

## COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

## CITY OF CAMBRIDGE PLANNING BOARD

IN RE: GENERAL HEARING

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS:

Pamela Winters, Acting Chairman  
Thomas Anninger, Board Member  
Hugh Russell, Board Member  
Patricia Singer, Board Member  
Steven Winter, Board Member  
Charles Studen, Board Member  
H. Theodore Cohen, Board Member

ASSOCIATE BOARD MEMBERS:

Beth Rubenstein, Assistant City Manager  
Les Barber, Director of Zoning  
Roger Boothe, Director of Urban Design  
Susan Glazer, Deputy Director  
Stuart Dash, Director of Community Planning

- held at -

City Hall Annex  
Second Floor Meeting Room  
344 Broadway, McCusker Building  
Cambridge, Massachusetts  
Tuesday, March 3, 2009  
7:30 p.m.

---

**REPORTERS, INC.**  
**CAPTURING THE OFFICIAL RECORD**  
23 MERRYMOUNT ROAD, QUINCY, MA 02169  
617.786.7783/FACSIMILE 617.786.7723  
*www.reportersinc.com* **G3**

**INDEX OF AGENDA PROCEEDINGS**

<b><u>Agenda Matters</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
Update by Beth Rubenstein	3
PB#238, 650 Main Street, Project Review Special Permit, MIT, applicant Deliberation and possible decision	8
PB#190, 325 Fresh Pond Parkway, Fresh Pond Mobil Repair, change of approved plans Discussion	153
<b><u>BOARD OF ZONING APPEAL CASES</u></b>	
(a) 9762 -22 Water Street, variance extension	150
(b) Telecommunications Special Permit for 148 Huron Avenue	198
(c) Telecommunications Special Permit for 243 Walden Street	185

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING**

Tuesday, March 3, 2009

PAMELA WINTERS: Welcome to the Planning Board meeting for tonight Tuesday, March the 3rd.

Tonight on the agenda we have Planning Board No. 238, 650 Main Street, Project Review Special Permit by MIT. We'll be having a deliberation and a possible decision.

Following that, we will be having Planning Board No. 190, 235 Fresh Pond Parkway, that's the Fresh Pond Mobile Repair and a discussion and possible change of plans.

Following that, Board of Zoning Appeal cases.

And we will begin tonight with an update by Beth Rubenstein. Beth?

BETH RUBENSTEIN: Thank you, Pam, thank you for chairing tonight.

Just not too much to announce, just upcoming meeting dates. We'll be meeting on March 17th at which time we'll take up the five-year open space plan which the Board has seen once and we'll get into it in a little more detail on that, and we've also put the Town Gown discussion recap on for the 17th.

April 7th and 21st, are the meeting dates for that month, and right now it looks like we will have a public hearing on the refiled Lesley University rezoning petition on April 7th. That petition was not acted upon in time last time, so it's been refiled, and the conversations between the Porter Square and Agassiz neighborhoods and Lesley are still ongoing. And I believe that is everything that I have.

PAMELA WINTERS: Well, before we start the meeting tonight, we have, I believe, five voting members on the Board.

And so, perhaps you might want to ask MIT if that's all right with them. It will have to be a unanimous decision.

MICHAEL OWU: Yes.

PAMELA WINTERS: And that's okay with you?

MICHAEL OWU: (Nodding.)

PAMELA WINTERS: Also, there was a question about whether or not we should keep the meeting open for public hearing, and that's something that the Board needs to discuss. There was a request for that, I believe.

BETH RUBENSTEIN: When the case was heard the first time in December, the Board actually did close the hearing for oral testimony and left it open for written testimony, as is your custom, and I believe there have been some requests to reopen the oral comment, but I think that's the question before the Board.

PAMELA WINTERS: We need to decide that.

CHARLES STUDEN: My question would be whether the oral testimony will differ from the correspondence that we received in our package. There was a considerable amount of correspondence from the Area Four Coalition. Various members of that Coalition wrote different letters, although the theme was quite similar.

I guess my position would be unless there's something new, I think we have in that correspondence what we need to know.

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay. Does anybody else have any other comments on that or --

*(No responses in the affirmative.)*

PAMELA WINTERS: No.

Okay, so, we will keep it closed then for public comment.

Okay, so would MIT like to begin with their presentation?

MICHAEL OWU: Thank you. Michael  
Owu.

BETH RUBENSTEIN: Can you come up to  
the mic.

*(Michael Owu complies.)*

BETH RUBENSTEIN: Thank you.

**PB#238, 650 MAIN STREET, PROJECT REVIEW**  
**SPECIAL PERMIT, MIT, APPLICANT:**

MICHAEL OWU: My name's Michael Owu.  
Thanks for having us again this evening.

CHARLES STUDEN: It's not on.

*(Mic is turned on.)*

MICHAEL OWU: What I would like to do is give you a quick overview of what we're going to talk about today, which is almost where we left it almost three months ago, a little bit of the planning context that brought us to this place.

Sarah Gallop from our Community Government Relations Office will talk a little bit about our community process which I know is very important to everybody. I'll speak about the parking, which I know is a big issue, and I would like to share some of our perspectives with the Board on that, talk about the proposed mitigation that has

come forward from the Traffic Department and then end with some of the design changes that David Manfredi, the architect, will present.

So, first, a little on the context in terms of where we are today in the project that we presented -- that we presented on December 16th and that we'll be reviewing it again with you today.

We put forward a project that is consistent with the base zoning district and will all the conditions of the Special Permit. We're not asking for anything extra. I think that's an important distinction with this project and other projects that you might've been reviewing recently.

The design reflects the zoning that was changed about nine years ago, I think it was, that was a result of an extensive community-wide down-zoning process. That resulted in the zoning framework that we were

working with here, specifically, things like the density was reduced, so you have a much smaller building, a 30 percent smaller building, on the site than might have been allowed previously, the bulk control plan, which was not in effect at the time, was introduced in direct consideration of the neighborhood that abuts the site.

In addition, there were changes to the parking requirement and other things.

We have met all those requirements in this application. In addition, we have extended -- we have gone beyond it in some cases. As you know, the open space requirement here is zero percent in the base district. The Article 19 guidelines are 15 percent and we're 29 percent open space.

We looked at the setbacks on Main Street. This is, again, direct response to trying to be responsive to the neighborhood that is butting us. We're proposing slightly

wider sidewalks on Main Street to create a more generous and friendly environment there, and even the retail is not required in this district. It's something that we felt was a gesture towards the neighborhood to present a friendly face to the neighborhood by creating some retail -- active retail spaces on that street.

So we feel very strongly that we actually designed a building that is very responsive to the abutting neighborhood, creates a very pleasant street environment and is something that we're quite proud of.

I'll turn now to Sarah, who will talk a little bit about community process. So, again, multi-year process with the neighborhood, with the City Staff, and the community institutions that created this basis, this zoning environment that we're working within, and then more recently a series of dialogues with the neighborhood

that Sarah will talk about.

CHARLES STUDEN: Michael, excuse me. It might be -- I don't know whether you or Sarah could clarify for the Board something that I think is very important, in particular as it affects the parking question, and that is -- and maybe I'm just not remembering this -- but is this building being designed for an R&D tenant, an office tenant, or is it a spec building without a known tenant at this time?

MICHAEL OWU: Okay, I will come back to the parking because I know that's a big issue, so I'll come back to that if that's okay?

CHARLES STUDEN: That's fine.

SARAH GALLOP: Thanks, Michael.

I'm Sarah Gallop, Co-Director of Government and Community Relations at MIT, and I just want to take a very brief time to describe our efforts to get out into the

community and talk with people about this project.

First, just in overarching terms, we took the project on a very preliminary basis to the City Manager back in university of 2008, and City Staff at the time, and, of course, that launches us into many months of process with many different departments: Community Development, Public Works, Water Department, all of that, as you would expect.

Later when the project had a little bit more shape, we asked the Area Four Coalition if we could engage with that group, and ultimately, we had four meetings with the Coalition, one was with the entire group, or at least the group that came to their regular monthly meeting, and three others were with leadership of the Coalition.

We also provided a summary of the project to all members of the City Council,

and ended up having five meetings with various City Council legislators, including the Mayor, and I think we feel that based on this framework of communications that the project was well vetted over a period of about nine months.

But what I would like to begin to just a little bit is our conversations with Area Four because we feel that the perspective of Area Four is very important as this project moves forward.

And what I would like do is try to describe what we see as the four major themes that came out of our discussions with the Area Four Coalition.

So, the first is around sustainable building design. The Coalition consistently urged MIT to build as sustainably as possible, and along the way had several ideas, had specific suggestions, among them: Demonstration rain garden, a green roof, a

green wall, a geothermal system, the idea of bringing in tenants who would fit out their space in sustainable manner and waiting to proceed until the recommendations of the Green Building Task Force were final, among many other ideas.

And where we are on this topic today is that MIT plans to design the building to meet the LEED Silver rating, which is consistent with MIT's academic guidelines on sustainability.

The second major theme that came out of our discussions was around traffic and parking. The Coalition recommended that MIT limit the garage to 650 parking spaces citing issues such as proximity to the MBTA, concerns about congestion, safety, air pollution, asthma. Questions were raised about traffic that might be generated by other projects going on at MIT right now, the Koch Institute, which is under construction,

the Sloan School addition, which is under construction, but at Koch, there is no parking and at Sloan, there's only replacement parking.

In talking with the Coalition about traffic and parking issues, we provided the traffic study, we provided the PTDM study, the PTDM plan. We described the different parking needs for office and lab uses, and obviously, this issue has been under review with the City's Traffic and Parking Transportation Department and will ultimately be resolved.

The third theme, I think, was around open space. Initially, there was some misunderstanding about the amount of open space being provided on the site, but once the need for relief on the permeability issue was clarified, you recall, then the remaining issues raised by the Coalition were largely around pedestrian flow, public access and

irrigation, and we indicated that the open space will be accessible to the public and that an irrigation system would be included.

And the final main theme and from our perspective is around the Cherry Street lot. Let me just explain this. MIT owns a lot on the corner of Cherry and School Streets, which is the designated parking for an undeveloped MIT-owned building at 750 Main Street, just up the street.

The question about the present and future use of this lot has been discussed for many years, long before the 650 Project came into being.

While City Staff deemed that an alternative interim parking use was not possible based on a City's zoning review because MIT had been asked if it could be used in the interim, but we were unable to find a mechanism to do so, what we have done is we have committed to the City, and to the

neighborhood, that we will resolve the issue of the lot's use, the Cherry Street lots use, when the 750 Main Street parcel is ready to move.

There were other issues, ideas that were raised at our meetings, most of which we summarized in our last presentation.

Just to give you an example of some them: Rodent control, streetscape beautification, mechanicals, noise and aesthetics, bringing in appropriate retail for the neighborhood, creating a more pedestrian-friendly environment on Main Street. We believe that these issues are being addressed in the application.

And, finally, I don't want to leave out our meetings with the City Council, but the meetings that we did have really covered many of the issues that I have already described as well as some other thoughts, including the benefit of the new tax revenue

stream that will come to the City.

So, that's the nature of our discussion in our outreach plan. I'd be happy to answer any questions if you have them.

PAMELA WINTERS: I have one question, Sarah. We received a letter from Councillor Toomey, and in addition to the traffic issues, he also mentioned that he would like to see a Grand Junction bike path, and I was wondering if you could say anything about that?

SARAH GALLOP: Yup. This has been suggested to us by the Traffic Department and we will address it later in our presentation.

PAMELA WINTERS: Thank you very much.

MICHAEL OWU: Thanks, Sarah.

I would like to talk about the parking issue.

So, I think, what I want to do is just lay out the process we went through to come up with 820 'cause I know 820 spaces seems like a lot of spaces, and it is, it's not a small amount of parking, it's a big garage, but we didn't pull that number out of a hat. It really is a number that we came up with following, to the letter the process that the City uses, in its PTDM plan.

So, the starting point is, you know, collect data from, I think it's the census track and go through a series of calculations and you come up with, based on a certain density of occupancy, you come up with a number, and then you cut that by ten percent, that is exactly what we have proposed for office use in this building.

So, while it is large, it is a number that is consistent with the methodology that's used on any other project going through a PTDM plan.

The (*inaudible*) that we have is 47 percent that if we ever went through the process, it's actually lower than the targets for some of the recent office buildings in Cambridge.

The other important fact which constrains us is the existing parking for Shire. We have a contract with Shire and, you know, I know there's a strong desire to, you know, to change the allocation to Shire. We have a contract with them. We can't simply do that. And with a tenant that, as we all know, has one foot in Lexington and one in Cambridge, we really want to keep them in Cambridge, that is important to us, and breaking a contract with them is not the way to keep them in Cambridge.

We fully recognize that the allocation to Shire is higher than what we would do today, and we have committed that when that Shire leaves the building, the new

tenant will follow whatever the current guidelines are in the City. We cannot break a contract with Shire.

So what we're asking for is some flexibility to deal with the situation that we have with Shire, we will commit to reduce it with the new tenant, and that's really sort of where we are with parking.

The 650 spaces that has been proposed would severely limit our ability to meet the needs of an office tenant, which is something -- coming back to your question, Charles. We are proposing a building that could be used for office or R&D. I think we described that on December 16th. We don't know who that tenant is today, and what we're asking for is the flexibility to meet the market, so if the market is for an office tenant, we need to be able to meet the needs of an office tenant as is permitted in this district and on this site, and if the tenant

is a lab tenant, we would like to go with a lab tenant.

We could easily have come to you with an office-only project and the 650 number wouldn't even be on the table. We'd be debating about 820.

But we wanted to be open with you and be straight up with you as to which way you want to go and we've offered to limit the additional the use of any additional spaces if they're not needed.

The concern that the Traffic Department had about blocking off spaces, which I proposed in the letter, I think that is a way to monitor that. We would be happy to pay a consultant to come by once a year, twice a year, whatever it takes, to ensure that we are not going above the limit that is established in this process.

That's kind of -- I just wanted to share with you some of our thinking behind

820 so you don't think we're just trying to be greedy here and go above and beyond. But we do recognize that it's a challenging number for everybody to deal with and we respect whatever action the Board decides to take on that.

On bicycle parking, I think we're pretty much on the same page with the recommendations that have come from the Bicycle Committee and from the Traffic Department. Just to confirm, the elevator will be big enough for two bicycles horizontally, not raised up, the gates of the garage entrance and exit will be designed to allow bicycle access, and I thought we had agreed to it in writing, but I guess we didn't, we will distribute the bicycle parking throughout the garage and not just in one location, which is what we had proposed and I think the Bike Committee wanted us to spread the bike parking around, so we'd be

happy to do that.

I would like to thank the Traffic Department -- moving onto the loading on Portland Street, I would like to thank the Traffic Department agreeing to keep the loading docks on Portland Street. We do believe that the impact will be minimal, and I would like to confirm with Sue that the loading dock will accommodate a 55-foot tractor trailer, and that we will discourage deliveries during the morning and evening, peak hours, as she has requested.

If there are no further -- any questions on that, I would like to talk a little about the proposed mitigation that Sue had in her letter.

There are two areas main areas that I would like to talk about: The first is the Albany/Portland Street section. We had proposed a configuration for that roadway alignment -- that is in the package that we

submitted in January to you -- that narrows the curb lines on Portland Street.

We did not change the curb lines on Albany Street because we were trying to respond to the concerns about -- the theories about maintaining sufficient width for the future Urban Ring, and there was concern about if you have a neck (*phonetic*) down there to narrow the distance, you could be impacting a lane for a bus or the Urban Ring and traffic, so we didn't do that. We'll be happy to reconfigure that. I think, from my perspective, and our perspective, we will continue to commit to fund improvements in there, and I believe I proposed a \$300,000 commitment to fund whatever design is appropriate. We will be happy to work with the Traffic Department to come up with a different configuration that works from the City's perspective and commit \$300,000 to do that.

On the Grand Junction Railway, the multi-use path that has been recommended by the Traffic Department, this is a concern to us, and it's something that we really have some really significant concerns with and issues with.

I have a board here, and I just want to show where the path is relative to the bike lanes.

The site is located right here on Main Street. There are currently bike lanes on Main Street. And there's bike -- bikes can use on street in between the travel lanes on Portland and Main Street, Albany and Portland. The proposed bike path, that multi-use path that is being recommended, runs along the Grand Junction Railroad here and it actually does line up with --

PAMELA WINTERS: Michael, excuse me. I'm wondering if you could use the microphone. It's really difficult to hear.

