical
project to have funding to do this project and still make a little bit of a profit. It's not astronomical, I'm sure, profit, because it's not that kind of a neighborhood because they're all small units. And I, I just agree that it should be done. And right, right away because it is in desperate need because it is disintegrating before our eyes. CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you, too, for coming down.

Anyone else wishes to be heard?
(No Response.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Apparently not. All
right.

As the Chair, I've mentioned we are in receipt of a number of letters which $I$ will read into the record in one form other another. There is a letter signed by Mr. Blum, Lawrence Blum as well as Noel Jette, J-E-T-T-E, Judith Smith, and Allen Zaslazsky, Z-A-S-L-A-Z-S-K-Y. The points that Mr . Blum made are covered in this letter generally, and
the letter is as Mr. Blum in support of the relief being sought.

There's a letter from the -- Denise Simmons, office of the Mayor. (Reading) I am writing to lend my strong support for Marcia Kirssin and the zoning application to construct three units, dwelling at 147R Prospect. I met Marcia nearly 20 years ago during my time serving on the Cambridge School Committee when Marcia was employed by the City of Cambridge School Department as family liaison. Then, as now, Marcia was committed to Cambridge and the betterment of families and the students in the city. I'm also familiar with the property and consider the location to be on the border of Mid-Cambridge an Area 4/Port neighborhood where I have lived for most of my life. Like many of the aging residents in my neighborhood, Marcia's sole asset is a condemned property that needs to be sold in order to provide for a reasonable standard of living and quality of life that we all certainly hope to achieve. My
understanding is that the value of the lot is significantly diminished by the Zoning Regulations due to unique characteristics on the lot, including the long and narrow driveway abutting a private way, rear yard, and front setbacks such as -- such that without zoning relief a quality development that satisfies Marcia's financial needs would not be possible. Additionally the Mid-Cambridge Neighborhood Commission had issued a Certificate of Appropriateness which will preserve a historical property, but also further provides a restriction on the siting of any additional development on the lot. I would strongly encourage the Board to recognize Marcia's unique financial hardship caused in part by chronic and debilitating health conditions as well as the high cost of owning and maintaining property in Cambridge. I've also reviewed the design of all three units and applaud Marcia and the developer for proposing three-bedroom units which are still in short supply and should be encouraged in an appropriate
context such as this. I strongly urge you to approve the variance for Special Permit relief request without delay.

There's a letter from a Steve Buckley at 43

Highland Road in Somerville. (Reading) I am writing to you from Fort Meyers, Florida, where as a sports -- did you meet him when you were down there?

JANET GREEN: I did.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: (Continue reading) Where
as a sports columnist with the Boston Herald, I am covering the Red Sox in spring training.

JANET GREEN: We didn't -- I just want to say we did not discuss this.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Put that in the record.
(Continue reading) The reason $I$ mention this is because I'm a native of Cambridge where at Senate Park I learned to play baseball. Not very well I should add. And it was at our family home at 147 Prospect Street that my brothers, sister, and I learned to love and embrace the
game. I loved it so much that I chose to make sports journalism my career and I've been blessed to have spent nearly 40 years doing something that brings me such joy. But I digress. I have been informed that there is a case before you, BZA case No. 009301 regarding the redevelopment of our longtime family home at 147 Prospect Street. Though our family sold 147 Prospect Street in 1977, we were pleased and flattered when the perspective new owner, Mahmood Firouzbakht, recently reached out to us and shared his vision for the old homestead. I could send you 50 pages of stories from our days in the house -- please don't -- but I'll boil it down to this: We have fond memories of this, we love it, and we hope it stands forever. From a personal standpoint in having seen Mr. Firouzbakht's plans, I am comfortable with the idea of a renovated expanded house with added units on the footprint. To me that's infinitely preferable than having it torn down and replaced with a brick box of condos. And as am now I am blessed to own and
live in a much larger house in neighboring Somerville, but I believe it makes sense to enlarge and expand the original development -- original dwelling at 147 Prospect Street to accommodate the needs of 21st century inhabitants.

A letter from Larry Slotnick who lives at 94

Grafton Street in Arlington, Massachusetts.

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: He owns an abutting
property.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: That's what it says in his
letter. (Reading) My name is Larry Slotnick and I am the owner of 145 Prospect Street, Cambridge. As you are probably aware, the state of affairs regarding 147 Prospect Street have been deplorable for a number of year (sic). So I welcome the prospect of the redevelopment of the property. I've met with Mahmood Firouzbakht and discussed his proposed development for the property. I understand his plan to increase the residential density of the property and am in agreement with that. I also understand that the variances
he seeks with respect to various setbacks and the rear and side yards, and with respect to the proposed parking spaces and needed setbacks. I am in agreement with the variances he seeks inasmuch as it will enable the development proposal to move forward. I also think that Mr. Firouzbakht has a solid reputation as a developer in Cambridge and will be sensitive to the needs of abutters through the design and construction process.

We have a letter from Charles Sullivan who has
already spoken tonight so I don't think I have to read his letter.

A letter from Barbara Hayes, H-A-Y-E-S. This
letter, I don't know what the date is. Anyway, she says: I am unable to attend the Board meeting tonight. I'm not sure if this was the original one or tonight.

BARBARA HAYES: That was the original. That was
me.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I don't need to read your
letter if you don't mind since you've spoken.

A letter from 320 Broadway Realty Trust.
(Reading) I am the owner -- not signed, just the name of the entity. It's at Broadway Gas and Service, the gas station on the corner. (Reading) I am the owner of 320-322

Broadway. I am in support of the proposed project at 147 R Prospect Street. I have reviewed the plans and it will be a great improvement to the existing property.

We have another letter from Lawrence Blum, et al.

And we've taken care of that.

We have also lastly a letter from George Sallum, S-A-L-L-U-M who resides at 127 Larch Road. (Reading) I am the owner of 141 Prospect Street in Cambridge. I support this project because it would provide much needed dwelling units in this area by virtue of its location midway between Harvard and MIT.

And that's it. There are no other -- that's the end of public testimony or public comment.

Anything further or where do you want to go from here, Mr. Hope?

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Um --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I'm going to
suggest -- I'm sorry, I asked you and then I interject.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Okay.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I would ask you to take
time to think about it one more time. You heard it from us.

You heard the issues. I think we hashed it out this time
much better than last time. You may come back with a very
same stay where we are or we'll have to abandon this project
if this Board insists that there must be less than the two units you have there. That's your prerogative. But I think it really behooves you to really spend a little bit of time to think about that. If you don't want to do that, if you want to push it to a vote tonight, that's up to you.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: When you mention a little more time, are you referencing a continuance?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yes, of course.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Yeah.

JANET GREEN: And, Gus, just to go back and say, I
mean, I want to be a little bit clear about what we're actually asking them.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Sure.

JANET GREEN: Because I think that's -- that would be helpful, too.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I can only tell what I'm asking is that I'm asking another structure, a new structure on the property that's smaller in footprint than what is proposed in the plans.

JANET GREEN: So it could be two, it could be one --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I don't care about the number that's used. That's where I'm coming from.

JANET GREEN: You don't care --

THOMAS SCOTT: And I'm not asking that. So that's
where I'm coming from.

JANET GREEN: And I'm not asking that.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Brendan, you have any
comments you want to make at this point?

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: I've probably spoken too much, but I would concur along your train of thought. I would like to see a structure that would comply to the setbacks on three sides.

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: You mean the zoning as of right, is that what you're saying?

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: We keep throwing around this as-of-right, but, yes. It would comply with the new structure, the new structure, comply with setbacks on three sides.