MICHAEL OWU: Yep. Okay.

The proposed bike lane that runs from Main Street to the crossing does actually line up with Galleria Way, and, in fact, that bike path lines up with the bike lane that MIT has constructed on Vassar Street.

From a practical perspective in terms of mitigating traffic coming to this site, the idea of being, as I see it, mitigation being, how do you get people coming to the site out of their cars and in there bikes to come to the site, if I'm a cyclist, I'm not going to come down Galleria Way, go down Main Street, do a crossing of the railroad tracks, come down this way, come over here somewhere, cross Albany Street, cross Portland Street to get to the site. Personally I wouldn't do that.

I would come down Galleria Way, Main Street to the site. But that's just sort've

intuitively, it doesn't seem like appropriate mitigation from the site. However, that is not the only concern that we have.

And what I would like to do is have Kelley Brown, who is with our Facilities Department at MIT, respond from the academic side of the house because there are some concerns and issues relative to a bike -- multi-use bike path in this corridor of land that we own, that I think that Kelley can describe in more detail, so, hopefully, in a few minutes he can do that.

KELLEY BROWN: As Mike said, my name is Kelley Brown. I'm Senior Campus Planner of Facilities, and I'm here from -- for an investment project. I asked to come here because this is an issue of a lot of concern from the academic side of the house.

Our concerns and comments about this general idea of a Grand Junction bike path have been on the table for about five

years.

We worked on the initial study and provided a nine-page letter of comments. The final report appeared two years later and reflected, in my view, very little of the comments that we had made, and there really haven't been any further substantive discussions with the City and MIT about how we might partner on this thing or in some other way figure out what to do with this proposal.

And the most important comment we felt we made at the time was that we felt that, as Michael suggested, that the Vassar Street cycle track be seriously considered as an alternative to this Grand Junction bike trail. It wasn't in the study, and it hasn't been since.

The City's correspondence on this project, which I read, suggested that the first section of the Grand Junction path had

been constructed under Brain & Cog, the building that you approved and we built, and we never have seen it that way.

What we saw was an accommodation that we made for, what we thought, was a very outside change -- and some of you weren't here at that time, but others were -- the outside chance that the Urban Ring would run two-way bus-ways, a freight line would run down there and then there would be no room for the path, and because it seemed that the permit for that project was in the balance, we thought, all right, we will redesign the project to accommodate in the very unlikely event that this occurs, and -- and this, from our point of view, is a very important point, that some future discussion take place about how and why this trail would happen, and what would be the relationship of MIT and the City in designing, constructing, managing, everything.

That didn't happen. I mean, we made the space. It's there today. You can see over on the right, you know, there's the little hole we made in the building on the upper right, and that's what it looks like when you walk inside. And you kinda come out the back, and it looks from the Albany garage on that bottom photo, it's kinda hard to see from where you are, but that's looking back at Brain & Cog looming over the tracks there.

And, you know, there's a number of practical problems with this, but even before we get to that, we just felt like if -- and we've said -- I mean, this has kinda come up in the course of the Urban Ring discussions because we've worked closely with the City on that, and one of the big things, from our point of view, that happened is, we got the bus-way out of the Grand Junction corridor on precisely the same grounds that I am concerned about the bike path.

We feel that it will be a terrible disruption to the academic campus that will not work well in that location. We've tried to be consistent, too, about pointing out -- and I assume you all know this -- MIT owns that land. We own that rail corridor, okay? That is not CSX, that is not MBTA, that's not the City of Cambridge, that is MIT. We provide an easement. That was the grounds under which we purchased it. The railroad company said, "We need to run our freight train on this track. You must permit us to do so in perpetuity." We said, "Fine." And they do that today.

And so, in the context of this discussion, I've said, and we've said, "Gee, if it is such an essential public good, you should acquire the property, design it and construct it and maintain it," that's what people do with these public goods that are constructed like city streets. This seemed

to us to be appropriate.

But that's -- we've never really had the opportunity to seriously discuss that.

And we have partnered in other instances; for example, on Waverly Street -- and I've talked about this in the Town Gown and we talked about this at the time we did Ashdown Dormitory -- we've done an extensive project on Waverly Street, partly, as mitigation, and because the City let us use that as staging, but we've gone above and beyond. We've created a multi-use path there with lights and drainage and everything -- that's just about done, will be opening in the spring -- and I think that kind of partnering opportunity is possible, but we have to discuss it.

And it appears in this case that the City's strategy is essentially to just force MIT's hand, give up access to its property, and make MIT build out this path on its own

land from Main Street to I don't know where. I mean, we kinda trail off. I know where the study says it goes. It goes all the way through MIT land past Pacific Street and on down.

You know, apparently that would be done as mitigation for whatever development takes place over the coming decades. I just don't think that's a great way to do business and it's a complicated matter. You know, there's a number of practical things you can see, you know, truck movements, other things, there's utilities throughout that corridor, we think there's security issues that apparently MIT would -- I don't know how we would resolve who is responsible in that instance. You know, there are service and repair. If you look down the line here (*indicating*), this is one of the few buildings that is currently on the north side. That's a cooling tower. Adjacent to

it is an existing and other cooling tower and 16A, which we can -- is really this little guy right here (*indicating*). That has fairly regular service. We're always back there. We've got cranes. We lift equipment in and out of there all the time. And it gets must worse on the far side. I mean, I understand you are just talking about one project, one little piece, it looks fairly simple, but when you get down west of Mass Ave, then we really start to have problems, and this is where we have the buildings now, and we have some serious operational problems all along there with -- there's a security fence, this is the nuclear facility, there's a major security fence there that's very important for the security of that plan. I got it pushed back as far as I could, frankly, because I wanted to keep that area open.

We have gas trucks that provide daily service, daily deliveries, they run

right down that line, emergency generators, equipment, all kinds of service and loading that takes place back there.

And, you know, I understand, you know, could we work around these things? Maybe. Maybe we could. But we haven't even really seriously talked about it. It has never been -- and I know this is sort've -- maybe off your radar screen, but I think, you know, it's obvious if people are saying we already built the Brain & Cog one, this next one is just the march down the road.

And I feel that -- you know, I won't even get into the constraints on development, but you can imagine with a new ten-foot setback, the reduced FAR, now what's essentially a 24-foot square swath, that's what happens, because the path wants to be 20 feet, if it can be, off of the center line of the freight line, fair enough, and that takes another 14, 16 feet out, so that's like 25

feet. So you can see that's a big swath in a fairly narrow, narrow parcel, and try and do things right, to try to do all the things that we want to do as we redevelop -- and this is the wrong block, really. This is this block I'm talking about here (*indicating*). When this garage goes, when this parking lot goes, when all this property that's very kinda undeveloped old property goes, well, suffice it to say, suffice it to say that I do think that it would be wrong to just tack this on as a condition on an adjacent investment project.

I think it's the kind of thing that's going to take a lot more work. We're willing to engage in it. I cannot guarantee we will agree and say, "Oh, yeah, you are right. This will all work fine." But I can agree that, you know, we will look at it and we will work on it, and we will hope that some of the alternatives are considered as

well.

Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: I have a question for Kelley: Could you describe Vassar Street and what the cross-section of that street is and what facilities there are for bicycles, pedestrians, and vehicles?

KELLEY BROWN: Sure. Mike didn't want me to get into all the gory details on that, but I'm delighted to.

I mean, essentially what it is, is there is -- I cannot tell you the exact distances, but there's a broad sidewalk on both sides, pedestrian sidewalk, adjacent to it, and it's with pavers, and then comes the cycle track, and then on the other side of the cycle track, there's generally the kind of street furniture, lights, plantings, et cetera, then the curb line. And that's duplicated on both sides.

And, you know, we understand that

it's -- it's perhaps, you know, not ideal from the point of view of, you know, people who want to bike really, really fast, you know, because there is some curb cuts, there's some dozy pedestrians that wander into the thing. You know, MIT students are still learning. We have a regular educational program every year that says don't wander into the bike path, and I'm serious. You gotta train people. People have never seen stuff like this before/ it's kind've a European thing and they haven't seen it. However, it's built, it's a segregated, you know, separated bike way, and it's very attractive, I think, and I think it will only become better as that street becomes better, and nobody has to spend a dime and we can get from Main Street down to Audrey and I think the City should take advantage of it.

PAMELA WINTERS: Do any other

members have any other questions for Kelley?

CHARLES STUDEN: I was not on the Planning Board at the time that the Grand Junction rail with trail study was undertaken. Perhaps, Kelley --

KELLEY BROWN: Well, there's others here that talk -- speak more about it.

CHARLES STUDEN: Yeah, but what I'm trying to understand is, what was the conclusion of that study?

You are saying that MIT did not agree with the outcome of that study in terms of what it was describing for --

KELLEY BROWN: Well, the draft that we got in, I guess, it was 2003, we responded in January of 2004, and we had a large number of questions.

There was a long delay, for whatever reason, in getting to a final proposition, and then when we read the final document, there was no further opportunity for us to

comment, although we asked in the letter if we could, and none of our suggestions -- some, I shouldn't say "none" -- I mean, some were taken up, but largely, I felt that most of our comments were not even fully disposed of.

I mean, the people who did the study can explain how they dealt with it but...

CHARLES STUDEN: I'm not sure whether this is the point at which perhaps Sue Clippinger could help us, but -- if she's here -- I'm trying to understand --

KELLEY BROWN: She did the study.

CHARLES STUDEN: I'm trying to understand the nexus between making this a requirement of this particular permit for 650 Main Street because I think the point you made about it turning and going down Main Street, if I was on a bicycle that's what I do, I would not stay on that path and go under Brain & Cognitive Center. It looks

like an altogether unattractive option to me, but maybe I don't understand enough about it, so I'm not sure again why this is being made a condition of this particular permit.

MICHAEL OWU: I think that is our concern, and I want to assure the Board that we fully understand that, you know, mitigation is sort've -- that's part of the deal, and we're happy to do it, as we described at the Albany/Portland Street intersection, and I think we just have concerns with this. It really is unrelated to the project.

We will be happy to consider other mitigation, we'd be happy to put aside, you know, \$100,000 to resolve it somehow.

It really has nothing to do with this project and unfortunately, you know, we're -- we are MIT, we're all the same family, but we are kinda two different

brothers, and what we can't do -- we can't do something on our side of the house that severely impacts the other side of the house, and that's the dilemma that I have as I stand here with the project that's an investment portfolio, and I can't agree to something -- it would be very difficult for me to agree to something that is impacting the academic mission.

Kelley described the range of concerns we have with it, and I have a challenge here.

So, again, we understand mitigation, we're prepared to do it, and we'd respectfully ask the Board to consider an alternative.

We would agree to meet with the City and work it out, but it really is not related to this project.

BETH RUBENSTEIN: This may be a good time -- Carrie Ciderman from the Community

Development Department Staff is here, and Carrie was project manager on the Grand Junction, and she can, perhaps, just briefly, talk about the long-range planning that was part of that study.

I mean, often we do do long-range studies of corridors we don't own. That's not something that's unheard of.

So, Carrie, maybe briefly you could talk about that study effort, and, Sue, you may want to add how it was that we thought about mitigation in this location being tied to 650 Main Street which is the question before us.

CHARLES STUDEN: That was my question, the connection to 650.

CARRIE CIDERMAN: Hi, I'm Carrie Ciderman, for those who haven't met me, and I work in the Community Development Program and the Environmental and Transportation Planning Division.

And I didn't prepare anything so I'm more -- I was here more for answering questions if they did come up.

Just very briefly, the plan for looking at this corridor, which is -- goes all the way basically from the Somerville line and beyond potentially that could connects up with their Somerville community path and North Point that would bring you to paths further west and into Boston and down to the Memorial Drive, the path along the Memorial Drive and also across to Boston. And this was envisioned in the City's Green Ribbon report that was looking at open space in the City. And so, this was envisioned actually as more of a community path and a linear park, and that was the reason that it was identified as one of the few corridors that was available for the City to be able to look at having something that was away from the streets and would actually

connect a lot of the uses.

So, it's not -- and I think it's -- what is really important is as much walking as anything and also for people who want to be traveling with their kids and offer a path is very different from anything that's on road facility.

The City then decided to undertake a study to determine would it be physically feasible to actually do this. Is this vision something that could be a reality, or is it just, you know, theoretical?

And to lead to the conclusion, the study says, yes, physically it's possible to do it, there are a couple of constraints that we would have to work around and the study identifies how you might be able to do that.

So, physically it's feasible. There are a lot -- there was a huge community process with meetings with the neighborhoods

and whatnot and there's a lot of support out there in the community to see this happen.

We did meet with MIT and we have talked with MIT, and the study very clearly acknowledges the concerns that MIT raises about access to their property and other issues would need to be worked out, and we have had many discussions about this in the context of looking at this corridor for the Urban Ring, and, in fact, the plans all show that the path will be on this corridor that we've been having in public meetings and plans that we've been working with with the university and with the community and the larger Urban Ring discussions that they have been shown there.

The other piece I just wanted to mention just to clarify because you had a concern about how people would travel, it's a small detail, but it's important to know, which is the piece between Main Street and

Broadway is actually designed and already funded by the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority, who is going to be constructing it, and there is -- and that's another piece that's actually going to come right up to this section.

And the idea is that even though you could -- you know, we don't have all of the funding for the entire way but that each piece would be a stand-alone piece and that we would be -- it would be done in a matter of different property owners, different sections. There's other projects that are north of this that have been looking at this and connecting it.

So, this piece also would be one that would go right to that building and cross to -- there's a pedestrian crossing right to Vassar Street or to Albany Street right where that piece would end, so even as a stand-alone if nothing else happened.

And then also, again, just the access, like all of the -- it's a path with nothing on it, so you can have service vehicles and maintenance vehicles and anything else go there.

So, I don't know if these other -- oh, and there are, obviously, the City has every intention of working with all the property owners. It's hard when you don't know exactly which pieces are going to move forward when, and to be honest, these long-range things are opportunistic in terms of what grants we can get and what's coming up.

And the land has been subject to what is called Chapter 40, Section 54A.

It has to do with previous -- some of you might be familiar with it -- previous railroad property that has -- there's a state law that governs it that has to do with looking at maintaining transportation uses on

those corridors and not to lose them permanently.

So, other questions? Is that too much information? Not enough?

PAMELA WINTERS: And Sue may just want to say about --

CARRIE CIDERMAN: Oh, yes, about the mitigation and the connection.

PAMELA WINTERS: That was a good description. Thank you, Carrie.

CHARLES STUDEN: Just one further question, though, relative to the Grand Junction rail trial study: How did the study envision that this would be implemented, specifically, the bicycle portion of it, if you can separate that from the other components of the other trail system?

What did the study say in terms of how it would be funded and --

CARRIE CIDERMAN: Well, again, this is a community path. It's not bicycle

specific. It's all use.

CHARLES STUDEN: Yes, such as walking and...

CARRIE CIDERMAN: Walking, kids, people with their dogs. And it basically quite acknowledges that we would be having to look for many different ways of funding it, including looking for grant opportunities.

The Cambridge Redevelopment Authority actually applied for some state money to help and that's one of the pieces.

We hope that we will be able to get money in like in the enhancements category from the State and Federal Governments.

As you know, there's a lot of priorities and there's a lot of things that the City tries to do, so...

There are many ways that you could fund it, and it was not envisioned that any one entity would be taking on the entire

thing.

PAMELA WINTERS: So, In other words, MIT would not be paying for the entire thing; is that what you are saying?

CARRIE CIDERMAN: That was not envisioned, and that was not discussed, that was not anything -- I don't know whether Sue wants to now -- or, you have other questions, or talk about the connection, or the mitigation, or do you want me to --

PAMELA WINTERS: Sue, why don't you come up.

CARRIE CIDERMAN: Like why this and how that mitigates because it's -- do you have a question?

PAMELA WINTERS: Well, Sue, come on up.

*(Sue Clippinger steps forward to address the Board.)*

PAMELA WINTERS: There's other issues, too, besides just -- there's parking

and other issues, too.

SUE CLIPPINGER: So I was going to talk about the Grand Junction in specific because that's what you're talking right about now, and the specific answer of why the Grand Junction would be mitigation for this project.

One of the Planning Board criteria of the project exceeds is the overall trip generation criteria. And so, one of the -- that's -- I can't speak -- that's an impact which is best handled by trying to reduce trips, and one of the ways of trying to reduce trips is by encouraging alternate modes of transportation to pick up a portion of those trips.

So we see this small piece of the Grand Junction Railroad as an opportunity to build the connection between the railroad crossing, which allows you to get from the Grand Junction to the project, the

development site, and which allows it to be connected to the piece that CRA is doing to the north as a very useful piece that starts to provide an alternate way for those various modes to find it more attractive to get to the site, and obviously, you know that's a way of trying to mitigate those impacts which are the trip-generation impacts for the total trips to the project, so that's the comment.

One of the things which is just of interest -- in the traffic study for the project that MIT submitted, they have a sentence that says, "A multi-use path is planned for the railroad right-of-way which will significantly enhance bicycle access for the site in the future." And once we were originally -- we were putting together our comment letter for possible mitigation for Michael Owu to be able to look at, even before it became formal with the Planning

Board, I also immediately called Kelley Brown to let him know that this issue was on the table, and this is back in late November, early December, so it's a little disturbing to get the level of opposition that we're getting here today.

And we're hopeful that some day when the economy is good, the development activity at the Kendall Cinema area, whatever we call that project, will be considered. And I know in past discussions with them, they have been very supportive and interested in the creation of the path along the Grand Junction that would allow this to move further even to the north from what's proposed now.

PAMELA WINTERS: Thank you.

MICHAEL OWU: Okay, just a couple reactions to that.

The use of a multi-use path or the one that comes to mind is the Minuteman Bikeway that is used by cyclists and

pedestrians and all that, it would not work if there were service vehicles, trucks and other vehicles there.

I've ridden that many times. I would be seriously freaked out if there was a truck backing up into it, so I don't think that the use of that corridor for a multi-use path as envisioned is really consistent with a service corridor which is inner-built to MIT's operations and that's really the concern that we have.

As Sarah said, the plan anticipated revolving some of these issues. Well, these issues have not been resolved.

Again, we would be happy to sit down and resolve them, but really not in the context of this project, and that's really our concern.

I would like to turn it over -- unless there's other questions -- on parking and traffic and all those things. I was

going to have David talk about some of the design --

CHARLES STUDEN: Just, not to beat this to death, but as a practical matter, doesn't the Vassar Street -- don't the Vassar Street improvements effectively do what we're talking about in terms of the --

MICHAEL OWU: That's --

CHARLES STUDEN: I mean, it does it very well, but I would just like to comment on it, I bicycle a lot in Cambridge, I commend MIT, I think that the work you've done on Vassar Street is fantastic. People will get used to the fact that the bike and pedestrian pathway are adjacent to one another and you have to watch out what you are doing, but that is providing the kind of activity along that corridor, and in fact, if it was so duplicated at some point then -- but we have the problem of a conflict with the service vehicles continuously with MIT's

buildings.

MICHAEL OWU: Correct.

PAMELA WINTERS: Anybody else have any other questions on traffic? Hugh?

HUGH RUSSELL: If you don't feel it's prudent to do the mitigation at the bike path, then what counterproposal do you have?

MICHAEL OWU: What I had proposed had been -- one of the exceedances had been the level of service at the intersection of Albany and Main Streets, one in the morning and one in the afternoon. I proposed funding whatever changes, curb things, whatever it would take to do that.

Sue suggested that that is something that the Department can take care of itself.

KELLEY BROWN: Mass Ave.

MICHAEL OWU: I'm sorry. Mass Ave and Albany, right.

So I had proposed that, which was sort've of very directly related to an actual exceedance, and we believed, based on preliminary discussions with our traffic engineers, that some signal timing changes, maybe some left turn lanes could actually alleviate that level of service and get it up a level.

But as Sue indicated in her most recent letter, that's something the City is already looking at and I guess they don't need our money to do that.

So, I actually don't have a counterproposal, alternative proposal, at this time, but what I would like to do and I'm fully prepared to do it is commit funding to do something at the City's choice, but again, we understand mitigation, we want to do it, this is just a hard one for us, but we would be happy to find some other mitigation -- just about anything, quite frankly -- that

works for the City.

CHARLES STUDEN: What's the estimated cost for the Grand Junction pathway? Do you know what that would cost to do, what's the City asking?

KELLEY BROWN: I had put in a number of -- which was sort've a comparable, I think I put in \$75,000, which, based on the description that Sue had given, there's already -- there's a pedestrian pathway there and the description that Sue gave us was it's basically just widening the asphalt, it's not a big deal.

So, I was not anticipating a big chunk of change, I thought \$75,000 would be more than enough to do that and that's the number that we came up with.

PAMELA WINTERS: Any other questions on traffic and parking?

I do have one for you. Since you don't know whether or not it's not going to

be research and development or office space at this point in time, would you have a problem with going with the 650 spaces, and then if it is office, then coming before us again?

MICHAEL OWU: Thanks for reminding me of that because that's one of the points I wanted to make.

So the challenge that -- and I think I touched on it when we met on the 16th, we don't have a tenant, that's very true, but what we do have is we have a challenge with timing. If this was a building that didn't have below-grade parking, we could probably build a building -- some sort've corn shell of a building in 24 months, give or take.

With the underground parking and given the depth and soil conditions that we're dealing with, we're looking at an additional lead time of another year and a half to two years. So, you're looking at

three and a half to four years of lead time to get from shovel in the ground to have a building ready for a tenant.

The problem we have in the market, and not just the market today, but the market in general, is that there's nobody, or almost nobody, who is willing to commit and sign a contract four years in advance.

And so, the problem we have is that if we have to wait till we have a tenant, we may not get a tenant because a tenant is not going to wait four years to get a product.

Most tenants in the market who are looking for new construction, corn shells of significant size are making commitments two years, maybe three in advance, but not five years. They may talk to you about it, they may indicate some interest, but they're not going to sign a piece of paper that says they're going to do it.

So what we have been talking about with internally is that we might actually have to spec the garage to take the two years off that lead time so that we're -- so when we're in the market, we're in the market within the two-year time frame that tenants are making the commitment.

At that point if we build 650 spaces, then we're limiting our ability to do the office.

And so, what I proposed was -- I understand that, you know, if it's a lab tenant, you might have too many spaces, we will block them off, we'll do something to make sure that we don't use more spaces than is consistent with the City guidelines. That's the concern that we have about the spec issue.

So I think, you know, the numbers are consistent with the City. The spec issue is a challenge for us.

PAMELA WINTERS: Tom has a question.

THOMAS ANNINGER: We have a pretty nasty example in Allston. Harvard has just dug into the ground and then stopped, perhaps at grade level, that's exactly what could happen here.

That's the other side of what you're talking about; the risk for us would be that you do the garage and you don't have a tenant and then we sit with an open wound, or a closed temporary wound, until you get your tenant, which in this day and age could be awhile longer.

I see high risk in duplicating what nobody is happy with in Allston.

MICHAEL OWU: That is a concern. I understand that concern.

The one difference between Allston and this is that today what you have now is a surface parking lot. If we spec the garage and put a roof over it, you would have

essentially what you have today.

So visually there wouldn't be that much of a difference between what is there today and a garage below decked over. So we understand the concern, but from a practical perspective, we may have to spec the garage.

I don't know how we can meet the market -- if a tenant isn't going to commit, a tenant isn't going to commit and there's nothing that we can do to get a tenant to commit four years in advance.

PAMELA WINTERS: Any other questions for Board?

*(No response.)*

PAMELA WINTERS: Shall we move onto --

MICHAEL OWU: Shall I move on?

CARRIE CIDERMAN: I want to add one thing. Thank you very much.

One thing I just wanted -- I think I

said it, but I just want to reiterate it, because I was out in the community listening to all the people who were talking about the project and hearing what they had to say.

So, I think from their perspective, even though many people are happy about Vassar Street, they don't perceive it as the same thing and they don't perceive it as, you know, it's great to have both things, people would say, but it's just not a trade off to have that.

So that's what I heard a lot and that's one of the reasons the City ended up moving forward with this because of that sort've opinion out there in the community about what they were envisioning.

Okay, thank you very much.

PAMELA WINTERS: Thank you. David?

DAVID MANFREDI, ARCHITECT: Good evening, my name is David Manfredi.

PAMELA WINTERS: One moment. Excuse me. Henrietta Davis, Councillor Davis?

HENRIETTA DAVIS: Yeah, I wonder if I can make a comment now about the multi-use path because you are probably going to move away from that to other topics.

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay. Certainly. Mr. Manfredi, sorry.

HENRIETTA DAVIS: Thank you very much for hearing me and nice to see, Charles.

I'm here because I've been implored to come by members of the community about the multi-use path.

This is not the first time we have been before the Planning Board about the multi-use path as it goes through MIT property.

I was here when the -- I think it was the McGovern -- you can tell me which building it is. MIT can tell me which one it is. But when the Brain & Cognitive

Science Building was here before, also there was the same sort of need on the part or the desire on the part of MIT to narrow down that corridor because it certainly serves their purposes better to do that.

But I've been on the City Council for 14 years and in that time, I have seen this vision of Cambridge as a bikable city go from kind've a hobby level to something where we may be getting quite serious.

For anybody who has been -- went to the DCR hearings about the BU bridge, you know that many, many people from MIT are the ones who came out and said, "You've got to make a bike path over the BU bridge. We think you can do it, we think it's possible to make bike lanes there." And this had become a mainstream issue in the time that I've been on the Council, things have gone from, Let's try to do it, maybe we can set a lane apart to we have to create connections

if we're serious about this, if we're really trying to get people to be using bicycles instead of driving, then we have to make it possible for them to do it, and this is one of those connections that really needs to be there, because Vassar Street doesn't connect up to all the -- in the same way that the Grand Junction Railroad is going to.

I think here with community development, with the Planning Board, we're here about the future. We're not just here about how does it work this year, how does it work this decade, we're here about, what it is going to look like in 40 years when we could really say we set aside the space to make it possible for this to really happen.

And I would ask you seriously to consider whatever it takes to make this happen so the Grand Junction Railroad is a reality because one day we're going to see

the Urban Ring there probably. We should be seeing walkable, bikable, all the rest of that there, too, so that we can encourage people to get out of cars. We've got to do it.

So, I know that you will consider this quite seriously and I just wanted to thank you for allowing me to say that at this time. Thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Here. Here.

*(Lots of applause.)*

PAMELA WINTERS: Mr. Manfredi?

DAVID MANFREDI, ARCHITECT: Good evening. I'm going to try to do this and I'll speak loudly.

I'm going to go through a couple, about a half dozen, urban design issues that we talked about before. Some of which I gave you a preview of when we met in December and some of which are new. And I'm going to go through the plans section, but really you're

gonna see most of it in the perspectives and then I'll talk a little about the landscape plan as well.

In each instance, the plan that we used in December is on the left and the new plan is on the right.

So, in plan view, you can see this is -- I could ask you to find the differences. There's really very few. The plan is basically the same. The only thing that has happened is we've eliminated arcade on that side of the building. There are changes in the paving plan and the landscape plan, but I'll come back to that.

But all the sidewalk dimensions have remained the same, so we're basically 16 feet on -- I should be talking to this one. We're 16 feet on Main Street, we're 18, 10 on Portland Street, we're 15 feet on Albany. All those have remained the same and you can see that there are setbacks from the

property line.

When I get to the roof plan, you can begin to see important changes in massing and, again, on the left, is the old plan from December, and it's really about the mechanical floors and the penthouses and we talked about that a lot before.

The configuration of the mechanical floors and penthouses, what we had done, what we have proposed was, to bring them out to the face of the building, engage them in the architecture of the building. And the reaction was, and Roger Boothe articulated it very well, that we were, in fact, enhancing or enlarging the massing of the building. The enhancing makes it positive he didn't mean positively. We were exaggerating the massing of the building.

Basically those enclosures are the same size. We've actually now had the time for our mechanical engineers to lay them out,

but you can see that we pushed back the mechanical floor and we pushed back the mechanical screen. Floor-to-floor heights have remained the same, the areas have remained the same, but we pushed it all more into the center of the building, and you'll see what that -- the impact of that in a moment from the perspectives.

There's one other major massing change that I think is actually of great benefit.

Again, Roger Boothe had made a comment about the scale of the arcades on Portland and on Albany that they were two-story spaces.

We reduced those to one story, and what that did was, we found some square footage and we were able to reduce -- this was the old section, this is a section cut through Main Street to Wing A, the courtyard and Wing B, and the building stepped in order

to accommodate the bulk control plan, but it had two steps. We've eliminated that piece of massing on Main Street, so that now it steps, I think, in a much more clean way.

Again, square footage remains the same. We've basically taken that square footage out of the section and we put it into the second floor of the arcade.

So now I can show you what all of it means in three dimensions.

This is a view looking west, down Main Street, and that kinda saddlebag in the section that I showed you before, you can see it here (*indicating*). We've eliminated it here. I think there's a clearer distinction between the massing of the building on Main Street and the massing that's set back and I think it's exactly what the -- what the bulk control plan anticipated, that there's a scale on Main Street that's appropriate to the use across the street and there's a

larger building set substantially back off the street.

You can see it again here; and this is the view looking south on Portland Street and we had looked at that -- I'm going to call it the saddlebag -- we had looked at that in one view, we looked at it once clad in precast panels, we've also looked at it clad in curtain wall. And now, we basically have removed that piece of massing.

Again, I think there's a clarity of the diagram that's much better.

The other thing you can begin to see, and it will become more apparent as I go down Albany and Portland, is we are using the mechanical floors and penthouses as a way of making the Wing A and Wing B more different. Again, a point that Roger made in his original assessment, that he was looking for -- he suggested that we look for more distinction between the two pieces.

There are reasons we don't want to make them too different, and they have to do with the tenanting and marketing of the building.

But there's great opportunity in the mechanical floors and the penthouses to do that and you will see as you go -- as we go around the building, we have taken advantage of it.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Could I ask you a question?

DAVID MANFREDI, ARCHITECT: Sure.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I thought you said earlier that when you changed the massing, the roof plate and the roof ridge, the penthouse didn't change in height.

Are you saying those two are the same height?

DAVID MANFREDI, ARCHITECT: Yes, they are.

What is happening is, the top of

the -- top of the roof screen and top of the roof screen is the same, but we pushed it back in this instance and it's showing up. The actual elevation of the roof and the elevation of the top of the mechanical floor and the elevation of the roof screen have all stayed the same.

What you are getting now at the top of the building is a stepping of the building. What is here is, that roof screen is here and you can't see it because it's pushed farther back.

This is probably the most dramatic change, the next several, and these we talked a little bit before. This is before and then after on the right.

And you can see -- the reason you couldn't see that screen was that it was way back here. What we've basically done is on both Wing A and Wing B we've taken this mechanical floor, we've taken this penthouse

screen, we have pushed them back and we have changed the material.

So, instead of the precast going all the way up exaggerating the height of the building, we changed the materials and we pushed them back.

There's a couple of other subtle changes and that's true, by the way, in both buildings. Again, the precast stops at the roof, it becomes metal panel above, and you can see that we're using -- actually, some of this is simply refinement. We know more now. We now have done mechanical layouts on those upper floors, although for fictional tenants, so they're subject to change, but we know how much louver we need to have. We're treating the louver in Wing B as kinda isolated frames. We're treating them in Wing A as a more continuous piece using, again, the rooftop to make the distinction between the two buildings.

The other thing that you see in this view, a couple things that are important: Number one, we've changed the infill in the masonry opening. We had originally had this larger opening while -- went on the street with transparent glass from basically floor to ceiling, but when we turned the building, we infilled it with a second precast panel, and, again, a suggestion from the Board; we maintained that proportion all the way around the building. We don't want glass to the floor all the way around the building anticipating lab tenants, who will have lab benches, they'll go up against the sill and that doesn't look great from the street. So, we'll infill it with Spandrel glass, but we'll maintain that better vertical proportion on the sides as well as on the face of the building.

And one more change you can see here is we've changed the proportion -- actually,

you can't see the before because there was an interim step that I don't have with me, but when we showed this to you last time in December, we had three modules of precast above. We've increased that to four modules creating -- and this is a suggestion from Mr. Russell -- that it created a more specific cap to this part of the building and we've taken that -- we basically created a precast parapet that runs all the way around the building. We didn't just do it at the top, we ran it around all the edges.

This is a very similar view and you can see all the same things. You can also see that the height of the arcade has changed. This was a two-story arcade as Mr. Boothe suggested, perhaps out of scale with pedestrian and the width of the sidewalk and the width of the streets. We pulled that down, it's a one-story arcade. That's where we found the square footage that allowed us

to make the changes in the massing on Main Street.

But, again, the most important things are the setback of the mechanical floor and the penthouse and the change in the materials and kinda the change in articulation.