MARK BOYES-WATSON: So in accepting the rear
setbacks is what you're saying?

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Accepting.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: The rear yard setback is 30
feet. The front yard setback is 10 feet. So that footprint is, I mean --

MARK BOYES-WATSON: So if it's, three sides other than four sides, three sides $I$ guess is -- you would be in the rear setback now could possibly be it. That's what I was clarifying.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Right, you could be on two sides and the front?

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: With the understanding that moving the house is going to impact a setback of violation or a setback requirement.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: That may be the old plan, Brendan. I think the one is attached Sean's letter. Is that attached to Sean's letter? I think there's one more in there.

THOMAS SCOTT: Is it this one?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: That's the one you want to look at.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: How you could comply here, here, and here?

MARK BOYES-WATSON: The first one is a 30 -foot required setback. The first one?

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Right. In other words, how you can comply, here, here, and here. This is a violation, yes?

MARK BOYES-WATSON: 30-foot required setback. 30.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Right. This is a violation
presently as presented?

MARK BOYES-WATSON: Yes.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: And this is a violation presently?

MARK BOYES-WATSON: Yes.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Okay.

So how you could comply with that requirement,
that requirement, and that requirement.

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: If we -- and keep the
historic single-family, Brendan, is that what you're asking?

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: And this gets moved to this
location.

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: I mean, you can tell
already, because the 30 -foot setback is right around here.

So then you'd have -- I don't know if you could build
anything there. That would really be viable if you -- if you meet those three setbacks. I mean, you know that right now.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Well, I mean....

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: We could look at that certainly. Okay.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: By the way, just if we do look at that as requested, please, your answer, I want it run by Ranjit. So we don't have a debate here, yes, he said this, yes, he didn't say this. We should all be on the same page with that. So if he signs off on whatever you're going to propose to us, very important to me certainly.

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: The challenge in making this
decision is whether to continue or what to do here is, you know, having vetted this project, you know, extensively with, you know, the Historical Commission, Mid-Cambridge, neighbors, our design professionals, our attorneys, and many professionals that actually live in the neighborhood as well, and the consistent feedback that we've received is that this is appropriate in scale and size and dimension. And it's beautiful. And it's a beautification of this property. And so -- and we've been incredibly sensitive to actually sizing this -- this project has been sized down I'd say probably, I don't know, three or four times from our original, original proposal. And so, you know, you get to a certain point where you feel -- I feel confident that this is right. This is the right size. This is the right dimension. This is appropriate for this lot. And there's a lot of other people who do this for a living, you know, who agree with me. And so that's the challenge, you know, in trying to please you and please you in making changes that
frankly I think aren't warranted to, I don't know, to get your approval. Whereas I think we have a perfectly fine project here that's appropriate and that meets -- in many ways meets 40-A standards which a lot of variance projects don't. And so that's a challenge. I have to say it's hard to accept the reality that we are having -- we are where we are. But I respect it because certainly I know from experience, you know, where you're coming from. And so I think certainly it makes sense for us to look at this again -CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I think so. MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: -- and see if we can make some modifications that hopefully please this crowd to the point where -- and to the point, this house is falling apart.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: We understand that. We understand that.

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: And I don't know what Marcia
will do should I step out of this picture. And it's a possibility that this house -- and I guess that's a reality --

JANET GREEN: That's --

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Please, back there, a little respect.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I really, I appreciate
what you're saying and I think you're taking the drift of my comment.

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: Yeah.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I want to take, I'm sorry, Marcia out of this.

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: Yeah.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: It's not about Marcia.

Her problems are not in any way relevant to our determination. I know, I know where you're coming from and I understand from a personal, emotional point of view where we are, but that's not what we're here for.

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: And I say that, Mr. Chair, just to make the point that the preservation of this house is at risk.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And we're not talking
about 12 months. I guess I'm not talking about --

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: You guys, you have a busy
schedule. It took us three months to get back.

MARK BOYES-WATSON: When did we start this?

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: We started this over a year ago.

MARK BOYES-WATSON: You have to know what it's
like to go through -- we started this a year ago. This is the culmination of a year's work.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: But in the context of --

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: In the context of the entire project, in terms of outreach.

MARK BOYES-WATSON: It's we go back --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I can't help the City of

Cambridge's approval process.

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: I guess if we can -- the
last time we had a continuance it took us a while to get
here.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: As you well know, it's a
case heard.

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: Right.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: So we have to find a date
that works for you and works for us. And I'll tell you from the start, I'm not here June 30th.

MARK BOYES-WATSON: We have to go back to

Mid-Cambridge.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: You would have to anyway.

MARK BOYES-WATSON: It depends on what it is.

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: Right.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Well, anyway.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: So I mean it sounds like
we're saying we would -- we want a continuance?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: That's what I'm hearing. ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Is there a date is probably important as well.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: The second date -- I'm not saying the outset to start the discussion going, I can't be here the second hearing date in June. So either before that or --

SEAN O'GRADY: It's going to have to be after that then.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Why?

SEAN O'GRADY: Well, you've got one slot next time around, but things have to be approved through the Department and they have to be in by the Monday. I can't come into the department and do a review by that. CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Some of the cases we may have on our continued agenda are cases that are what I'm going to call phantom cases, people will continue the case and continue it again or it's just a very five or ten
minutes.

SEAN O'GRADY: We have people who continually come back and come back and eat up huge amounts of time.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yes, okay. I'm trying to say I'm willing to push this Board and to move this case along. Because $I$ understand what you're saying and I agree with it. I can just tell you that June -- the second time in June $I$ can't be here. So that date is out. So, again, I'm willing, if other members of the board are able and willing to somehow shoehorn this at an earlier date, if you wanted an earlier date.

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: That would be very much appreciated.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: How about the first one in June? That's about a month from now.

SEAN O'GRADY: You've got a full house, three continued cases.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: What are the nature of
those continued cases?

SEAN O'GRADY: I don't know.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yes. I just -- my
experience has been that -- well, at least one -- you saw tonight, at least one of the continued cases is a case that disappears.

SEAN O'GRADY: You're the Chair. CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yes. And I -JANET GREEN: What's the date of the first one? CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And we'll be here later than usual.

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: And hopefully we'll do such an incredible job on our presentation and we'll do away with it quickly.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Can other members make it on June whatever?

SEAN O'GRADY: 16th.

JANET GREEN: 16th.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: June 16th?

JANET GREEN: Yes.

MARK BOYES-WATSON: I won't be here, but you'll be fine without me.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: How could they do it
without you, Mr. Boyes-Watson?

MARK BOYES-WATSON: My daughter is getting
married.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Congratulations.

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: That's okay then.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay, the Chair -- ready
to take a motion? June 16th work?

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: That's fine.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: The Chair moves that this
case be continued as a case heard until seven p.m. on June 16th subject to the following conditions:

One, that the petitioner sign a waiver of time for decision. And you've done that already.

Two, that the posting sign be modified. You know the drill, but I have to put it on the record. Be modified to reflect the new date, June 16th, and the new time, seven p.m.

And that this modified sign or new sign be posted for the 14 days prior to June 16th as required by our Ordinance.

And lastly to the extent that you're going to submit revised plans or, and I guess this goes to also the as-of-right plan that we're -- you've been talking about with Brendan, they all should be in our files and any dimensional change in dimensional form, if necessary, in our files no later than the Monday before June 16th.

All those in favor of this motion, please say
"Aye."
(Aye.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Case continued. See you
on June 16th.
(Alexander, Sullivan, Scott, Green, Hammer.)