And another view from Albany Street, I'm looking now towards -- this is the new way between the existing 700 Main Street building, and, again, you can see a couple things happening: One is the change in the scale of the arcade, the change in the articulation in the height of the building.

And, again, that same phenomenon is occurring here because we've changed the -- this may actually look taller, it's just that it's closer to you. It was more setback in the previous versions.

That basically defines all of the

massing in the enclosure envelope changes around the building.

I do want to talk a little bit about one view that you have seen before and one view you haven't seen before but you requested.

On Main Street -- and this is a view basically looking to the entrance on Main Street where we have a three-story piece of the building. As Michael indicated the intent is that there's retail on Main Street along that frontage. And there is on Main Street a little bit of a different articulation in the windows.

There's almost a kind of refined Chicago window here in that you can see there's a return to the glass and a kind of reveal against the precast, larger openings on the ground floor to accommodate retail tenants.

As we know more about this

tenanting, what we really want to have happen on the base of the building is more refinement here, is the opportunity if this is restaurant to make it openable to the street. We got very wide sidewalks. We can accommodate outdoor dining. We can make this edge quite friendly. We can make it more penetrable or visibly penetrable and more articulated.

And I think that all comes with knowing a little bit more about how it finally gets tenanted with retail tenants.

And you had asked for a drawing of the sidewalk scape. And this is along Portland Street, it's a one-story arcade with free-standing columns and then the building enclosure at the first level beyond, so you've got a sidewalk, and the dimension from the inside face of the column cover to the building wall is about six feet, so it's two people walking in the arcade.

THOMAS ANNINGER: How does that sidewalk relate to the picture to the left? Is that around the corner?

DAVID MANFREDI, ARCHITECT: It's around the corner.

There were also comments about the courtyard, and this was the courtyard as it was presented in December, and the courtyard as it is revised.

And if you remember, we're trying to accommodate several things: We're trying to accommodate some paths of travel or anticipated paths of travel.

We believe that there will be eventually connection back to core campus and that this will be an important connection.

We believe that in the more short term, when the building gets built, that there are pedestrian paths of travel that will do this (*indicating*), and that there's also paths of travel -- and we talked a

little bit about how we got to the configuration of all the uses on the ground floor -- that this is great space to accommodate food service uses of the tenant, cafeterias, dining spaces, that they open out under the arcade.

And so we want to anticipate that people are going to come out and -- within that, and you can see that there could be tables and chairs accommodating outdoor seating.

I think the comment was that it didn't feel green enough. We've increased the amount of green by about 1700 square feet, but I don't think that's the important thing. I think that what Bob has done that is significant here is he put it together so it's more impactful.

And so, we still want to accommodate those paths, we still want to accommodate the connection of the interior of the building to

the exterior of the building, but what Bob has done is really put together a kind've green swath, a bigger critical mass of green -- of lawn, and as always was the case, this is publically-accessible all the time and open all the time, so we anticipate the tenants use -- the tenants of the building using the space, but it's open 24/7 seven days a week.

You see some other, I think, very nice improvements to the plan. There is more green. There's kinda of a definition, we have that similar kind of arcade that's six-feet wide and now we have this continuous green. All of this, as you know, from here, all of this (*indicating*), is built over the top of a parking garage, it's on four feet of dirt so we can maintain substantial trees.

There were questions about the definition, I'll call it, of the new way, and I don't think we did a great job explaining

it last time, so let me try again.

The intent is that the grade of all of this is the same, that basically we come off the sidewalk and -- of the street, and we ramp up to the elevation of the sidewalk, so all of this is at the same grade. Similar thing happens at Main Street.

What we're trying to do is a couple things: We're trying to enhance the usability of the open space and try to -- instead of the open space being that with a street here (*indicating*), we really want the open space to visually be that.

We're also trying to discourage the use of cut-through for automobile traffic.

So, we're raising it up so that it doesn't feel like a city curb cut and city street, reduce that cut-through traffic.

And you can see -- and we're a little bit still conceptual about what all the paving materials might be, but we treat

the sidewalks one way and we treat that interior space, that courtyard space, another way in terms of what that final paving material, paving pattern and paving colors can be, so that there is, if you look very closely at the drawings, there's a series of bollards long this edge and a series of bollards along this edge, so the people simply are not walking out into that new way and there will be cars that are accessing our below grade parking and accessing loading docks as well.

A couple of other points I want to make: One is about noise. I feel like we talked a lot about noise over the past couple years. And the best thing we can do -- and clearly, the buildings are going to conform to the City of Cambridge's noise ordinance.

The best thing we can do is to build screens around equipment and treat those

screens with acoustical material and make them tall enough that we basically are enveloping the noise to the extent we possibly can. And that is how these rooftops are designed.

But the real point is that the buildings will comply with the zoning ordinance.

As Sarah already mentioned, the buildings will be certifiable at a LEED Silver level. A question was -- a suggestion was made, and if I can get all the way back to my roof plan about putting a green roof on the low roof out here. We have looked at it. It is still a possible strategy. It's not part of our -- of getting to that LEED Silver at this point. We've got a number of issues to solve around it. But the commitment is there to go a LEED Silver for the entire project. Thank you.

PAMELA WINTERS: Thank you.

Do any members have any questions of Mr. Manfredi?

Charles?

CHARLES STUDEN: I had one further question about the private way because I'm still concerned that there might be the potential, as cars and service vehicles are traversing that street, that there be a conflict with pedestrians, specifically that the cars and trucks would go too fast.

You are showing in the drawing, you know, some variation in the paving color, I assume, some texture; any kind of speed bumps or controls or doesn't that really work well?

DAVID MANFREDI, ARCHITECT: There's one thing I should've mentioned. No speed bumps, but we did change -- if you go out there today, this is straight (*indicating*). We've actually angled this to create a 90-degree intersection, which is better from

a traffic point of view. But it's also intended to slow that traffic down and to calm down that traffic so you don't have that shot through.

But I think what Michael will tell you is that cut-through doesn't really happen today. There's not city traffic going on that way today.

MICHAEL OWU: So that concludes our presentation, and just to sum up, we're very excited about this project. We really hope that the Board will hear some of the concerns that we've raised.

At the end of the day, we respect the Board's decision and whatever conditions you feel are appropriate for this project and we look forward to moving forward on it. And we will be happy to answer more questions, if you have them.

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay, how does the Board feel about taking a five-minute break

before we deliberate or would you like to start deliberations now? How are people feeling?

CHARLES STUDEN: I'm comfortable to continue the deliberation.

PAMELA WINTERS: Charles needs to be out of here. He has something to go to at quarter of ten, so he needs -- we need his vote, so perhaps we should continue.

So comments? Charles?

CHARLES STUDEN: I'll start. I am very -- I'm pleased with the changes I've seen here tonight, and in particular, I'm pleased with the massing and enclosure changes that you are proposing to make. I think that the overall immensity of the development seems less as a result of that, and in particular on Main Street, and I know the neighbors have been concerned about the impact of this larger development on a street that has residential development on the other

side of the street, that by setting the upper stories back even further, it helps to reduce that impact.

I think it's unfortunate that Main Street is, in fact, the dividing line between that residential development and the institutional use, if that's what it is, and you are trying to accommodate your program on the site, and I think you are doing it in a very sensitive way. That's my reaction to it.

I'm very happy that you are making a commitment to Silver LEED on this building. I think that's great.

The parking issue, I generally concur with the Traffic Parking and Transportation Department's assessment of the project. I understand not wanting to build too many parking spaces on the one hand, on the other hand I understand what you're going through from a marketing and development plan

of view, and if I'm understanding it correctly, you are proposing to build the garage ahead of time and the surface of that garage would be a parking lot. Effectively, it would look very much like it does today; is that what you are saying or not?

MICHAEL OWU: In answer to Tom's question, that's of the worst-case scenario.

Our expectation is that if we were to build the garage, we would actually proceed with the development. So I don't anticipate that being a lengthy thing, notwithstanding what's happened at Harvard, but that's not the intent.

CHARLES STUDEN: So, again, yeah, I think that I'm feeling much more comfortable than I did the last time we met with what's being proposed here.

PAMELA WINTERS: Other comments from members?

Tom?

THOMAS ANNINGER: Well, I guess my review is still mixed somewhat. I think on the one hand there's a lot to like about what you've done here and it's similar to what we had last time.

I like the massing. I like the way you've worked out the buildings on the site and it's not an easy site.

I think that the low building on Main Street is just right.

I should back up once and say that I've walked around the whole neighborhood and the site, and there is a big hole there now, this on-grade parking lot is a gapping hole in the streetscape, and just the idea that you're going to fill that, in and of itself, is a big positive and I think we need to acknowledge that. Something should go there to better align what is irregular now and I think this does that.

And the way you've shaped the low

building at Main Street, I think is just right, and I think what you've done in terms of eliminating the saddlebag and so on is an improvement. So I think that's all positive.

In terms of doing two buildings the way you've done, I think is very clever and works well. I don't fully understand the connection in terms of bridging and so on. We haven't talked a lot about that. I'm assuming that that's not a big issue. Although sometimes bridges can ruin things. And so I think we need to be sensitive to just how you do that.

But I like that and I like the way you interrelate with the street and the sidewalks, you go to the edge, you shape that site very well. I think the private way works extremely well, and I think you are absolutely right, nobody uses that; it's just not an issue. And I think the other access

also kinda opens it up, and so I think that all is to the good.

Let me go over some of the problems that I have: On the one hand, I think you've done a good job with the rooftop and trying to better it, but looking at the worst-case scenario, which is a total lab, which, I think, is not a bad use for it, I think that would be a good thing for Cambridge, but it's a bad thing for the rooftop. And I still find it close to being unacceptably bulky, and I don't know the answer to it, but at least in the drawings that you have shown us, and I commend you on being so honest in the way you've presented it to us, and you're not sugar coating it, in any way, and I think that's something that's significant in your integrity, but on the other hand, it's no small matter to take a look at what you've done on top of that building. It's a big hulk still and maybe what you've drawn lacks

some of the three dimensions and the different planes that will make it seem better, but I'm still wondering whether there's yet one more level of improvement to be done there.

I hate to hope for office space because that isn't really what I hope for in terms of use. I like Cambridge to be a life sciences center, and so I see that as a -- in many ways a better use, but I think the rooftops are going to be seen from far and wide.

If you could put up the entry at Albany Street, that sort've key -- you had two different renditions of it, either one would work. Probably the first one would be a little bit better.

I think what has happened is we may have trapped you a little bit by asking for a lowering -- I forget whether it's Building A or B to the right.

DAVID MANFREDI, ARCHITECT: A.

THOMAS ANNINGER: By asking you to lower the first and second -- the line for the first floor, so that we now have a clear line for the first floor and the second floor, and by leaving the entryway for B with those rather aggressive teeth, you've got two different lines that, I think, collide, and it's tempting to want to draw the same line across it. I don't quite know why that entryway has to be -- have quite the feel and I think there are -- that's right.

DAVID MANFREDI, ARCHITECT:

*(Indicating.)*

THOMAS ANNINGER: That's right. It's that line, I think, that bothers me and it comes up to the left and it comes up to the right, and it seems inconsistent right now. It seems like something doesn't quite work. I don't know whether that means eliminating -- just eliminating it in the

main entryway.

I think I understand why you have the entryway that way because I think it signals this is where you are supposed to enter the building and this is a significant building and you are trying to make this appealing to a tenant that you don't yet have, so I understand that.

On the other hand, once you've got the tenant, I'm not sure that's the right entryway anymore. I think it will depend to a certain extent on who that tenant is.

That sort've speaks to one of the dilemmas of this building, which is, you've designed it on spec, and yet, because you have nothing inside to tell you how to reflect what's going on in there, and so you've built something appealing, but the day will come when you have a tenant, and all of a sudden, some of that ought to change, so that it has -- it has some sense why the

inside and the outside, how they connect. That raises, I think, an important issue in terms of timing of the design of this. You're not going to build this for a couple years. Somehow we need to have some sort of flexibility to be able to, on the one hand, approve and give you the Special Permit that you need to get a tenant, but we need to be able to look at the design of the building after you have that tenant and after you've decided that maybe that isn't quite right and maybe we need to do some adjustments to it, so that we can see it again.

That's not something we've ever had presented to us before because we've never really had to approve a building on spec.

That's a -- I don't think that's been presented to us where you can go AC/DC because we don't know the orientation -- just to make some bad analogies.

ROGER BOOTHE, DIRECTOR OF URBAN DESIGN: I do believe there is precedent for the Board approving a project and wanting to see certain design changes of this nature, so I do think you -- maybe not exactly this scenario, but you've often asked to see something like this as it develops.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Well, you get the idea. I think that's something that I think we'll want to and need to address.

HUGH RUSSELL: This is sort've halfway between a building approval and a PUD?

ROGER BOOTHE, DIRECTOR OF URBAN DESIGN: Yeah.

THOMAS ANNINGER: The next point goes to -- I'm going to take one of the words that you used from Main Street, and apply it to the glass, I think that the glass on the side feels like a saddlebag. It doesn't quite connect well to the building. It seems

somewhat disembodied almost from the rest, and here, too, I have the feeling -- I'm not quite sure why you did it that way -- that you are trying to appeal to a tenant that you don't have yet and this is somewhat sexy perhaps. But I don't think it integrates well with the building.

In many ways, I would have loved it without glass at all because I think this kind of interplay of glass and stone is almost becoming a little bit of a too-familiar vocabulary now in Cambridge and elsewhere. Every hospital looks like this. And it's getting a little tired, and I don't know what it's going to look like in 20 years, but I worry about that. I think we need to take a long view and so I think that whatever exaggerated bay glass windows that you attach to it, really need to be very thoughtfully done, and this might be another area where after you have your tenant, you

might be able to improve on that because I think there's room for improvement there. I'm not saying eliminate it because on the other hand, it might become boring if you did.

But I will say I did take a hard look at the elevation of the building from the private way where you have no saddlebags and it's really very handsome. It almost -- it looks like an old mill building brought to date and it's a very handsome -- it would look fine without any of that glass, I think.

But I like the way it relates to the street and the way it's shaped and so on, and so I think that's another issue that could move over time.

And I guess the last point I want to make and I -- it has to do with the landscaping. Maybe you could put the before and after up on that?

*(Mr. Manfredi complies.)*

THOMAS ANNINGER: Now, different people have different views on what they like, and landscaping is one where everybody has a like and dislike.

I know why you did what you did because it was a request -- I wasn't the one who made it, but there was a request that you emphasize the green.

I, on the other hand, feel what you had in the first go-round has more integrity to it, fits better, than what you came up.

To me that looks just like a swimming pool, but it's in green, and it reminds me of some unsuccessful other parks in the Boston area. I think Copley Place has a green area that doesn't work. Many people know that. It was done for political reasons.

HUGH RUSSELL: Copley Square?

THOMAS ANNINGER: Did I say Copley

Square? I did say Copley Square.

HUGH RUSSELL: You said Copley Place.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Did I say Copley Place? Okay. Copley Square. Sorry. Thank you.

And, of course, the best example of too much green and ill-designed green is the Rose Kennedy Greenway. That doesn't work and will have to be fixed some day, and this is much smaller than all of that in scale, so I'm probably not using perfect examples, but I don't think this is an improvement. I thought it was much more interesting before, and I thought you could have found some compromise perhaps between the two, like perhaps like in that access, the way you've emphasized the green there, it's a little cleaner line, and I don't know quite what they are, but they look like green benches or something, green little plots.

But I'm not crazy about this big plot of green that I think is going to get in the way more than help. So I thought the first one was much more interesting and I'm sorry to see it go.

So those are my comments. I haven't spoken to the parking and the traffic. I think that's a really tough issue. I'm gonna hold off on that, and I'll leave to others some of the other issues.

I guess the only comment I have is, I'm very reluctant to speak on the trail way without having a whole lot more knowledge than I now do of how that works.

I found everybody who spoke on it convincing. I thought everybody made sense. I thought Kelley Brown made sense, I thought Carrie made sense, I think there was somebody else, Sue Clippinger made sense, our City Councilor, you did; you all said the right things, and I don't know how to bring that

together, but I don't think we're in a position to do that either yet, at least I'm not without a whole lot more information, and so I'm very reluctant to acknowledge the nexus between the two.

I would like to see us speak to some of the issues that I've been speaking about, parking and traffic added, and leave that mitigation issue for another day and another forum. Thank you.

PAMELA WINTERS: Anybody else?  
Hugh?

HUGH RUSSELL: My thoughts aren't as well organized as Tom's, but I think I would agree with most of his architectural observations, and I think the fundamental issue is one of -- this is a schematic design, as it has to be at this point, and as buildings develop, things get improved.

So, if we can keep the improvements going, and through, you know, staff reviews

and if the staff wants to share those reviews informally with us, then I think that's -- that would be appropriate.

And if, you know, there's a substantive change that affects the permit, then we would have to review them as a major or minor amendment. So I think that handles it.

I'm curious to know why the -- there's 64 feet of mechanicals on top of this building, there's some 34 feet, I guess, like a two-level mechanical room, and then another 20 feet of mechanical enclosure, and I think it's very important that the mechanical enclosure be there because it will protect the residential areas to the north from the noise of the cooling towers up there, but I'm wondering if those enclosures -- I think we ought to put a condition, I guess, that says when you finally get the building to, you know, a next stage of construction, that you

attempt to minimize the footprint of the top of the building enclosures so as to get back some of the -- particularly in the views from the north -- to try to reduce the apparent volume, I think shrink them towards the south in a way towards the configuration they had before.

I think at this point nobody knows with any certainty what equipment has to be up there beyond certain classes of equipment, but exactly how big it is, what size it is, is unknown.

And it won't be known until you actually start doing the construction drawings for the building.

So, I would want a condition as part of this design review that this particular point be addressed very specifically as you come in and defend every square foot of that enclosure, every foot of projection towards Main Street.

The green space, I think from a pigeon's eye view, the new plan will seem to be more green. 1700 feet of extra green space in a plaza of that size is not very much.

I think this room is about that size, maybe a little smaller than 1700 feet, but it's not too much more than what would be in this room.

So I was looking to see where -- I think if you're on the ground, whether you've got it all on one thing or whether you've got some walkways through it, particularly if the green areas are slightly raised, it can be raised inches, from a distance you don't see the walkways, you see -- all you see is green.

So when the detailed design comes in, either design, I think, would look about the same amount of green from the ground.

And I think it's important to maybe

look and analyze how some of the existing similar spaces that have been built. I'm thinking of University Park in particular, how they function. University Park space is much larger. The central quadrangle abuts it. This is a big piece of space, and I think, again, in the development, I would like more development to go on and more thought be given to that.

I think, in particular, that as you are walking through Building A and B, there's a strip of paving that's 50 feet wide with about 20 feet of green, so there's 30 feet of pavement there, and I think that could probably take the MIT academic commencement procession without any trouble. And I think maybe there could be as green areas are developed on the new plan, they could be wider and there could be a little bit less pavement in there.

And, again, as you know more about

the tenants and the users, you know more about the uses around that north and east side of the space, you get more clear about what you can do.

Right now, it's a diagram that I think in some ways are pretty much the same.

On the subject of the amount of parking spaces, I can't figure it out, to tell you the truth.

What I can't figure out is how many spaces are associated with the two possible tenant mixes in the new building, how many are in Shire, how long is the Shire lease for, and things like that.

I find Sue Clippinger's argument very convincing, and I find her thinking, in general, about this subject to be sober and sensible thinking, and so I'm inclined to feel that we should go with her analysis of the amount of spaces.

It's just not clear to me, you know, if the Shire lease runs 20 years, will there be a period where there might be -- where MIT would have to go back to the Shire and say, "Look, you're not using those 100 spaces, and we would like to renegotiate."

I mean, you can -- you talked about breaking leases, but there's also a process called renegotiation, and maybe in renegotiating a lease, they'd no longer pay for 100 spaces that they're using. That might possibly be of some interest to them.

The other parking piece that I think in the sense -- this is an opportunity to figure in -- is that parking lot on the corner of School Street and Cherry Street, and it has been our Town Gown list of questions for the last -- ever since we've been having the questions -- is that six, eight or ten years -- and we've never got an answer.

That's an inappropriate use of that piece of land in that residential neighborhood. And it should be changed, and so I would be willing to maybe offer some more spaces in the garage as a sweetener if that space became used for either housing or for community purposes. I'm not quite sure what is wanted. But it was identified, I believe, in the neighborhood study many years ago, and it's not an area that doesn't have a lot of green space, and I've heard they're talking maybe community gardens would be a great use of that piece of land.

So I think the commitment to talk about it at some time in the future isn't enough. And I would like to see a commitment to decommission that as a potential parking lot for 750, and let it be used for purposes that can be worked out with the City and with the neighborhood. And say with that, if there are 50 spaces in that lot, then maybe I

would add those to the 650 that Sue is offering you. Because, in fact, 650 is about as close to 750 as the Cherry Street lot is. It's nowhere near the building. It's like two blocks away. So that's how I would handle that.

I share Tom's feeling we should not be altering City policy on vis-a-vis the Grand Junction right-of-way, but I also felt that MIT made some very good arguments about how this may not be very good and I have been very impressed with the development of Vassar Street. The actual -- and remember when Michael said, "Well, we're budgeting \$75,000 what the City asked for," everybody looked at what the City was asking for and it was for some paving.

So, will it be harder to have that discussion if that extra paving goes in there? Maybe a little harder, but it strikes me it's a very small investment that's being

asked, and that if -- when those discussions happen about the Grand Junction right-of-way, if MIT is able to convince the City, or there's something that involves that pavement being wasted, in the context of this development, that's not really a very significant waste.

So I would recommend actually that we adopt Sue's recommendation with maybe some qualifying language that says that if between now and the date that that was going to become operative, further discussions would cause that to be changed, that would be okay. Because it's not -- if they were spending half a million dollars, this would be very different.

And so I can sort've say, well -- my personal opinion, uninformed, is that it probably makes sense to try to use Vassar Street for this kind of connection because 10 million dollars or something has been

spent there, and it's a very nice facility. It's not a multi-use path, but it may actually do the job better and maybe it's better to have that pathway enlivened compared to the -- you know, rather than having two parallel things, maybe we want to have the kids and the dogs and all the rest on Vassar Street to make that street a nicer, more lively place in the City, but -- I guess that's how I would come down on that.

I guess as a final note, if you look at Chapter 19 in the findings that we're required to make, it's not difficult to look at the findings we have to make and to look at the physical proposal in front of us and say, "Yeah, we can make those findings." They've addressed the issues under the urban design issues in the way that I think we want them to do it.

So I think we -- and given that, I think we have to actually -- we've got a call

from, I believe, Councilor Toomey, we've had calls from him where it says, Don't vote. Don't take this."

Well, I hear that as a thing saying, Ignore the law, ignore what you are supposed to be doing, and go off on your own direction because we don't like what the law -- we don't like the law. We don't like the consequences, so just ignore it, and let us negotiate some more. I don't like being told to not do what we're here supposed to be doing.

PAMELA WINTERS: Thank you, Hugh. Steve?

STEVEN WINTER: I want to say that I agree with Hugh on your point about the -- our role as a deliberating body and our role in other public sector processes that are ongoing and that may be ongoing or may not be ongoing.

We have a job to do here and I think

we have to be fairly single minded about that job.

Michael, I don't want to put words in your mouth, but at some point did you indicate that, okay, if MIT didn't get involved in the Grand Junction pathway, and if the -- if your offer for the work at Mass Ave, Vassar, and Albany wasn't really needed that there was \$300,000 that you could put to the project?

MICHAEL OWU: Not quite.

*(Laughter.)*

MICHAEL OWU: It was \$300,000 for the Portland Street/Albany Street intersection; and \$75,000 for the bike path all subject to negotiation.

STEVEN WINTER: But it would all be subject to negotiation.

MICHAEL OWU: Putting on my developer hat here, what I need to do and come away with is an understanding of what

I'm agreeing to, and if I have a dollar number associated with it, I can go back to the house and say, "Run the numbers," and say, "Yes, this works." If it's open-ended, I can't do that.

So, I need some boundaries around what I'm agreeing to.

STEVEN WINTER: Okay. Thank you.

Hugh, I concur with your idea. I like the idea of the parking compromise, as you stated it. I also agree with the design comments that you and Tom both had.

I must say that I was a little concerned that parties who I respect, and who have come before this body all the time, MIT and traffic and parking, seem to be really at loggerheads over an issue that should've been -- it's an issue that wasn't fully knit together and it really should've -- it just concerns me that it's that loose and as my father used to say, you know, "Who is zooming

who?" So I just wanna say that that concerns me that that's not taken care of.

MICHAEL OWU: Can I respond to that?

STEVEN WINTER: Hang on just a moment, please.

And I have to say, and you touched on it, but in the larger sense, I'm not sure that mitigation is the place to address this bike path issue, and that mitigation for one developer coming in for one building is really the place to do this. It sounds like a much bigger issue with a much bigger financing package and a much more comprehensive plan and it just seems to me that it needs to be baked a little bit more before it's ready for prime time.

Michael, yes.

MICHAEL OWU: I'm sorry. On the parking, I apologize, I didn't want to characterize our position as being in conflict with Sue.

I actually think that for the most part we agree. We agree that if it were a lab building, it would be 650, and if it were an office building, it would be -- my language is 820, her is maximum is 820, but essentially the numbers are consistent. The issue is if we're building on spec, and the challenge that we have is that we're building the garage on spec.

We're not miles apart. It's just a question of timing of construction and, you know, I know when Sue says a maximum of 120, she means less than 820 -- sorry -- but essentially we're not that far apart. Thank you.

STEVEN WINTER: I'm all set.

CHARLES STUDEN: On that point, Michael, I thought that Sue had a very interesting suggestion in her memo, which was assuming that the permit were approved for 650, which is what she's recommending, that

if the building is office use, that you could come forward and seek an amendment from the Planning Board to increase the maximum once you provided evidence that, in fact, it was an office tenant and you needed that additional parking, but that this permit would be approved at the lower number initially.

MICHAEL OWU: And the challenge we had was the timing issue. I may not know who the office tenant is at the time that I need to start my garage.

PAMELA WINTERS: Sue, would you like to make a comment on that?

SUE CLIPPINGER: I want to say a couple things.

First of all, I welcome your comment. I would wish that we had had a more deliberative process before here. We generally like to not be in disagreement while we're before the Board and putting that

kind of pressure on you well as volunteer members. We're trying to deal with all these issues.

I also think that in the intervening, what's been several months, we have gone and tried to look at what we know about office tenants in the Cambridgeport -- in the Kendall Square area, and try to get some sense of whether we know anything more about what, you know, does make sense or doesn't make sense. There are not a lot of office tenants in Kendall Square. It's not generally an area that's been heavily used by office tenants prior to this. There are 205 Broadway and 210 Broadway; one of them is the building that's predominantly CDM with a small R&D tenant; and the other one is the building that I always think as *(inaudible)* Ink -- although *(inaudible)* Ink isn't there.

*(Comment from audience member.)*

SUE CLIPPINGER: I believe they're

not there. And both of those buildings are, you know, below one per 1,000 in terms of parking, and what we were saying for the R&D building is 1.12.

So that, you know, leads us to have some sense that, you know, that 820 may be a high number for an office in the Kendall Square area and 7 Cambridge Center, which has a very large number of tenants in that area, it's 900,000 square feet and 731 parking spaces is actually 36 percent larger than this building and, yet, has a smaller parking supply. But, again, it has a very broad range of tenants, and in the end, the whole issue about parking really is about what's the employee density of the building and so the world is not really made up of these nice little boxes that say R&D is one employee density and office is another employee density, and, you know, you're either one or the other. What it is, is a

whole spectrum depending on the characteristics of those tenants.

So, I actually think that, you know, a permit for 650 spaces might work fine for quite a broad variety of tenants, and I think it's very worrisome from my perspective to think about building a very large garage in which there may be decades' worth of commitments for keeping spaces blocked off and what the hell are you doing with a big comment box with space that can't be used to park cars, and what kinds of uses are that? And as you talk about the open space, I wonder why we're building spaces that may never be needed under places where you are trying to grow trees and other kinds of things.

So, as the intervening time has gone by, I think, you know, our feeling is we've looked and looked and tried to figure out, you know, is there a magic answer, which

there isn't, that I feel more and more confident that the 650 number is really totally consistent with what we've been trying to do for many, many years, does not prevent, as we had suggested, you know, if the initial tenant is office that they couldn't come back and make sure that they have sufficient parking to have that tenant comfortably be in the building, and who knows what our mobility needs will be in the future, you know, with whatever kinds of changes may be happening.

So, good luck, Board.

PAMELA WINTERS: Thank you, Sue.

BETH RUBENSTEIN: I hate to add to the pressure, but I did want to point out to the Board, the deadline for action on this case is March 16, and the Board's next scheduled meeting is March 17th, so...

PAMELA WINTERS: That was my next question to you. Oh, boy.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Can I ask Beth, is that not something that get, by agreement, postponed.

BETH RUBENSTEIN: It can. We would need to ask the proponent if they were willing to give us more time, and I would say that's a conversation you may want to have at this point. If that were not forthcoming, we certainly would have the option of scheduling another meeting next week in advance of the 15th. We'd have to have either a decision tonight, an agreement to give us more time or we need another meeting before the 16th.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Can I --

PAMELA WINTERS: Yes.

THOMAS ANNINGER: -- ask the proponent a question as a follow-up on that?

There have been a few issues that seem to me somewhat unresolved. The thought about the parking lot is no small matter. I'm not sure you have an answer to that

tonight as to whether that's -- if that's even of interest to you, or whether you can make such an agreement, maybe you want to speak to that, but while I agree with Hugh that we're probably very close and Article 9 would not be difficult to work our way through, on the other hand, I think there are enough open questions, some of them seem unresolved to me, that maybe time is something that we all need a little bit of, and I don't mean a year; I mean a week or two or four.

MICHAEL OWU: I actually -- I think the issues that are on the table with respect to -- I think the big issues are the parking and the bike path. Those are two big issues, and there's a neighborhood issue with the Cherry Street lot.

I think with the Cherry Street lot, the difference from what we've said in the past with what we're saying now is that we're

saying that we will make that lot available to the neighborhood and we will engage in the process to determine what that use is.

There have been conflicting requests, parking for teachers, affordable housing, green building design, park, community gardens. There's a lot of issues around that. And we're committing -- we have committed to make that happen, just not now and not part of this project.

So I would like to take that off the table because I think it really is not related to this project.

On the parking, what I would suggest -- request is that the Board decide. We will live with whatever the Board decides.

If you decide that -- based on the case that I've made that the flexibility of office is important, and that you believe that we will block off those spaces -- and

we're carrying the cost, it costs us money to do that. If we're willing to do that, you know, that's our problem, it has no impact.

If you are concerned that we will try to cheat the system and use more parking spaces than we need and you think that we should be limited to 650, that's fine. We will deal with it. There will be implications for us. It means that we may not get an office tenant. It means that the use is being restricted in ways that I don't think is intended in the ordinance, but if that's what we have to live with, that's what we have to live.

I think on the bike parking thing -- on the bike path, the issue for us there is, as I think I articulated, is we've got two sides of the house. We have very conflicting requirements here.

I think Hugh's suggestion -- and I think I wrote it down here -- the concern

that I have with that becoming part of the Special Permit, the Special Permit is something that does get filed, it's sort've -- it's tied to the property, it's in the deed, it's a permanent restriction, and I don't know legally -- I can turn to my lawyers and find out -- I don't know if legally there's a way to craft the language in the Special Permit that disconnects that should we not be able to resolve this in the long-term with the City.

I think the issue -- which really raises the point that we were trying to make before, which is, it's complicated, it's not an easy -- there's no easy answer for that, and we just don't think we're gonna be able to resolve it.

You know, let's say we postpone it for a week and we try to meet again, or we -- this is not something that is going to get resolved in a matter of weeks, to be

perfectly honest. There are complicated issues that are going to require a lot of discussions between MIT and the City, and I don't see that happening in near term.

So, you know, my request to you tonight would be to park Cherry Street, we will work with the neighborhood to solve that; make a decision on parking; put aside the bike path. We will -- as I said, we will put money aside to make something happen, and move forward with the vote tonight.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Okay.

PAMELA WINTERS: I would like to make one quick comment.

Roger, you, in your memo from December 5th made several comments regarding the building, and several of them were addressed, and I'm just wondering if you have any other comments in terms of the architecture or any other issues from your memo from December 5th.

ROGER BOOTHE, DIRECTOR OF URBAN  
DESIGN: Thank you, Pam.

Certainly, I think some of the comments that Hugh was making about trying to be able to look at it as it evolves, and I think others on the Board were also talking about that -- I mean, Tom originally seemed to be touching on that -- would be, I think, very consistent with how we've done other things, and I think that would be the best way to work some of those things. I think we certainly heard your concerns about some of the shifting around of massing and so forth, and I feel like that's within the range of things we've looked at before.