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: And, Mr. Chair, just
one -- did you get a chance to review the alternate plan that we submitted in the file?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: That was the as-of-right
plan?

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: No, no, no. There's an alternate plan with the driveway modified. There's a turnaround that's proposed.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I did review it. But the driveway's not been my problem. I did review the plans to answer your question.

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: I guess -CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I didn't focus a lot of time on it, but I did review it.

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: The reason I ask that is we took what in the first instance was presented as driveway space, turnaround space --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Right.

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: -- and we converted that to green space, which we can do and still meet, and, you know, still sort of meet the same parking -- relief requirements, which significantly changes the green space.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: It's how we get to that ten percent over what's required, the comment in the file.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And to be honest with you, Mahmood, I didn't review that closely because I was focusing on the other issues. I was frankly disappointed to see that we were basically seeing the same project we seen before despite the objections you heard before. Be that as it may, we'll focus on it more the next time and if you want to highlight that a little bit more, make sure you do it June -- the Monday before.

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: Sure.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And that could be
significant. I don't know, I'll have to see it.

MAHMOOD FIROUZBAKHT: Okay, thank you. See you
next time.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Good night.
(8:40 p.m.)
(Sitting Members Case No. BZA-009632-2016: Constantine

Alexander, Brendan Sullivan, Janet Green, George S. Best, Alison Hammer.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay, the Chair calls case

No. 009632-2016, 56 Amory Street.

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

CAITLIN KUNZLE: Hello.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Hello.

CAITLIN KUNZLE: How are you all?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: As you now know, give your name and address to the stenographer. Anyone who is -- and this gentleman as well.

CAITLIN KUNZLE: I'm Caitlin Kunzle. I'm here on
behalf of Johnson Shing for 56-58 Amory Street.

So basically what we are proposing is relief regarding the dimensional requirements and the gross floor area.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yes.

CAITLIN KUNZLE: Because we have a currently non-conforming structure and we're looking to add about 300 additional square feet on the third floor only through a dormer extension. So a larger third floor area which would push us even more non-conforming as well as some additional deck space on the second floor.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: We should make, for the record, make sure everybody understands what you're talking about to increase the FAR, because it is significant.

CAITLIN KUNZLE: Yes.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Right now you're at 1.48.

CAITLIN KUNZLE: And we're asking for 1.57.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yes, which is almost
twice --

CAITLIN KUNZLE: The FAR. 0.75.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yes, the permitted FAR.

It's a lot of structure on the lot.

CAITLIN KUNZLE: Yeah.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: It doesn't mean we're
going to turn you down, but the record should be clear about that.

CAITLIN KUNZLE: Yeah.

So we do understand that we are significantly
non-conforming. The benefits of our design is that we're strictly limited to the third floor. We're not changing the footprint of the building, the setbacks -CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: But you are adding decks?

CAITLIN KUNZLE: We are adding a deck on the second floor.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And decks, you know, this

Board doesn't look at -- we look at them very closely when it comes to decks because of the privacy and noise issues particularly in tight neighborhoods. And I don't understand -- get right to the -- I can understand the need for additional space. I can see the addition, but I have personally have a lot of problems with the decks, particularly the third floor deck.

CAITLIN KUNZLE: Okay.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: So I don't -- maybe why do you need decks?

CAITLIN KUNZLE: It was really just an improvement to the units to have some open space and private open space.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: What about the impact on the neighbors?

JOHNSON SHING: My main concern for the deck -- I'm sorry. The main concern for the deck was the fire.

JOHNSON SHING: Fire escape.

CAITLIN KUNZLE: Egress.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: You don't need a whole deck for egress. You could have a staircase. Many houses in Cambridge do have that.

CAITLIN KUNZLE: And we do have letters from abutting neighbors that are all in agreement with the project. These are all the direct abutting neighbors.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I'll read them into the file at the appropriate time.

ALISON HAMMER: Can I add one thing about the decks? I would certainly have a question as to whether the space under these decks are also additional gross floor area and if you're actually increasing the gross floor area even more than you're thinking?

CAITLIN KUNZLE: The space underneath the decks, there's currently a cellar entrance on the first floor and we would be maintaining the same footprint of the cellar
entrance as well as raising the side walls up to the bottom of the second floor deck, but other than that we wouldn't be enclosing anything else on the main floor.

SEAN O'GRADY: Yes, if you cover space.

CAITLIN KUNZLE: That counts?

SEAN O'GRADY: Yes.

CAITLIN KUNZLE: So that might be the case.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: So even more FAR issues
than you said?

SEAN O'GRADY: Yes.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Have you really thought
about maybe foregoing the decks? I mean, you want additional living space, and I understand that.

CAITLIN KUNZLE: Correct.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: We can talk about whether
this is a dormer extension or whether this is just an addition.

CAITLIN KUNZLE: An addition.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I for one am not going to
get into that debate. But I can only -- I'm going to get right to the chase. I'm only going to support this if we get rid of at least the third floor deck. I don't see any need for it whatsoever, and it has an adverse impact to the neighborhood.

CAITLIN KUNZLE: Okay.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: The second floor deck is
smaller than it is, I'm open to it. That's my view. I'm only one of five. And that's where I'm coming from.

CAITLIN KUNZLE: That's totally understandable.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I mean, if you have a
justification for the decks other than it seems like a good idea --

CAITLIN KUNZLE: Right.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: -- you know, fine.

CAITLIN KUNZLE: The egress was the first kind of concern because there was a second stairwell in the home
that we're removing with the interior renovations, and so this was the second exit from the rear of the building that was kind of the first priority. And other than that, I think that there was --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Well, we haven't heard from other members of the board. I could be outvoted. As you probably know, you need four votes to get the relief you're seeking. So you could have one descenter and still get the relief.

CAITLIN KUNZLE: Okay.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Just so you know. I'm
sorry I interrupt your presentation.

CAITLIN KUNZLE: That was pretty much it. It's a
small project. Yeah, the only other change would be interior layout changes. CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Well, we don't generally are not concerned about interior layout.

CAITLIN KUNZLE: And we have gone to the

Mid-Cambridge Conservation District.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yes, you have no choice.

CAITLIN KUNZLE: They have approved of the changes to the front, we're just slightly widening the staircase -CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: This is a two-family house, right?

CAITLIN KUNZLE: Correct. And it has a sister
house.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: It's side-by-side?

CAITLIN KUNZLE: Correct, it's a side-by-side two-family house and it has a sister house directly next to it that's recently been restored, so we will be doing something similar, restoring the clapboard siding and things like that.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: In the front of the house?

CAITLIN KUNZLE: Well, we would be looking to re-side the whole house really.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay. Re-side but not
extend -- built extensions?

CAITLIN KUNZLE: No, just update the exterior. It currently has asphalt shingles that are a little bit old and in disrepair.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I understand.

Comments or questions from members of the board at this point?

JANET GREEN: No, I would look at the size of the deck on the second floor, looking at it just because it does increase your FAR which is already pretty high.

CAITLIN KUNZLE: Okay. So it's currently ten feet deep, the second floor deck. Are you looking for half that size?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Less than ten feet. I
personally, I would say yes, at least, no more than five.

And if you can do three, that would even be better. But, you know, I'm open to discussion as to why that's too small of a deck.

JANET GREEN: Yeah, and I would think five you could actually put a chair out there.

CAITLIN KUNZLE: Right. Anything smaller I would say is a balcony or so.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: One of the problems that where we're going with this discussion, I'm thinking about the case we just finished, is that, I think, maybe I'm wrong, we're going to another continuance because you're going to have to go back to redraw your plans to show a smaller deck on the second floor, no deck on the third floor, but some sort of second means of egress which you say you're going to have to put in if there's no deck.

CAITLIN KUNZLE: Correct.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: That means you got to do
those and we have to have another hearing.

CAITLIN KUNZLE: Okay.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Anyway, I'm jumping ahead.

Anybody have other views about this?

GEORGE BEST: No.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I'd like to do this case, we call it a case heard, after -- sometime in early, the earliest would be in July because we've got a full schedule between now and the end of June and we -- since this is a case heard, I've got to sit on this case and I won't be here on June whatever, 30th?

SEAN O'GRADY: Just to interject, the reason -- we have a slot open the next time around. I couldn't commit to the Department to review and bear work prior to that time. But there is still a slot open.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: But if you can --

SEAN O'GRADY: It was only really that project.

I'm not going to review on this project.

JANET GREEN: Is that what you're saying is this
is more simple?

SEAN O'GRADY: Well, the problem that I had with the last one is that one of the requirements was that Ranjit
review whatever it was and get a final on it.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Right.

SEAN O'GRADY: I couldn't commit to that.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And I don't know what the
first session in July or roughly the second week in July, would that be -- I know you like to get your work going. JOHNSON SHING: That's perfect timing because I'm leaving the country and I would be back about then. CAITLIN KUNZLE: Can I just, I want to be clear. The second floor deck you would like it smaller and the third floor not at all?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: That's my view. I'm only one person.

CAITLIN KUNZLE: And there's no need for a second means of egress on the third floor. If we remove the deck, there would be no doors and it would just be windows.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: It's just reconfiguring
the second floor deck and eliminating the third floor deck.

CAITLIN KUNZLE: Right.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: You can just revise the
plans.

JOHNSON SHING: And we have a pathway so they can climb down the second floor like in case of an emergency. CAITLIN KUNZLE: On the third floor you mean? JANET GREEN: That would be a place where you could --

JOHNSON SHING: Yeah, two feet, three feet wide so there's a path.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Can all the members of the -- when is the date, the first date in July?

SEAN O'GRADY: 7/14.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: I don't know if anybody has come down here.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I want to get there before I get there.

Is there anyone who wants to be heard on this
matter before we -- okay, Ma'am.

RACHAEL ZSEMBERY: I'm Rachael Zsembery. I'm a neighbor directly behind the unit at 12 St. Mary Road so this looks directly onto my backyard and I have similar concerns which I expressed to Rebecca about the -- specifically the second floor deck as it -- this is already a significantly rescaled home and the deck would sit right on my -- almost right on my lot line. So I'd actually prefer almost no second floor deck. And obviously the noise from the third floor deck is a concern for me, too, depending on how it's used.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay. Thank you. Your
comments are well noted. And I think the petitioner is on board with you anyway.

RACHAEL ZSEMBERY: The other thing I wanted to mention, too, you mentioned originally the size and scale of the dormer extension --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Right.

RACHAEL ZSEMBERY: -- which is quite large. We do have very little -- that's the south sun that comes from that side and we do have very little sun that we get into our yard anyway, and this will start to encroach on that again, so $I$ would just also look at the size.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Well, are you -- can I ask
you, are you objecting to the size?

RACHAEL ZSEMBERY: No, no, but I just wanted to mention that as long as the deck, that's my main concern. CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: We're going to be continuing this case to July 14th it would appear. If you want to be -- does that does that work for you if you want to come back or did you say what you're going to say?

RACHAEL ZSEMBERY: I just wanted to mention about
the decks so I'm happy to write a letter for the other.

Thank you.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Ready for a vote?

ALISON HAMMER: Can I add one more thing?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Of course.

ALISON HAMMER: Maybe I missed it. I didn't see any existing elevations which made it hard for me to understand what you were proposing.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you.

CAITLIN KUNZLE: To the?

ALISON HAMMER: To the --

CAITLIN KUNZLE: The side?

ALISON HAMMER: The house, right. And even on your drawings, $I$ found them a little bit difficult to read. So if you could just definitely add the existing elevation and make it very clear this is what we're adding, this is what's existing, that would be very helpful.

Thank you.

CAITLIN KUNZLE: Sure.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And okay, well, this would be part of my motion in a second, but these are revised plans that you're going to have to do. They must be in our
file no later than five p.m. on the Monday before July 14th, otherwise we won't hear the case. Just so you understand it. I'll make it part of the motion.

The Chair moves that this case be continued as a case heard subject to the following conditions:

That, one, that the petitioner sign a waiver of time for decision. And we have a standard waiver that everybody signs.

Two, that the posting sign be modified or a new one obtained which reflects the new date, July 14th, the new time, seven p.m. It won't be as late as this hopefully. And that this sign be maintained for the 14 days before or the 14th required by our Ordinance.

And lastly, as we first said, to the extent that there will be new plans, and there will be, these new plans and any modification to your dimensional form which also needs plans, and there should be some, because as has been pointed out, you have an FAR calculation you got to redo.

CAITLIN KUNZLE: Yes.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: They must be in our files no later than five p.m. on the Monday before July 14th. If you don't do that, then we're going to have to continue it again. And that's just to allow us and the citizens of the city who are interested to come down and see what it is you're asking us to approve on the 14th.

All those in favor please say "Aye."
(Aye.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Five in favor. We'll see you on July 14th.

SEAN O'GRADY: 7/14.
(8:50 p.m.)
(Sitting Members Case BZA-009745-2016: Constantine

Alexander, Brendan Sullivan, Janet Green, George S. Best, Alison Hammer.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: The Chair will call case No. 009745, 76 Prospect Street.

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

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Good evening,

Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. For the record, my name is James Rafferty. I'm an attorney with offices at 675 Massachusetts Avenue. I'm appearing this evening on behalf of the applicant, Partners Medspring. Seated to my left is Joseph Berry, B-E-R-R-Y. Mr. Berry is a Vice President in charge of real estate. And to my right is Jonathan Davila, D-A-V-I-L-A and Mr. Davila is also with Medspring.

So this is an application to seek a Special Permit to modify the parking requirements. I'm sure the Board is familiar with the site. It's been for the last 20 years or so, it's been a bakery.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Two different kinds of
bakeries.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Right. I was -- I go back to when Carberry's first went there. Came there in front of this Board --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: So do --

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: -- we got a Special

Permit.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: You didn't need to get parking relief then am I correct?

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: No, we didn't. I looked at the Special Permit. We had the same issue, though, because the lot is slightly deeper than the zoning --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: That's a variance issue.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: And that's the second part of the application. I'm sure you know the building. And it was actually an auto glass store. And I remember when Mr. Carberry wanted to make it a bakery 20 plus years ago, the neighbors came out and said, forget all that plate glass window because the prior owner had boarded most of it
up. That's going to get smashed, that's going to get broken, they're crazy. So it was a very transformative use in that location, that stretch of Prospect Street. And Carberry's was in its day when it first opened, it was one of those, you know, a different kind of bakery where you could go and get a sandwich and it was, it was focussed on bread. He was a bread bakery. And the guy who was his baker came from Iceland and lived in the little room above the building. But, you know, I heard Steve Buckley going down memory lane so I thought it was worth noting. JANET GREEN: He was a big fan of Carberry's, too. ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Steve, yeah, he could walk to it. Yeah, he was.