PAMELA WINTERS: So an ongoing design...

ROGER BOOTHE, DIRECTOR OF URBAN  
DESIGN: I think ongoing design review will be fine.

THOMAS ANNINGER: This one is big

enough, I think, this would come back to us at one point.

ROGER BOOTHE, DIRECTOR OF URBAN DESIGN: I would probably expect that, yeah, and then you could even say that you wanted that in the permit, if you want.

PAMELA WINTERS: Thanks, Roger.

So, we have the decision to make. Do we vote on this this evening? And Board members, I need some input from you.

THOMAS ANNINGER: I'm pretty close. I think I could do it.

I think on the three issues that Mike listed, I think we'd have to reflect something on Cherry Street in our decision. Disconnected as it is geographically from our lot here, I think we ought to say something about it. And perhaps that commitment is good enough. I would be interested to know. Hugh raised it, I would like to know how Hugh feels about that.

I would recouple the bike path from this decision. I think that's what Steve was saying. I see Charles nodding.

PAMELA WINTERS: I do, too.

THOMAS ANNINGER: On the parking, that's the tough one.

I was persuaded by Sue Clippinger's last remarks. The idea of having forever this wasted space in a sustainable world where we try not to -- where recycle and we try not to throw stuff away needlessly, it's very hard for me to imagine an empty underground inner sanctum forever and ever. That would bother me.

So, if I had to decide tonight, I would probably go with the 650.

STEVEN WINTER: Hugh?

I would like to hear some other Board members.

PAMELA WINTERS: Ted, do you have any thoughts?

You don't need to, if you don't want to.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I would rather not.

HUGH RUSSELL: Just to answer Tom's question. I thought that Michael's clarification that they had made a commitment to work this out on Cherry Street, to me, is the important statement here.

If that commitment is made it's not going to be backed away from, and therefore, I feel we don't have to put it in the decision.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Okay.

PAMELA WINTERS: Well, it seems as though we're agreed that we will vote on this this evening. Is this the consensus that I'm hearing here?

MICHAEL OWU: Can I throw a thought out?

PAMELA WINTERS: Yes.

MICHAEL OWU: 650, 820 there's a lot of numbers in between, so we can certainly find some middle ground should the Board so chose, but just a thought.

PAMELA WINTERS: It's a nice thought.

*(Laughter.)*

HUGH RUSSELL: Actually, 170 parking spaces requires 50,000 square feet of space or about 4 or 500,000 cubic feet of building, and one of the ironies here is that it's an R&D building, there's a huge volume of stuff on the roof that we don't want to look at, and we don't need that huge volume in the basement, and if it's an office building, we need that volume used as cars, so maybe we challenge -- you say, okay, when you build out that basement, either it's gonna be used as part of your mechanical space for the R&D, even though that's not the way R&D buildings often work, but just look at the way Harvard

built their R&D building, you will notice they used an enormous amount of basement space and built it out, you know, to a two-story garage, I believe -- three-story garage. So you just build up volume, take whatever it is, it would be like 15,000 square feet and don't put the floors in initially when you are building, and if you -- if it turns out to be a mechanical room, that's a big tall mechanical room; otherwise, it's a -- other you add more steel in and you got some floors and you got more space for your parking.

Again, I'm not sure you can agree to that sitting here, but volumetrically, it seems to kinda do what we want to do.

MICHAEL OWU: Yeah, yeah, yeah. Actually, it's complicated -- it's -- I understand the concept and we can look at it. I'm already envisioning a whole group of complications that would probably make that

unfeasible.

BETH RUBENSTEIN: I just would add that if the Board did end up saying it was the lower number and MIT gave it some thought and they thought they could come back with a discussion about larger number of parking spaces or mechanical, they certainly would always have the option to come back to amend the decision.

CHARLES STUDEN: And, in fact, I thought that was what Sue was suggesting in her recommendation that we approve the lower number with the notion that if it changed at the time you were moving forward, you would come to the Board and explain that.

BETH RUBENSTEIN: Even if there's a change in their thinking building the spec garage and thinking about the spec garage being developed, they certainly could come back for the amendment.

CHARLES STUDEN: Right.

PAMELA WINTERS: Would somebody like to make a motion?

THOMAS ANNINGER: I'll move it as long as Hugh goes through the findings; I don't have the energy for that.

PAMELA WINTERS: Hugh, do we need to go through the findings? You said we pretty much...

HUGH RUSSELL: Well, I would say we don't need to go through the findings in detail. I think we read the findings, they're responsive to existing patterns of development, clearly that's, you know -- relates to the scale, the scale of the buildings, the scale of the building as it relates to the housing across the street, pedestrian/bicycle friendly. There are items that have to do with the design of the courtyard and space and the sidewalks around it, and these are all things that the staff

can really flesh out. Adverse impacts on neighbors. I think the only two impacts I can think of are the -- part of them are just in the zoning. It's like the sound protection and the sunlight protection for the housing that's near it. There's no evidence for any projects (*inaudible*) the City's infrastructure, no communication from the City on that. New constructions, reinforced and enhanced, the conflicts, urban aspects of Cambridge as they develop, historically, I'm sure Roger can find words to express that. My sort've thing is it's -- you know, again, the issue to keep the street pattern, to make the building down into sizes that are, you know --

STEVEN WINTER: Permeable to pedestrians.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. And this is not such a complex area so that -- so I think these findings are pretty

straightforward.

PAMELA WINTERS: We're approving the 650 spaces; is that correct?

HUGH RUSSELL: What I hear is 650 spaces.

PAMELA WINTERS: That's right.

HUGH RUSSELL: No linkage to the pedestrian path and the Brain & Cog building, I think is what they call it, and I think the rest of Sue's recommendations get incorporated as they stand.

PAMELA WINTERS: Should we make a condition about ongoing design review or no?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Yes. We have to talk about that. How do we -- can we make that pretty specific?

HUGH RUSSELL: I'm sure Roger can.

ROGER BOOTHE, DIRECTOR OF URBAN DESIGN: We will look at the issues you

raised about the ground floor, the meshing, the different materials, the entryway, the rooftop of the building.

THOMAS ANNINGER: And I guess the landscaping, although that will take some consensus here, I recognize that.

ROGER BOOTHE, DIRECTOR OF URBAN DESIGN: The landscaping, yep.

PAMELA WINTERS: So.

MICHAEL OWU: I'm sorry, but the dollar commitment to the intersection work so if you can cap it, we will work with whatever designs make sense. If I have a sense that the Special Permits to MIT to \$300,000 for that intersection, that would give me something for the --

CHARLES STUDEN: Plus the \$75,000 that --

MICHAEL OWU: Plus the \$75,000.

THOMAS ANNINGER: I thought the \$75,000 was what we just recoupled.

CHARLES STUDEN: But was for Vassar and Portland Street at Mass Ave, and Sue was saying she doesn't think that's necessary.

However, I do think that using that money for some other related transportation, bicycle improvement, would be perfectly appropriate.

PAMELA WINTERS: Very good.

MICHAEL OWU: That's fine.

SUE CLIPPINGER: I have a suggestion if you are interested?

PAMELA WINTERS: Sue?

SUE CLIPPINGER: If you are trying to go from this project to Vassar Street there's a railroad crossing that you are able to access Vassar Street from this project, and to get from Albany Street to Vassar Street, this is not accessible because there's curbs, and so that \$75,000 could be allocated to providing the connection that is missing for the bicycles and for disabled

people to Vassar Street since, as I understand your tones, you're feeling like that's the appropriate place for the bicycle pedestrian connection in lieu of the one that we were recommending.

CHARLES STUDEN: For the time being, obviously. The Grand Junction concept --

SUE CLIPPINGER: In terms of this particular project in mitigation, yes.

CHARLES STUDEN: Exactly, yes.

STEVEN WINTER: That's acceptable, I guess.

KELLEY BROWN: I love spending Michael's money.

PAMELA WINTERS: Good. All right, so --

BETH RUBENSTEIN: Can I ask a clarifying question? I did hear the discussion of Cherry Street was not to be in decision. Did you want a discussion of that in the findings that that was discussed

tonight?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

BETH RUBENSTEIN: Thank you.

THOMAS ANNINGER: I think the word "commitment" in there would be useful.

PAMELA WINTERS: We did hear the word "commitment."

MICHAEL OWU: Yes, you did.

PAMELA WINTERS: So, we have a motion. We have --

CHARLES STUDEN: And a second.

PAMELA WINTERS: And a second; and all those who approve?

*(Unanimous vote.)*

PAMELA WINTERS: It's unanimous. We're right on time for Charles.

*(Short Recess Taken.)*

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS CASE 9762 - 22 WATER  
STREET VARIANCE EXTENSION:**

PAMELA WINTERS: So, next on the agenda is the Fresh Pond Mobil Repair, however, before we get to that, the folks at 22 Water Street have applied for a variance extension and so the Board needs to vote on that.

LESTER BARBER: You don't have to vote on it. You can comment, if you wish. The Board may remember they -- some of the Board members may not -- we approved a housing development in North Point under the PUD regulations there on Water Street, and that project, in addition to the Special Permit, required a variance for additional height and that variance was granted about a year and a half ago.

Variances cannot be extended. They have to be -- if they run out and you haven't undertaken the project, you're required to

resubmit and reapply for the variance, so nothing has changed about the project. They simply want to renew the variance that they received before.

PAMELA WINTERS: They need more time?

LESTER BARBER: Yes. The project isn't moving forward immediately, so they need additional time. They may be back to you ultimately to continue the Special Permit, but that still has time to run out.

If you wish, we can send the same comments that were made at the original hearing.

HUGH RUSSELL: That makes sense.

PAMELA WINTERS: That would be fine.

Does everybody else agree with that?

STEVEN WINTER: That's fine.

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay, very good.

That way they don't have to stay around until

after we heard you.

**PB#190, 325 FRESH POND PARKWAY, FRESH POND  
MOBIL REPAIR, CHANGE OF APPROVED PLANS:**

PAMELA WINTERS: Now we're up to the 325 Fresh Pond Parkway, Fresh Pond Mobil Repair and change of approved plan and discussion.

MICHAEL SAVAGE: Members of the Board, my name is Mike Savage and I have been asked my Mr. Lackis (*phonetic*), who is the owner of Fresh Pond Mobil to assist him in moving this project to completion, and we have had an alteration in the structure itself which was originally presented to you as a concrete block building, but due to circumstances, we ended up erecting a steel building and I have our general contractor here, Philip McLaughlin, who has been responsible for the construction and the permitting of the project.

And I would like him now to explain what has gone on and why a change in the

construction.

PHILIP MCLAUGHLIN: Here is a letter from our engineer just to say the ground at Fresh Pond is really soft and they've got -- I've got a section of what we're going to do.

PAMELA WINTERS: Sir, would it be possible for to you use a microphone?

PHILIP MCLAUGHLIN: The ground at Fresh Pond is very soft, we put a lot of piles in the ground, and when we started out the project, we did some task pouring, and when we knew the ground was soft, then we started actually putting piles in the ground, that's when it was a lot softer than we expected, and we sat down with our engineer, Arthur Chu (*phonetic*) and reviewed the whole thing. And we decided that maybe a metal would be lighter, easier on the ground, and when we put the building in, it wouldn't move and crack and be a further problem in the future.

Metal being fire -- in the same lines as block, not fire -- not a building that's going up in fire and burn, so this is (*indicating*) -- that's the metal building there, and then turn it and then we will put a brick veneer. It's a brick veneer that would be put on the building, so the look of the building is the exact same as what we projected, it's not going to change the actual look of the building, so we haven't -- you know, we're not looking for anybody to change anything. It's gonna look exactly the same when it's completed, which will be just like that there (*indicating*), which is used a lot.

PAMELA WINTERS: I believe there were other issues, if I remember correctly, about windows and landscaping, too. I don't know if you want to address that.

PHILIP MCLAUGHLIN: Well, we put in the metal building. Right now we're in the

process of putting in all the windows exactly where they're located. We put the metal building up first. The weather got cold, so we delayed putting the windows in. Right now we put the windows in and then the brick will go on, so the building will look exactly as -- do you have the drawing there (*indicating*), what was approved by you guys?

THOMAS ANNINGER: Well, it's a little different than approved. It was presented to us that way.

PHILIP MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, but it's gonna -- it's gonna look the exact same.

The only difference is going to be instead of a block, it still will have a steel frame, which was always in the block building. And the only difference is going to be this right here, this finish (*indicating.*)

HUGH RUSSELL: The project as presented to us showed a mix of brick and

block?

PHILIP MCLAUGHLIN: Yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: So what would be used for the areas that were shown as block?

PHILIP MCLAUGHLIN: It's the same block veneer that looks just like this here (*indicating*).

This is actually a brick, half-inch of brick, sliced right off a brick, which is actually pretty expensive. Bricks are actually cheaper than one of these pieces.

PAMELA WINTERS: So the question that Hugh asked is, will the blocks will be the same color as the brick?

PHILIP MCLAUGHLIN: The blocks can be the same color or it can be like a regular block color. We didn't specify in the drawings, do you know what I mean?

It's -- we wanted to go with like a red brick to match the water - the water pump building is across the street right there at

Fresh Pond, we wanted to match that same color red brick.

HUGH RUSSELL: The building has four sides. On one side is pretty much obscured by the abutting restaurant, I believe, and there's two sides that are visible from the parkway. And there's one side that's visible from the playground at the school through some trees, so it's gonna happen on all four sides?

PHILIP MCLAUGHLIN: One side is already block, that's the side up against the restaurant.

We're proposing this brick on the other two sides. And then the side up against the school, we wanted to see what you guys had for a thought.

I mean, if we could keep that a metal, or if you thought we should put a veneer on.

THOMAS ANNINGER: This is the back

we're talking about now?

PHILIP MCLAUGHLIN: There's an eight-foot fence with a -- it's got that plastic mesh through the fence, you can't see through the fence, you know, up against the building. That's like back 20 feet from the building.

THOMAS ANNINGER: And the other side is the armory?

PHILIP MCLAUGHLIN: No.

THOMAS ANNINGER: What's behind that fence?

PHILIP MCLAUGHLIN: Tobin School.

There's about 20 feet between the school and the building. There's like an eight-foot fence and there's 20 feet at the back of the building. So, if you look, if you're standing at the fence, you couldn't see over the fence and see the building. The building's only -- do you know what I mean? It's too far.

PAMELA WINTERS: Any comments from the architects in the group?

LESTER BARBER: There's also a site plan requirement which that they will adhere to the original approved site plan.

The requirement is that they submit a detailed landscaping plan and identify the materials for the curbing and there was concern that the landscaping might be vulnerable to the vehicles using the properties, so we had suggested locating bollards at critical locations so they can't go between the two lots and protect the landscaping. So the location of those need to be shown on the plan, but all of that need only be done, you know, before the building is occupied.

PAMELA WINTERS: Before they get their permit to occupy?

LESTER BARBER: Yeah.

PHILIP MCLAUGHLIN: We're not

looking to change what we proposed with you guys. We're looking to keep it the exact same. I'm a contractor. I'm going to keep it the same. It's not going to change.

I mean, like, Les says if he wants, I can give him a drawing with bollards, whatever he needs.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Can somebody explain, what was originally approved the sides were supposed to be?

HUGH RUSSELL: Here is a rendering that perhaps explains it more clearly.

I think it was in the interim stage actually, and we finally ended up with this gray material, this to be brick, and this metal here and that section was gonna be concrete block.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Did you know what it was going to be on the other two facades?

HUGH RUSSELL: This is sort of a

party wall and that was going to be block and the back wall was shown as block with a lot of windows in it.

STEVEN WINTER: Facing the Tobin?

HUGH RUSSELL: Facing the Tobin, yeah.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Who did that rendering?

HUGH RUSSELL: It's dated 2 September 2003. I keep files of projects. I'm particularly vigilant on this one because of the very poor track record that the owner has in following conditions that are imposed on him, so I keep it all.

I guess I want to have a discussion with Roger about this. I'm wondering -- I wonder, can you actually do the brick up against the windows in such a way that it looks convincing?

ROGER BOOTHE, DIRECTOR OF URBAN DESIGN: Yeah. I guess I would like to see a

detail of how the window was to be fit into that.

PHILIP MCLAUGHLIN: You set a brick with a corner, so it's a whole piece.

ROGER BOOTHE, DIRECTOR OF URBAN DESIGN: You don't have any drawings of that?

PHILIP MCLAUGHLIN: I can get some drawings.

ROGER BOOTHE, DIRECTOR OR URBAN DESIGN: I think it would be desirable to have some drawings that actually pin this down because it's kinda hard to just talk about it.

I think it's a good question as to whether the windows can be made to look graceful. I'm not familiar with this kind of system.

HUGH RUSSELL: My other question is -- I confess I never liked the block myself, and I'm wondering if the areas shown as block

might be best left as metal. It might have more integrity.

ROGER BOOTHE, DIRECTOR OF URBAN DESIGN: Yeah, I thought about that as well and I think that our primary concern is to have it face onto the parkway and where you see the entryway be as attractive as possible. I think the utilitarian backside could be metal.

HUGH RUSSELL: And I think even the area of block on the front if it were metal might be okay.

ROGER BOOTHE, DIRECTOR OF URBAN DESIGN: Yeah, I don't see a problem with that.

THOMAS ANNINGER: I think you'd have to take a look.

ROGER BOOTHE, DIRECTOR OF URBAN DESIGN: Again, I think it would be best if we see a drawing that really has all this articulated.

H. THEODORE COHEN: This brick here, I take it that's not Brickmaster or just something put on?

PHILIP MCLAUGHLIN: It's similar product to brick. It's an actual brick.

H. THEODORE COHEN: An actual brick that has been sliced?

PHILIP MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah. It's not synthetic, it's actual real brick.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And then you put in on with grouting between the brick?

PHILIP MCLAUGHLIN: You put it on a metal sheathing (*indicating.*)

You put it on a -- see right here, it sits on all these and then it gets -- (*indicating.*)

H. THEODORE COHEN: Is the color always so uniform?

HUGH RUSSELL: There are different bricks available, lots of different bricks.

STEVEN WINTER: This is the existing

building, then this is attached, this is attached and this is attached?

PHILIP MCLAUGHLIN: Yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: I would think you would want pressure-treated plywood.

PHILIP MCLAUGHLIN: This is just a sample, but it's called brick veneer.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Is there a building in the area which has this on it?

PHILIP MCLAUGHLIN: I could find out. I could talk to the company and find out what buildings may be in the area that would have that.

H. THEODORE COHEN: If you could find out, that would be good.

HUGH RUSSELL: I did a parking garage in Natick completed last year that used -- in brick, actually cast into the precast structure of the garage, and it's really quite convincing, I would say. It's less convincing there than this would be

because it was so regular, and there -- you can see here there are slightly different shadow lines that denotes something put up by hand and that's -- that's desirable.

STEVEN WINTER: Because, in fact, that grout was applied by hand?

HUGH RUSSELL: Correct.

STEVEN WINTER: I want, if I could, inventory where we're out of compliance here just so I have that picture.

So where exactly are we out of compliance?

LESTER BARBER: The building, as presently on the site, has none of the finished material and was not consistent with the plans we approved, and it was, indeed, not consistent structurally with the plans we approved, which were to be the steel frame building with block fully functional, normal block, and brick material for the side walls, and the building had actually been occupied

and was operating without an occupancy permit, so the City had to make sure that the building was vacated.

There had been a request that we approve these alternate plans but allow occupancy while finalization of those plans physically on the site were executed over the next several months.

So we were not able to certify any of that through Inspectional Services, so the building can't be occupied because of that.

STEVEN WINTER: Are there landscaping issues also?

LESTER BARBER: There's a landscaping plan, and before occupancy, the permit requires that we see the final landscaping plans with the details of plant materials and the like, identification of the curbing, which is identified on the plans we approved for the building permit and the

location of these bollards.

All of that has not been done yet, but that would not be atypical as you are building up the building for final occupancy. So there is time for all of that to happen.

PAMELA WINTERS: But the landscaping would not have to be actually put in the ground before the occupancy permit?

LESTER BARBER: No. Typically, it would be fully installed prior to occupancy.

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay.

LESTER BARBER: And certainly the curbing and all of that other -- all of those other aspects of the landscaping would be installed prior to operation.

PAMELA WINTERS: And would the landscaping be the same landscaping that was done --

LESTER BARBER: Well, that was a schematic plan. I think the proposal -- the request is that there would be submitted a

final landscaping plan with identified plant materials and the like.

PAMELA WINTERS: So, it sounds like then we're asking for more detailed plans from the proponent?

LESTER BARBER: Well, I think at this point we have to decide whether we would accept this alternate building for the building and allow them to proceed to complete that building.

In the interim, they would submit the final landscaping plans which the staff would approve and that would -- that plan would be installed prior to occupancy.

So those things can go in parallel, but at this point, we can't move forward because the building that's there now is not consistent with the plans, and the Board either has to insist that the original building form be constructed, or this alternate, or some other alternate be

approved by the Board.

PAMELA WINTERS: Yes?

STEVEN WINTER: Madam Chair, I have a question for the staff, if I could: Is the structure provided in the steel frame building, does it meet all the compliance guidelines that a structure for the building that would have held the block in the brick?

In other words, the building that was constructed, is that as solid a building, is that as a permanent a building as the building which was presented to the Planning Board?

ROGER BOOTHE, DIRECTOR OF URBAN DESIGN: That question is kinda hard to answer. I don't really now how to answer it.

It's not clearly not at all consistent with what we approved, and it has been built with this metal siding and, you know, again, the Board can insist they rip

down the siding and build it the way it was supposed to be built or being asked to look at the alternate, I'm not quite sure what you're asking.

STEVEN WINTER: Let me try it one more time because I'm not sure I'm delivering it the right way.

The building that was constructed is different from the building that was presented to the Planning Board?

ROGER BOOTHE DIRECTOR OF URBAN DESIGN: Right.

STEVEN WINTER: Is there a structural difference in the two buildings, in the beams and the posts, not in the --

ROGER BOOTHE DIRECTOR OF URBAN DESIGN: I'm not an engineer, so I can't tell you. I don't know.

STEVEN WINTER: You don't know.

ROGER BOOTHE DIRECTOR OF URBAN DESIGN: That will be their issues to certify

to the building department.

STEVEN WINTER: They would ultimately have to do that and it would have to be in compliance with the building code.

ROGER BOOTHE DIRECTOR OF URBAN DESIGN: It would've to be in compliance with the building code.

LESTER BARBER: To be frank, the structural nature of the building, I don't think was central to the Board's deliberations, we wanted a building on the site that was attractive, and particularly, we wanted the landscaping and the setback and the parkway character to be respected, and I suspect that over time, you know, we probably would prefer more substantial use all along the parkway than automobile-oriented activity, so perhaps even our objective isn't that someone invests a tremendous amount of money in a building here that might ideally change in 20 to 30 years or

whatever, and so I don't think the structural form of the building is particularly central to the Board's actions.

MICHAEL SAVAGE: What I would like to say is that this building, when completed, will be as close as possible to the original drawings that we presented you.

It will not be different in its look, it will be in sympathy with the water works building and the other thing is if the Board would have a problem with thin brick, we've also got estimates for regular brick, if that's what you want. We're looking to get this building completed. It has been a number of years and it needs to be up and finished.

PAMELA WINTERS: How long will that take you?

MICHAEL SAVAGE: We're looking right now to start work the 1st of April. We've got estimates for thick brick, we got

estimates for regular brick, we have one for concrete block, but we're not going in that direction. We're going to find something that meets your approval and we can get going on it.

PAMELA WINTERS: And how long do you expect it will take before it's completed?

PHILIP MCLAUGHLIN: We can get started now in March, we'd probably be done by Memorial Day, I think, approximately.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I'm sorry. You've now confused me. We have this letter that says that the ground was not suitable for structural bearing, and you couldn't build it as designed, but now you've just said that you could use regular brick or you could use stone, SO I don't quite understand how that comports with this letter.

HUGH RUSSELL: Let me try to answer that.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Please.

HUGH RUSSELL: The building as proposed had thick walls, and so they're saying by having thin brick, or even regular brick, it will weigh a great deal less so they can -- they can do either one, but they can't use the thick -- the heavier wall, they don't have the foundation that can support that anymore.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Would the Board have cared back in 2003 what the type of construction was if the facade appearance was what was proposed to the Board?

HUGH RUSSELL: I don't think so because I don't think that was -- it wasn't part of the decision, it wasn't part of the drawings, except it was part of the rationale for the block and the fact that's how we were going to build it using these block walls all around and it switched to --

H. THEODORE COHEN: We didn't care in terms of final appearance?

HUGH RUSSELL: We can get the final appearance with the window sizes and the -- putting the brick in places where brick is shown. That's what we were trying to achieve. And the landscaping.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right.

PAMELA WINTERS: Is the question before us tonight whether or not to let them occupy the building as --

BETH RUBENSTEIN: Whether to alter.

STEVEN WINTER: Whether this alteration is acceptable.

ROGER BOOTHE DIRECTOR OF URBAN DESIGN: Whether it's acceptable.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Do you have an opinion, Roger?

ROGER BOOTHE, DIRECTOR OF URBAN DESIGN: Clearly, it's a very unfortunate circumstance, and we're trying to make the best of it here, and I believe that what they're showing with the thin brick and what

the changes that Hugh suggested allowing for some metal (*inaudible*) where there had been concrete block before and seeing the exact window details, and so forth, I think it's the best we can do at this point and clearly getting all this done before there's any occupancy, so there can be no further slippage from what was approved.

I don't feel happy about it, but I don't think that a passerby would necessarily notice unless they stopped and you can often see this is kinda of a cheaper look and feel to the building, but I think that, in general, it can be made to look decent and clean and it's very important that it be well put together.

THOMAS ANNINGER: And the landscaping?

ROGER BOOTHE DIRECTOR OF URBAN DESIGN: The landscaping is very, very important. That's why we have the overlay

district.

I would also add they're consistently parking a tow truck out on the DCR property, and I'm going to call the DCR on it. They shouldn't be doing that. And we don't want to see this landscaping get built and have vehicles parked willy nilly on the landscaping either. So I'm very concerned about that. It's something that needs to be respected.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Does the landscaping have greenery shrubs? What does it have?

ROGER BOOTHE, DIRECTOR OF URBAN DESIGN: Yes, it does. Hugh has the plan.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Do you --

LESTER BARBER: We don't have the final plan.

ROGER BOOTHE, DIRECTOR OF URBAN DESIGN: Follow that schematic and...

THOMAS ANNINGER: One thing I'm

worried about is --

HUGH RUSSELL: Here it is.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Typically -- you know, particularly during the early stages, this is going to require irrigation of some sort and maintenance. If these all die, we will have gained nothing in the long-run.

PHILIP MCLAUGHLIN: We can put a sprinkler system in, no problem, on those to make sure that --

THOMAS ANNINGER: What kind of a system?

PHILIP MCLAUGHLIN: A sprinkler.

ROGER BOOTHE, DIRECTOR OF URBAN DESIGN: Irrigation will be essential, otherwise it won't last. And it's very important to have this done so that vehicles aren't just destroying it right away.

THOMAS ANNINGER: I think that ought to be a condition.

PHILIP MCLAUGHLIN: I can get you a

detailed plan of landscape, the plants' location, sprinkler system and write it all up and have it all presented.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Roger, can we go back to your comments? If this is done well and the window treatment works with the brick, do you still think we end up with a lesser building than what had been originally proposed?

ROGER BOOTHE, DIRECTOR OF URBAN DESIGN: I think that it's probably gonna be somewhat a less solid feeling looking, if you really pause and thought about it. I don't think for someone driving by you would notice it. Somebody walking by -- an architect walking by would probably notice it.

But at this point, I don't know if you will agree, it's really critical that it be done crisply and neatly and done with detail and then, I think, it's not so bad. What we had approved before could've been

poorly construction and had similar issues, so we're not really comparing something that exists; we're comparing what was in our mind at that time, and so, I think following through with really careful construction is essential.

STEVEN WINTER: Madam Chair, I would ask that the staff that when we deal with this issue that everything -- we need to have everything written down.

There needs to be no ambiguity because this proponent clearly doesn't understand how to respect the guidelines that we have here.

ROGER BOOTHE, DIRECTOR OF URBAN DESIGN: It was written down before and they built something flagrantly in violation. That's why they're shut down.

LESTER BARBER: There is, as another condition, that the Mobil station meet the landscaping requirements of a

previously-approved Special Permit before occupancy of this building. And I'm forgetting the details of that plan at the moment, but, you know, those all in the permit and our requirements of the issuance of the occupancy permit for this thing.

PAMELA WINTERS: All right.

BETH RUBENSTEIN: Do you want to take a vote?

PAMELA WINTERS: So we will take a vote.

LESTER BARBER: Approved the revised building design.

PAMELA WINTERS: With all the conditions that were mentioned?

LESTER BARBER: All the previously-approved conditions.

HUGH RUSSELL: The change is really just to allow them to substitute the metal siding for concrete block on the front and rear of the building, that's really the

change.

STEVEN WINTER: Is there a motion?

HUGH RUSSELL: That's what you need to approve. The rest we're saying has to be the same.

LESTER BARBER: And the other conditions which continue to apply.

STEVEN WINTER: I second that motion.

PAMELA WINTERS: I second that motion.

All approved.

*(Unanimous vote.)*

PAMELA WINTERS: Thank you very much.

We now have some BZA cases.

Telecom Special Permit for 148 Huron Avenue and Special Permit for 243 Walden Street.

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEAL CASE -  
TELECOMMUNICATIONS SPECIAL PERMIT FOR 243  
WALDEN STREET:**

DANIEL KLASNICK: Good evening.  
If it pleases the Board, my name is Daniel Klasnick. I'm the attorney representing Verizon Wireless on the 148 Huron Avenue project. I'm not certain of the Board's familiarity. I did bring some handouts, so I can pass those out and discuss it.

I think we had initially introduced this project to Ms. Paden, and we have been corresponding by email, I think, since the end of last year, and then in January we actually sat down with Mr. Barber, and I believe Mr. Boothe, and reviewed the project further.

And so at this particular juncture, Ms. Paden suggested that it would probably be appropriate to come before this Board and obtain some guidance on the

proposed design.

As already been stated, the proposed install would be at 148 Huron Avenue and I think what Verizon Wireless has come up with is a completely stealth facility.

In the packet I handed out, the first page and the first photograph is actually it's just sort of a rear shot of the existing conditions.

The property is zoned Resident C1, but you can see there's an existing business on site.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Is this the old hardware store?

DANIEL KLASNICK: I'm not familiar historically with --

GEORGE EVSIOUK: Antique shop.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Antique shop.

DANIEL KLASNICK: In the packet as well, I've included the 11-by-17 copies of the drawings. They're not full-detailed

drawings, they're conceptual drawings. And then we've also included seven separate photo simulations. And just for background information we included some coverage maps.

What Verizon Wireless is proposing to do is to exterior mount four panel antennas to the existing penthouse that would be painted match, and then towards the front of the building, Verizon Wireless is proposing to construct a false penthouse that would be almost identical in size, shape, and height to the existing penthouse, and then they would mount an additional eight antennas inside of that false penthouse.

There's also a proposal to install an equipment shelter that would be in proximity to the existing antique business and the idea would be to match the design of that structure. It would be sort've of an L-shaped structure, as you can see in the drawings.

Electronic equipment would be housed in like a 10-by-20 portion of the L-shape and then there would be a separate generator room that would be 9-by-12. The utilities would be from existing service underground. And then there would be a cable tray that would run up the outside of the building over the top of the rooftop and connect to the antennas.

I don't know if you would want me to go through the photo sims or views on Huron Avenue and Concord Avenue?

STEVEN WINTER: Yes, please do.

THOMAS ANNINGER: This is the old hardware store. I forget the name. It was there for 50 years at least.

DANIEL KLASNICK: In the photo sim packet there's a photo location map with different perspectives.

So, the first photo simulation was taken directly from the front of the building

and as is represented in that first photo stimulation the facility actually won't even be visible from -- if you are standing directly in front of building, so the second one was taken a from a slightly different perspective on Huron Avenue. And so 2A is existing conditions; and 2B is proposed conditions.

So you can see just peeking up above the existing roof line is what we're proposing to install as the false shelter that will house the eight antennas that will be internally mounted so they will be entirely not visible.

Then there's another perspective from Huron Avenue at 3A. So we see 3A, existing conditions again, and then 3B is the proposed conditions, which shows the false equipment building.