So Carberry's was there for a long time. And then Matt Carberry sold the business to Lyndell's, the bakery from the Somerville neighbor for a few years. And it's been vacant now I'm going to say for well over a year. I walk by it many times, and a number of uses looked at it. But

Medspring Urgent Care operates walk-in medical offices. I'm sure you've seen them around. They're becoming more popular in the Boston area. They partnered with Partners Healthcare in the Boston area. I know they have one in Brookline. They have one in Watertown. They're also in Newton.

JOSEPH BERRY: That's right.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: And this would, this
would follow that model. We've provided a floor plan. But the parking requirements, as you know in this business district, with regard to a medical office is based on square footage. And there's two aspects about the building that have some relevance. If you look at the floor plan, you wouldn't know this unless you knew the building, but the way they're laying out the space, the set of stairs that access as the second floor, which is really a rotunda-type room upstairs, that staircase is coming out. It's coming out because they're not going to use the space. It wasn't accessible. But it's not, it's not a pretend removal. It's
an actual remove because if you look at the floor plan, their treatment rooms, everything else, their floor plan does not work if the staircase remains. So the Ordinance doesn't really address that, but we think it's a condition worthy of consideration for the Board and the relief we're seeking as you know --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I want to make sure I
understand your point. You're saying that you're going to be removing this second floor. I understand it.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Access to it, yeah.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And as a result of that,
if the second floor were removed, you would meet the requirements?

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: No. We're still going to be shy. If you go to the dimensional form --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: 16, 13, I got it.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: That's right. If you go to the dimensional form, in a pure zoning sense the
building, the square footage is based on the building. So if that additional 812 square feet were there, the Ordinance would suggest 16 spaces are required. Without that space, the only 13 would be required. So we're saying in real terms, the parking requirement is 13.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yep.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: And what we're -- what exists at the site today is 11 . So we're two short.

So, but as you know, the provisions of Article
6.31 that authorize the Board to grant this relief, identify three criteria, and chief among them is the availability of, or the proximity to an MBTA transit station. And this site is very proximate, as we all know, to the Central Square station.

The second criteria is the availability of public or commercial parking facilities. And the City maintains there are a number of municipal parking lots on Bishop Allen Drive within a few hundred feet of this location; three on
this side -- on that side of Mass. Ave. and the City's
municipal garage on Green Street. So there are commercial parking facilities within reasonable proximity.

And another criteria is whether there's anything about the age or occupancy restrictions which are likely to result in a lower level of auto usage. And this particular use, I learned from Mr. Berry and Mr. Davila, many of the patients that come here don't have established relationships with primary care physicians. They're students, they're younger people, they sometimes have recently arrived, and they're a demographic that don't own automobiles at the same rate of occupancy as others do. So given the younger demographic and the Cambridge market in particular and this cluster closest to Central Square, I would suggest the Board could also take recognition of that in weighing the criteria associated with this.

In terms of actual usage and demand, the parking, the staffing at the facility I learned would involve three
staffers; it's a medical provider, an MD, and two additional staffers.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: That's it?

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: That's it.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And, therefore, with that
skeleton staff, the kind of services you're going to offer are basically, as you say walk-in. I mean, a person's got a headache or whatever. I don't know, minimize it. You're not talking about coming in and having X-rays taken? Are you?

JOSEPH BERRY: So we offer X-rays. CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: You will offer X-rays?

JOSEPH BERRY: So we think if an X-ray is
required, we have that on-site.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: But as an adjunct to the
person walking in maybe has a broken bone, let's take an

X-ray, that kind of thing?

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Right. So it really
operates, in my opinion, and these gentlemen can correct me, it really operates like the office of a primary care physician but a little more expansive, and so --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: That's what I wanted to
know.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: And there is occasion
when you get referred to an Emergency Room, but the volume is expected, and based on the historical use and elsewhere, they anticipate that after one year the average 40 visits a day, which is about three people an hour.

The hours of operation, the model they work on now is nine a.m. to nine p.m. They do see a lot of activity on the weekends when traditional medical offices are not open. So they tend to get a little more volume when parking and traffic is a little lighter in that particular location. So I think that's also a criteria of some relevance in evaluating whether or not this location would warrant the

Special Permit for the reduction of parking.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: So, which is I think very
useful. If you assume, if you assume all three of these professionals are going to drive to the space, you'll still have eight parking spaces for people who, for other patients am I right?

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Right. And their policy they informed me, may sound hierarchal, but apparently the physician gets a parking space and the other two are left to find their own parking. But if the supply exists in the lot, they would use it. But in some, this is appealing to the applicant because it actually has more parking than many of the other urban locations that they're in. So with these

11 parking spaces, they think they'll be able to allow the two employees. But I was surprised, frankly, to learn it was only three as well. So I asked a series of questions about well, how does it work? And they said, well, given the volume of business particularly in the first year,
that's the model that works in this setting three staff people?

JOSEPH BERRY: Yeah.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: And so, in discussing
criteria that the Board typically looks at is, you know, to what extent is the parking accommodating visitors or patients and to what extent will it accommodate staffing?

So the staffing numbers are rather modest, so we think that the, again, the some staffers will come by obviously transit but there's adequate parking.

So that's kind of the story on the parking.

It's -- and it's an existing condition parking lot.

By way of changes there's no dimensional change in the building. There's facade improvements that we included that we'll improve.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Other than removing the cupola, the second floor.

Only the stairway's being removed.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Oh, okay. You're right. ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: The form and the mass are there. If we were removing this entirely, then it wouldn't be 16, 13. There would be no talk about the 16, right? So that the square footage is there, and I can't find an exemption in the Ordinance that would if you can't access it, you don't have to include it. Logics suggest that relevant for your analysis but it's not set forth in the Ordinance. And so that's our story on parking.

And the second part of the Ordinance relates to -CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Variance.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: -- the relationship to
the zoning boundary to the lot line, and I did make a copy just to let the Board understand the order of magnitude. By my estimation $I$ think it's within the six to eight foot range.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: And it's a condition
that exists in that building and the adjoining building. It was part of the relief when the bakery --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Right.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: -- when the All Rise

Bakery was given. Of note, though, in some cases I understand appropriately the Board's concern is well, what's the impact on the residential district? Are there rear doors? There's nothing. It's a solid wall, there are no openings. So no impacts on surrounding neighbors. We did send communication to the Essex Street neighbors, and these residential properties are on Essex Street and offered to meet with them and discuss the application. Several weeks ago I got a nice reply from Ms. Ryan saying thank you, they were aware of it, and they declined to meet with us. So I think -- and I'm not aware of any concern.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Just for purposes of when we make our findings to grant the variance, are there any
other facilities in the general area like yours walk-in?

Are you fulfilling a need that's not --

JOSEPH BERRY: I think that's one of the reasons
we targeted this. We felt like it was an open area for that kind of service.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Okay.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: You'll have a chance, sir.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: So the Variance is
related to the hardship. It's the location of the building.

It would be a hardship. I mean, to not use that portion of the building would be somewhat wasteful. As a practical matter, I'm not sure -- it wouldn't be required to take it down. You wouldn't even be required to put a wall up. CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: But, yeah, we have a precedent for granting the Variance that was -- the one you obtained the last time around for the bakery.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Oh, no question. No,
and I think there are precedence in other locations where the deeper lot extends slightly beyond it. CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yeah.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: And so, it's a
longstanding commercial building that's had that footprint for decades. We're not introducing or encroaching into an area that's an existing situation. So for those reasons we think the hardship is related to the existing structure and would warrant the relief. It won't derogate from the intent of the Ordinance because we're not going to impact. It's an allowed use in the Business A-1 District where the principal property is located. So we're hopeful that the Board will find that the elements of relief are present and the variance -- for the use in the Residence B District, and that portion of the building would be granted and a Special Permit would allow for the reduction of the required parking.

Comments or questions from members of the Board at this point?

JANET GREEN: I only had one question. When it was called Urgent Care, it made me think of more people driving there actually in a hurry to get there, you know, had an accident with the lawn mower or something like that. Maybe those people go to Emergency Rooms, huh? And was it urgent? I mean, what does urgent mean?

JOSEPH BERRY: It means if you feel like you need to get into a doctor, and like Mr. Rafferty said, if it's unavailable, you've got to wait. Like you said, you cut your arm and go wait in the ER for a couple hours for a stitch or you could come down the street if it's after hours, it may take the time to get down there. If you ever had a kid that is sick three in the morning, it feels pretty urgent so that's kind of the idea. That it's walk in-and we're available.

JONATHAN DAVILA: And it ties into the time of the
visit which is typically around an average of 45 minutes for an average visit, getting in and getting out.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Any other comments from
members of the board?
(No Response.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Appearing to be none, I'll
open the matter up to public testimony. Sir, you wanted to speak?

RAFFI MARDIROSIAN: I had a question.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Give your name and address to the stenographer.

RAFFI MARDIROSIAN: Raffi Mardirosian, R-A-F-F-I

M-A-R-D-I-R-O-S-I-A-N. I live at like next to it on

Prospect Street so that's less of an issue. My question is more around utility of the space and kind of the city plan. I do note there is an urgent care facility just up the street less than a mile away, and a couple of other urgent care facilities within a mile. And to me it just doesn't
seem like a great use of space right in the heart of Central Square. I feel like there are better things for the community, and if someone needs urgent care that's not an emergency, they can walk less than a mile probably. I'm not a medical professional so maybe that's wrong. So my questions are less around noise even though I'm a neighbor, but I do have questions about hours and noise, but it's, you know, I'm in the city, I can understand that. It's more around is this the best use of the space?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Well, I think, I guess my comment might be is that this place has been vacant for a good, long time and that maybe is the answer to your question, apparently there is not a --

RAFFI MARDIROSIAN: I thought
healthcare --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: No retail use.

RAFFI MARDIROSIAN: The rent was being asked was
quite high, but that's a private matter.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Maybe so, that's the
landlord's prerogative.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: I might offer with all
due respect to the Board, the question of use isn't one before the Board. So it's an allowed use in the Business A-1 District.

## CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Except of the piece of the

 building --ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: True. So I get the sense that it's not the six to eight feet that the speaker is referring to.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I understand that.

Anything further?

RAFFI MARDIROSIAN: No.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Anyone else wishes to be heard on this?
(No Response.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: The chair notes there is
no one else.

We're not in receipt of any letters in the file
other than the Planning Board has no opinion on this matter.

So I will close public testimony.

Any further or final comments --

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: No, thank you.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: -- Mr. Rafferty?

Ready for a vote or you want to have some discussion?

JANET GREEN: I'm ready.

GEORGE BEST: Ready.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay, I'll take the variance first.

The chair moves that we grant the variance -- the chair moves that we make the following findings with regard to the variance being sought:

That a literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would involve a substantial hardship. Such
hardship would be that this building, which is almost entirely in a commercial district, would not be able to be used for commercial purposes unless a variance is granted with regard to that small portion of the building that extends into a residential area.

That the hardship is owing to the shape of the building; namely, the way unfortunately straddles two zoning districts.

And that relief may be granted without 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 Board has already granted a variance on the very same issue a good number of years ago to allow a bakery to occupy the premises. That there is always a need in this day and age for urgent care facility or a medical facility that would cater to neighbors and residents of the city that don't require major medical help and that requires sitting in a wait room for two others
who are more to get that help or Emergency Room. And that's it.

On the basis of these findings the Chair moves that we grant the variance requested with regard to the continued location of a portion of the structure in a residential district.

All those in favor please say "Aye."
(Aye.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Five in favor. Variance
granted.
(Alexander, Sullivan, Green, Best, Hammer.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: With regard to the Special

Permit to reduce the parking, the Chair moves that we make the following findings:

That the requirements of the Ordinance cannot be met unless we grant the Special Permit given the number of parking spaces that are on the premises right now and what is required by our Ordinance.

That traffic generated or patterns of access or egress will not cause congestion, hazard, or substantial change in established neighborhood character.

And, again, in this regard, the parking -- use of parking on this facility for the bakeries didn't create that, and there's no reason for this Board to believe that the medical use would be substantially different in terms of its impact on congestion and the like.

That the continued operation of development of adjacent uses permitted by the Ordinance will not be adversely affected by what is being 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 what is being proposed will not impair the integrity of the district or adjoining districts or otherwise derogate from the intent and purpose of the Ordinance.

In this regard the Chair would note that the parking relief is rather modest. They have to have 13 spaces, they will only have 11.

That as the petitioner has pointed out, there are numerous off-street parking facilities in the immediate neighborhood or immediate area of this facility so that the ability to find parking is not unduly hampered.

And so on the basis of all these findings, the Chair moves that we grant the Special Permit requested which would reduce the amount of parking spaces to -- I'm sorry, from 13 to 11. This being done by the way on the condition of the -- on the premises and on the condition that the stairwell that allows access to the second floor of the structure will be removed thereby making the second floor not occupiable except by helicopter, occupiable and would create additional parking issue.

All those in favor please say "Aye."
(Aye.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Five in favor.
(Alexander, Sullivan, Green, Best, Hammer.)

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Did you want to throw something in there about the close proximity of public transportation? CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I did say that. BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Oh, you did that? CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yes.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: I was only going to
suggest because the language in the Special Permit is kind of funny about the requirements that the Ordinance cannot be met.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Right. I don't understand that.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: It's wrong here.

Because if you look at the language, the -- that section is directing you to 6.35 .1 which has criteria. So the applicant's burden before you is to prove that we can meet the requirements of 6.35.1. So I bristled a little bit when
you said, because $I$ know it reads that way. But everything here is stated in the negative so you make the opposite vote. It says traffic generated, but would cause congestion, hazard. So you're finding that all those things are not true. CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Right.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: So the initial finding here, $I$ think reference to $I$ hope we've made the case of the four criteria in 6.35.1, the proximity to transit and the availability of commercial parking and other criteria that you evaluated that criteria.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I thought I did that.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Yeah, but I think that's
the section of the Ordinance that we are meeting. But I just....

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay, I hear what you're saying.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: And I think that's what

Mr. Sullivan's comment that we're, we're complying with the provision -- in your view we've complied with the provisions of 6.35.1 and that's allowed the Board to grant the relief. CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay. I think we took the vote I can't add to it right now.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: No, no, I understand.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And I also agree with you
by the way. The Special Permit --

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: It states it in the
negative, right? And it's kind of funny that way. But if you read the state statute it goes the other way. It's just -- and if you look at the form, the application, it states it in the affirmative.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Right.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: So when you prepare the form, so, I answer the form, how will the -- will the Ordinance be met? And I say yeah, the Ordinance will be met because in most cases, right, the Special Permit, you are
authorized to grant the Special Permit if the following conditions are met. Sometimes they're quite generic, but sometimes they're specific to a particular district or a particular action like parking and all of that. And I think the applicant needs to approve compliance for you to grant the relief.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Nice to see you all.

Good evening.

JOSEPH BERRY: Thank you.
(9:15 p.m.)
(Sitting Members Case BZA-009886-2016: Constantine

Alexander, Brendan Sullivan, Janet Green, George S. Best, Alison Hammer.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: The Chair will call case No. 009886, 12 Sacramento Street.

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

SUSAN FRIEDEN: We're back.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I was going to make the same comment. What's going on here? This is the third time.

SUSAN FRIEDEN: I can't believe it. I know how to get here really easily by car. It's kind of our fault. We forgot about the deadline.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: But anyway, we're jumping
ahead. Name and address for the stenographer.

KARL FRIEDEN: So maybe I'll start. I'm Karl Frieden and this is Susan Frieden and our architects Mary ann Ann Thompson and Brittany Milas.

THE STENOGRAPHER: Can you spell your last name?

BRITTANY MILAS: Brittany Milas, M-I-L-A-S.

KARL FRIEDEN: So we're applying for a Variance and a Special Permit to construct an addition --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Are you applying for a

Special Permit? I didn't think you were doing that. Just a

Variance.

KARL FRIEDEN: Just a Variance.

SUSAN FRIEDEN: We already got the permit.

KARL FRIEDEN: Okay, we got the permit.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And it's still in force.

SUSAN FRIEDEN: That one we got.

KARL FRIEDEN: Can I give a little bit of
background?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Go ahead.

SUSAN FRIEDEN: Do you need it since we've been here before?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Well, maybe other members may need it. I don't need it.

JANET GREEN: It may not.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I'll ask questions anyway
that will draw it out.

KARL FRIEDEN: I can just give a quick opening and then draw it out.

You know, we've been in this house for 21 years and in Cambridge for 40 years, and by way of background, we applied for this very same variance and was granted unanimously by the Board and needed a second Variance which was the same project but a sort of fireplace. And unfortunately we had a delay in the renovation caused by our daughter's illness and hospitalized twice in the last year. So we were aware I think of the one year rule, but we thought that the one year rule for getting the Building Permit kicked into the second Variance. We found out unfortunately when we went to the Building Permit six or seven weeks after the first Variance was a year old that we didn't. That that didn't, that wasn't the rule. So we're really here for a second time on the exact same -- nothing has changed, on the exact same plan that was unanimously approved by this Board. So I, you know, if you want to draw it out more.
troubled by your form of advertisement. Why didn't you just simply say that -- you make it sound much less than what you're seeking. We just want to put an -- enlarge the area with additional fireplace. You're asking for more than that.

SUSAN FRIEDEN: We didn't say that. That, I know we didn't know why that came either. We got that in the mail, and I'm like how come it says that? That's not what we said the first two times.

JANET GREEN: You had to submit another thing for this time, right? And this isn't what you said this time?

SUSAN FRIEDEN: How did it come out?

JANET GREEN: It looked exactly the same to me.

SUSAN FRIEDEN: The time before?

JANET GREEN: Yeah, didn't it? I mean the --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yeah. I mean, Mr. O'Grady
has pointed out to me, here is your application that you
signed. And it says: Description of petitioner's proposal.

Variance to enlarge floor area with an addition of a fireplace.

SUSAN FRIEDEN: No, I'm saying that was this time, right?

KARL FRIEDEN: We are enlarging the floor area.

MARY ANN THOMPSON: That's the second variance.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I don't want to make a big
deal. But why didn't you simply say enlarge --

KARL FRIEDEN: I asked that question and I was told that was the proper form to put it in.

SUSAN FRIEDEN: I didn't know who did it.

Whatever.

BRITTANY MILAS: Can you clarify your question?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Well, you're seeking more
relief than you advertised. You're seeking to put an addition on which includes an enlarged fireplace, but it's not just an enlarged fireplace. And, you know, it sort of misleads the public. The public probably saying oh, it's
just a fireplace, who cares? But in fact it's more than that.

BRITTANY MILAS: We were in touch with Maria

Pacheco I believe it is.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Pacheco.

BRITTANY MILAS: And Ranjit during the application process.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yes, and they told you that's all you had to say?

BRITTANY MILAS: I don't recall if they said verbatim to --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: My understanding is -- and I don't, I'm going to drop this now. They implored you to do something more and you refused to do it.

BRITTANY MILAS: We were trying to clarify what the situation was and we were unclear what it --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Why didn't you take their
advice? The situation is you want to put an addition on
which includes an enlarged fireplace, that we granted you relief for before. That would be very simple to say. And I don't know why, but anyway.

KARL FRIEDEN: That wasn't any intent on our part.

SUSAN FRIEDEN: We didn't have any discussion about it at all. Like, none.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I didn't think you had. I didn't understand your potential --

KARL FRIEDEN: We weren't trying to mislead. We just at that point talked to all the neighbors. We had the same two letters we submitted last time. No neighbors oppose this. They're all supporting it. If there was anything misleading --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And I wanted to ask one question --

KARL FRIEDEN: -- I apologize for that.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: -- the relief you're
seeking tonight is the sum total of the relief you got on
the two variances no more, no less?

SUSAN FRIEDEN: Exactly.

KARL FRIEDEN: Exactly.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: To me end of story.

Okay?

Comments from members of the Board?
(No Response.)

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

Is there anyone here wishing to be heard on this matter?
(No Response.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I guess not. You
mentioned we have some letters in the file.

KARL FRIEDEN: We brought them again.

SUSAN FRIEDEN: We brought them again.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I thought I remember
seeing some letters. I don't see them now. Give me the
letters.

KARL FRIEDEN: And so this is one copy for everyone and this is the second one.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: We just need one.

KARL FRIEDEN: Okay.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: These are identical
letters?

KARL FRIEDEN: Yeah, just a copy for all of you.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I'll read it into the
file. (Reading) To Whom It May Concern: I live at 10

Sacramento Street. Well, I live at blank Sacramento -- I'll
leave that blank because the letters are all identical.

Everybody says I live at 10 Sacramento Street.

KARL FRIEDEN: I'm sorry, that was one copy of the
first letter --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Oh.

KARL FRIEDEN: And this is the second copy of the
letter for everyone.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I'm sorry. Okay. Okay, we have two letters.

First letter is: I live at 10 Sacramento Street directly next-door to the Frieden's house on 12 Sacramento Street. I have looked at the plans and discussed with them their plans for adding a two-story addition and new windows to their home. As their neighbor, I feel that the design is appropriate and therefore I support their request for a Variance and Special Permit relating to this project. Again, you're not seeking a Special Permit. The person who wrote this letter is mistaken about that. I can't read their handwriting as to the name, but one of the persons is Charlotte Hogdstader, H-O-G-D-S-T-A-D-E-R and the other person is?

SUSAN FRIEDEN: Wendy Prellwitz.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Wendy?

KARL FRIEDEN: Oh, no, Wendy's on the other one.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yeah. That one.

KARL FRIEDEN: Just Charlotte?

SUSAN FRIEDEN: Oh, just Charlotte, and Charlotte.

KARL FRIEDEN: And Charlotte. Just her, I think.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Oh, okay.

And the other letter is I live at Three-and-a-half

Wendell Street and I abut the Frieden's backyard at 12

Sacramento Street. I have looked at the plans and discussed with them their plans for adding a new -- for adding a two-story addition and new windows to their home. As an architect, I feel the design is appropriate and therefore I support the request for a Variance and a Special Permit related to this project. And that's Wendy Prellwitz, P-R-E-L-L-W-I-T-Z. And those are the only letters that we have.

So I'm going to close public testimony. Anything further you want to say?

KARL FRIEDEN: Not unless you have questions.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Comments from members of
the Board or ready for a vote?
(No Response.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I guess we're ready for a vote. I'm not hearing otherwise.

Okay, the Chair moves that we make the following findings with regard to the Variance being sought:

That a literal enforcement of the provisions of the Ordinance would involve a substantial hardship to the petitioner. This hardship was demonstrated and passed up upon by the Board when we granted the prior Variances and they relate to the need for additional living space which would include a fireplace.

That the hardship is owing to the fact that this
is a non-conforming structure. So any relief, any
modification of the structure requires zoning relief.

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

In this regard the Chair would note that we made this very same findings twice in the past with regard to Variances, and what is being sought tonight is no different than that and therefore the past findings have been made should stand for this case.

Therefore, on the basis of all of these findings, the Chair moves that we grant the Variance requested on the condition that the work proceed in accordance with plans prepared by Mary Ann Thompson, T-H-O-M-P-S-O-N Architects each of which has been initialled by the Chair.

All those in favor please say "Aye."
(Aye.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Five in favor. Good luck.

Do it this time, will you?
(Sullivan, Alexander, Green, Best, Hammer.)
(9:25 p.m.)
(Sitting Members Case BZA-009920-2016: Constantine

Alexander, Brendan Sullivan, Janet Green, George S. Best, Alison Hammer.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: The Chair will call case

No. 009920, 81 Griswold Street.

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

KERI MURRAY: Yes, hello.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Name and address to the
stenographer.

KERI MURRAY: Yeah. My name is Keri Murray. I am an architect. And this is Mark Tibbetts. He is the client at 81 Griswold Street.

So we are here tonight, we -- the client would
like to build an addition, that's a conforming addition to a non-conforming lot. So, while the addition will meet all of the requirements of Article 5.000, it will actually be under the floor area ratio that is the maximum for the equation, the lot, the non-conforming lot does not conform to the
width of the lot, that is the only part of the by-laws that it does not adhere to. So one of the sides is about six feet as opposed to the seven, six that's required.

The new addition will not project out any further in terms of the width. You won't really see it from the street. It's not any higher, it's not any larger, and the non-conforming lot is 40 feet wide when it's required to be 50. So we are here to request this relief.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And the extent -- the
purpose of the extension is what?

MARK TIBBETTS: To, so we have more room for our family basically.

KERI MURRAY: Yeah, the -- actually, the client is -- his family has been living here for generations.

There's a few letters in support, just that --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: One letter.

KERI MURRAY: Yeah. Oh --

MARK TIBBETTS: I actually brought them with me.

KERI MURRAY: The abutters as well.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay.

KERI MURRAY: Yeah, so they have lived in here for generations. Mark's family has grown up here and he has recently had a son, he's nine months, and the family would like to stay in this home. They would like to stay in Cambridge, but they do need more space to accommodate their growing family.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay.

By the way, just so you're aware because I'm not sure you appeared before our Board before. Should we grant the Variance, we will condition it on the work proceed in accordance with these plans that you submitted. So these are your final plans? If you have to modify them later, you're going to have to come back.

KERI MURRAY: We know, yep. I had an engineer look at them and everything.

Comments from members of the board?
(No Response.)

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

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Just briefly, thank you,

Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. My name is James Rafferty.

I represent a homeowner who lives across the street from
this property. The individual has been there for 54 years. She raised her children there, me being one of them, and I was visiting with her on Mother's Day and she was looking out the window and she was commenting to me if ever there was a lot in Cambridge that had a hardship it was that one. These are the type of things that we talk about in my house on Mother's Day. But the Tibbetts family has been generations, they've been there longer than the Rafferty family. But we knew Mark's parents, his grandparents, and it's a great house with a very deep yard. And it's obviously well below the allowable FAR and just wanted to
add our support to the application. And I told my mother she should write a letter. And she said well, if Brendan Sullivan is there he'll do the right thing. And now that he's here, I'll stop talking.

Thank you.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you, Mr. Rafferty.

And I guess no one else in the audience. I guess
no one, unless John wants to be heard. I don't think he does.

We are in receipt of two letters, neither of them are from Mrs. Rafferty. One is from Ann Tennis, T-E-N-N-I-S who resides at 71 Griswold Street. (Reading) I would like to go on record that $I$ am in favor of the addition to Mr. and Mrs. Tibbetts' home and believe that this would be a wonderful asset to the neighborhood. I have lived at 71 Griswold Street since 1970. This is a neighborhood everybody stays.

KERI MURRAY: It's a nice neighborhood.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: When we moved in, the

Tibbetts family lived at 81 Griswold and a member of the Tibbetts family have lived there both before and since. Now starting the fourth generation with a one-year-old handsome Brendan Tibbetts. It is wonderful that the City of Cambridge could have generations of family wanting to remain in the city. Again, please record me as being in favor of the addition on the Tibbetts family home.

And then we also have a petition in support and it's been signed by one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight individuals including Ellen Rafferty. That your mom?

Anyway.

KERI MURRAY: And just to note those are, you
know, direct abutters.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: The signatories to the
petition reside at 85 Griswold, 75 Griswold, 44 Sunset, 88

Griswold, 98 Griswold, 75 Normandy Avenue, 80 Griswold, and 74 Griswold.

MARK TIBBETTS: Would you mind reading the names
on there?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Say it again.

MARK TIBBETTS: Could you just read the names if you don't mind, the names of the people.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Sure, I'll try and you'll help me out.

The signatories are John Neville, N-E-V-I-L-L-E, Patrick, Marissa Riley.

MARK TIBBETTS: Yes.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Anistoy, A-N-I-S-T-O-Y

Kotams, K-O-T-A-M-S. Marlyn, M-A-R-L-Y-N Rosa, R-O-S-A, Carolyn Callender, C-A-L-L-E-N-D-E-R, Ed O'Callahan, Mike Iannoti, I-A-N-N-O-T-I. Get it right? And Ellen B. Rafferty.

MARK TIBBETTS: Thank you.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I will now close public
testimony.

Anything further you want to add at this point? MARK TIBBETTS: No.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Speak now or remain
silent. No?

Ready for a vote?
(No Response.)

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

That a literal enforcement of the provisions of the Ordinance would involve a substantial hardship to the petitioner. The hardship being is that the petitioner, a long-time resident of the City of Cambridge needs additional living space due to an increased size of the family.

That the hardship is owing to the fact that the shape of the structure and its location on the lot. It's a very narrow and the lot itself, it's a narrow lot with setback issues so that any extension would create additional
setback issues. But those are the only issues. With the addition the structure will still be below the required FAR minimum -- maximum FAR of our Ordinance.

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

In this regard the Chair would note that the request is rather modest in nature and it seems to have unanimous neighborhood support.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: One thing that is really -- I know this firsthand, is that there are a lot of families who are locating up there and yet they're finding that the existing housing stock which was built in another time is challenging to raise families in because of the substandard lots that they were built on. And that any little expansion that requires some zoning relief. So this is really a fair and reasonable request and warranted to provide housing. I look at it two different ways:

At one point it used to be all populated by police and fire and that is coming back in vogue, but also that to raise families in that area is challenging with the existing housing stock. So anyhow.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: All the more reason to grant zoning relief to allow families to remain in the City of Cambridge and not have to move out because of the need for additional space.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: But we need them to populate future little leaguers, too.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: So on the basis of all of these findings the Chair moves that we grant the Variance requested on the condition that the work proceed in
accordance with plans prepared by Keri Murray Architecture, all of which has been initialled by the Chair.

All those in favor please say "Aye."
(Aye.)

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Variance granted. Good
luck.
(Alexander, Sullivan, Green, Best, Hammer.)
(Whereupon, at 9;35 p.m., the

Board of Zoning Appeals Adjourned.)
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