4A is from Concord Avenue, sort've of a rear shot, and there's the Dental Group

of Cambridge building and behind that, you see that's the existing penthouse that's on top of the building, and then if you go to 4B, you see the building, the penthouse portion and what Verizon Wireless is proposing to do is to paint it and then it would be mounting the four additional antennas externally painted to match to that penthouse.

THOMAS ANNINGER: That's where I lost you. You are comparing 4A and 4B?

DANIEL KLASNICK: Yes. 4A is existing conditions sort of that rusty rooftop penthouse.

THOMAS ANNINGER: That was there before, that's there now?

DANIEL KLASNICK: That's the existing conditions. And what Verizon Wireless is proposing to do in 4B is to really clean that up a bit, and you can see those four dashes, those would be the four

externally mounted antennas.

And then 5A, once again, existing conditions from Concord Avenue; 5B would be the new penthouse, which, as I had said, is basically the same size and identical height of the existing penthouse. So we're trying to give symmetry to the building and match the two penthouses.

On 6A shows the existing conditions you can see towards the rear of the building, again, the existing penthouse on the sort of rusty structure back there.

And then 6B shows -- this is probably the best perspective to see both the penthouses side by side. You will see, once again, what Verizon Wireless has tried to do, based upon comments that we had from Mr. Barber, is try and create some symmetry to those -- between those two penthouses.

And then, once again, just 7A is another view of the existing penthouse and

then both the existing penthouse painted and the false penthouse installed towards the front of the building.

H. THEODORE COHEN: On the new false penthouse, the antennas are on the inside?

DANIEL KLASNICK: Yes. That's made of a fiberglass RF friendly material so it can made to appear --

THOMAS ANNINGER: What would be the feel of the material of the new penthouse, that's just aluminum sheathing?

DANIEL KLASNICK: Well, it's a fiberglass that would be painted to match. What's being proposed is to clean up the rear penthouse, make it the same color, which I guess it was originally, and then, you know, match that with the front of the penthouse.

THOMAS ANNINGER: And the color is some sort've a gun-mental gray?

DANIEL KLASNICK: Yeah, that seems

to be consistent with what was there if you look at it.

HUGH RUSSELL: What was there wasn't very attractive.

My recommendation would be actually to have a nicer color.

THOMAS ANNINGER: That's the one question.

HUGH RUSSELL: Whether it be --

THOMAS ANNINGER: Brick maybe.

HUGH RUSSELL: There two colors of brick on the building, there's a yellow brick and red brick and there's some stone trim. I would pick one of those three colors rather than the --

THOMAS ANNINGER: That makes sense to me.

LESTER BARBER: What Roger and I were looking at were several alternatives most of which were a series of false chimneys, a lot of them sort of sprinkled

all over the roof, and we thought consolidation into a single structure was a better solution than that -- those other alternatives.

DANIEL KLASNICK: And we also substantially shrunk down the size of the penthouse to make it, I think, compatible to what's already there in the back of the building.

THOMAS ANNINGER: I think the solution is a thoughtful one, but I agree with Hugh, that I think the color could integrate better with what's already there.

It's another new color that looks like a mechanical rooftop, and if you want do disguise it a little bit by giving it one of the -- possibly, the red, the yellow, or that darker color that seems to be at the cornice line there, that's another possibility.

STEVEN WINTER: Do you understand what Hugh's --

ROGER BOOTHE, DIRECTOR OF URBAN

DESIGN: Yes, I think we understand that.

STEVEN WINTER: Could we ask Roger to make those recommendations?

ROGER BOOTHE DIRECTOR OF URBAN

DESIGN: We could follow up on that. I understand what you're saying. That gray is a cold color and all the other colors are warmer tones.

PAMELA WINTERS: It's a very contemporary look. The gray is -- metallic is very contemporary looking. It doesn't quite go with the rest of the building.

ROGER BOOTHE, DIRECTOR OF URBAN

DESIGN: I think that's a great comment.

HUGH RUSSELL: It's a -- it looks like there's a smooth band of limestone that's not very dirty.

ROGER BOOTHE, DIRECTOR OF URBAN

DESIGN: That what I was thinking made more sense.

HUGH RUSSELL: So it's neutral. It's warmish, neutral, as opposed to cold. It's right under the cornice. You see there's a line of stone there, that's probably that color of the cornice that works with the yellow and works with the mortar of the brick.

THOMAS ANNINGER: It may be something to use again sometime. It's an interesting idea to punch them in and put them behind some materials so they don't have that.

ROGER BOOTHE, DIRECTOR OF URBAN DESIGN: As Les was saying with some of the earlier ones, and I certainly did put a lot of work into all the options. Some of them were kinda too busy. That calms it down.

THOMAS ANNINGER: This is pretty good. It's a nice building and it does have lot a lot of history to it.

ROGER BOOTHE, DIRECTOR OF URBAN

DESIGN: The Dawson.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Dawson Hardware.

GEORGE EVSIOUK: He lives Harvard,  
Mass.

THOMAS ANNINGER: He's not a man  
anymore.

STEVEN WINTER: So if our action is  
make to a recollection to the Zoning Board of  
Appeals, what do we say?

HUGH RUSSELL: We feel this is a  
good solution to provide these antennas in  
this type of enclosure and we would recommend  
that they look favorably upon this  
installation, and that they -- that the color  
be matched to the original stone color that's  
visible on the building.

DANIEL KLASNICK: Well, thank you  
very much. I appreciate it.

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS CASE -  
TELECOMMUNICATIONS SPECIAL PERMIT FOR 148  
HURON AVENUE:**

BRIAN GROSSMAN, ESQ: Good evening Brian Grossman with Prince Lobel Glovsky & Tye representing Metro PCS, a Massachusetts LLC; Taryn Patrick, the set acquisition consultant for Metro PCS is also present.

Yes, the Board is correct. You have seen this one once before. It has had a little bit of a history before the BZA and has been continued to next Thursday, to the 12th, and there's a small design change on this that Metro wanted to make sure to go ahead and get the Planning Board's feedback because we know the policy of the BZA.

And there's a little bit of a twist to where we are with the BZA, and so we're going to be asking for input on something else as it relates to this.

In terms of what you have before you

in terms of the design change, very minor, what happened is, and based on some of the feedback, none of the locations of the equipment changed. So the chimneys that you saw before are exactly where they were. The equipment is still located in the basement.

The difference is the original chimney setup was one chimney was 12 feet high and that was that one was on the sloped part (*indicating*) of the roof, and the other one that was on the still sloped but a little flatter part was 10 feet 6 inches.

And based on some of the feedback from the BZA, even the Planning Board had given, what I consider, a pretty positive recommendation, the design of the few chimneys changed every so slightly to try and reduce them as best we can.

And so the chimney that had been 12 feet is now 11 feet tall, the chimney that

was 10 feet 6 inches is now 9 feet 6 inches off the roof line.

And that is the change that we have in terms of the Masi (*phonetic*) Hardware design and so we would ask, obviously, that the Planning Board give the same recommendation it had in the previous go-around.

But one thing we will need in the file for both the Masi Hardware site and the site that hasn't been filed yet with the BZA -- correct -- has to do with an alternate that came up during the BZA hearing process, and it was something they asked us to investigate and something we were able to pretty quickly turnaround. It hasn't been filed yet, but one of the things I think will be very important is this alternate candidate.

It's something that I think this Board and both the BZA may be familiar with,

that in about 2004, both Sprint and Omni Point had applications for this building and those applications ultimately, I think, were acted on unfavorably by the BZA; however, given the developments over time, and in conjunction with the Masi Hardware hearings, they've asked Metro PCS to go back and look at whether or not this building would be appropriate given that it's significantly taller and may present some better design options, especially in light of the fact that you don't have, at this point, two carriers competing for space and mucking up each other designs. You have one carrier working on its own that really kinda has the buildings as a blank slate.

And so, Taryn, I think we already handed out the sims?

THOMAS ANNINGER: This would be instead of Masi's?

BRIAN GROSSMAN, ESQ: Yes, that's

correct. This is an alternate candidate.

The two sites wouldn't be constructed together, one would replace the other, which is generally an unusual circumstance. Usually I'm on the opposite position of saying, no, no, these would work together, not separately. Together, wouldn't replace each other.

So on that design, switching gears a little bit, it's six-panel antennas, the vast majority of what takes place takes place, as you can see from the photographic stimulations, on that penthouse, and there are four antennas that would be facade-mounted to the penthouse and they face off in the four different directions.

There would be one vertical element to the cable tray, you see there (*indicating*), that would lead to the equipment platform.

Now, the top of the equipment is

only 9 feet 10 inches off the roof line. Part of that is also obscured by a parapet that sticks up slightly.

For the elements that would be visible from the equipment platform, it's the same equipment that you've been accustomed in the Metro PCS applications. You've seen the same equipment as with Masi Hardware.

Two-radio communication equipment cabinets, two battery cabinets, there's no generator, one power and telephone cabinet located on the steel platform.

Taryn, do you have the -- do you have the roof plan?

TARYN PATRICK: The bird's-eye view?

BRIAN GROSSMAN, ESQ: Yeah. Good enough.

The radio communications equipment is situated so it's basically blocked on three sides by two penthouses and some mechanical equipment.

The third side, it's the nearest edge of the building, although it has a lot of carry to the nearest property line, it's the one if you were looking straight on the building, you would look up and see the equipment cabinet, and so as I think you can see in the photographic stimulations from that angle, there's been a screen wall proposed to match the facade of the building to screen off Metro PCS's equipment, and there are -- I mentioned only four of the antennas. There are two -- I will ask you to flip back -- additional facade-mounted antennas that are on stairwell penthouses towards of the edge of the building and that gives Metro PCS the array of coverage that it requires. And in terms of the antennas connected by coaxial cable, just like the other installations you are familiar with, except for that one vertical element cable tray that runs from that penthouse down to

the equipment cabinets for that middle penthouse, that will be painted and textured to match the facade. Everything else in terms of cable tray runs along the roof line and would be obscured by the parapet and still be covered by a cable tray, but wouldn't be visible from the ground.

That's the description of that one. And we've requested the Board's feedback because I think it's going to be very important both how this Board feels and how the BZA feels with regard to what the Board ultimately does with regard to the Masi Hardware site.

PAMELA WINTERS: Tom?

THOMAS ANNINGER: We, at one time, saw a proposal on this building and didn't like it.

BRIAN GROSSMAN, ESQ: That's correct. I was not involved in it, but I have seen the decision, so, yeah.

THOMAS ANNINGER: This is pretty close to Masi's; this is just a block or two away.

BRIAN GROSSMAN, ESQ: Yes, but it's in the residential zoning district. Ordinarily we'd be doing the reverse. We might be on a residential building pointing out it's predominantly not residential and the questions would be coming at us of, well, what's in the commercial districts or nonresidential districts nearby? And this one, given the design and given kinda the way things have developed over the past few years, people may have rethought whether or not this was, perhaps, maybe the more appropriate location, and so they've asked us to take a look at it. We've leased it.

TARYN PATRICK: We did lease it. We actually terminated the lease agreement and now we're going back to renew that lease agreement we because thought we weren't going

to be able to zone it.

BRIAN GROSSMAN, ESQ: We're in the process of refinalizing a lease agreement for the building and have been able to make it available to us and bring it toward as an alternate design.

As I said, the two are competing alternates to each other and so, as long as the Board -- the BZA approves one, Metro PCS gets what it needs. If neither one is acceptable, then Metro PCS is in a tough spot.

H. THEODORE COHEN: From my point of view, the Masi Hardware one is still elegant and simple, and that seems so clever that, you know, I don't really object to the other one. It seems like it's glitchier or --

BRIAN GROSSMAN, ESQ: Ideally I think from our perspective what we would like to see is -- certainly comments like that are helpful, a recommendation of one over the

other, but even if the Board were to recommend "We think Masi Hardware is the better site from an aesthetic point of view" and all the other considerations we need to take into account. Some feedback specific to this kind of proposal on this site would be helpful because this may be the one that ends up having to go back before the Board as well. So having the Planning Board's comments specifically, Okay, we like Masi better, or We like this one better, but -- and we wouldn't change anything, or Here is what we would change on this one if we were to go forward, would be appreciated.

THOMAS ANNINGER: My memory is what happened last time was that it was put on the sides of the building, on the narrow edges, and they were very prominent. And I think you could really see them and -- even though, I think, they were below the cornice line, so they didn't jut up into the sky, they

nevertheless did not integrate well, and I think that's what I remember as being objectionable and you seem to have resolved that. Does that ring a bell to you?

HUGH RUSSELL: No bell is ringing, or if it is, I can barely hear it.

ROGER BOOTHE, DIRECTOR OF URBAN DESIGN: I think that rings a bell for me as a staff member.

THOMAS ANNINGER: I don't know. I think they're both pretty good proposals myself, and I think you can pick between them as far as I'm concerned. I agree the Masi's one is kinda elegant, but...

PAMELA WINTERS: Roger, do you have --

ROGER BOOTHE, DIRECTOR OF URBAN DESIGN: I do agree with Tom. I have a preference for Masi's but I guess --

PAMELA WINTERS: They're both acceptable.

ROGER BOOTHE, DIRECTOR OF URBAN

DESIGN: Yes.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Does this mean --

HUGH RUSSELL: I have a preference for the other one.

PAMELA WINTERS: Do you?

HUGH RUSSELL: That's because if I lived in one of those apartments that overlooks Masi's roof, I would rather not see too many chimneys. But I agree that as a strategy, it's really a very clever strategy. If you had to do it, it's a very good strategy.

I just think I would rather -- in terms of the impact on the residential neighbors, I think it's less impact on the second one.

THOMAS ANNINGER: You will concede it's pretty minor, would you say? It's just a couple very thin chimneys at maybe how many feet? 100 feet?

TARYN PATRICK: No, no. The building is only 30-something feet.

BRIAN GROSSMAN, ESQ: Just from this building to Masi Hardware.

THOMAS ANNINGER: That's right. It's not just this building, it's any building.

HUGH RUSSELL: It's this building right next to it.

THOMAS ANNINGER: The building right next to it. I see what you're saying. I see what you're saying.

HUGH RUSSELL: The intervening house, but...

THOMAS ANNINGER: Let me take a look. Why did they fuss over the 9 feet versus 10 feet or 11 feet versus 12 feet? Where did that come from?

TARYN PATRICK: They weren't clear. They just asked if we could minimize the height that we're proposing and --

THOMAS ANNINGER: I see.

TARYN PATRICK: -- in order for us to achieve it, we have to move the antennas and they said we have to use -- they can only reduce the height by a foot.

STEVEN WINTER: Clearly, we could say both of the designs have appeal and there's some Board members that feel that Walden Square Road --

PAMELA WINTERS: It sounds as though they're both acceptable.

ROGER BOOTHE, DIRECTOR OF URBAN DESIGN: I think I'm hearing both -- no one is objecting strongly to one.

PAMELA WINTERS: They're both acceptable.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Is that good enough?

BRIAN GROSSMAN, ESQ: That's good enough.

PAMELA WINTERS: Do any other Board

members have any comments on some of the other ZBA cases?

TARYN PATRICK: Sorry, I am catching half of what he's saying. I had spoken with Liza regarding two other sites for T Mobil that I wanted to discuss with the Board this evening. They have not been applied to the BZA yet I would be more than willing to come on the 16th.

PAMELA WINTERS: Well, it's not on the agenda, I think it's getting pretty late.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Do you have pictures?

TARYN PATRICK: Yes.

PAMELA WINTERS: If you could come back that would be great because it is getting late. It has been a long night.

Any other BZA cases that have concern to people?

LESTER BARBER: Well, I just note --

HUGH RUSSELL: Excuse me, given that

we're asking her to come back, maybe we could put her on the agenda at a time certain and that not require her to wait for four hours.

STEVEN WINTER: I think that's a good idea.

TARYN PATRICK: I'll make sure to get the specifics to Liza. So, thank you.

LESTER BARBER: The second to the last case, 9761, this is the St. John's property and the Board has issued a Special Permit through this conversion of various church buildings to housing and previously there had been a variance issued for filling in a notch on a building, one of the buildings, you may recall, it had a cut-out in it and this was to square it off, and then variances to put some decks on the roof of the buildings. They willy nilly went ahead and modified that little notch by putting a bay window in it, which increased floor area, and therefore, violated the variance they

had, so they're requiring an additional variance for that, and I think they're modifying the decks in ways that I'm not sure of because there wasn't an extensive narrative.

They'll have come back to you for approval of variations of the plans that you approved, and I don't know whether you wanted to comment to the BZA or not or just leave it to them to grant that and then you can review the plans subsequently.

H. THEODORE COHEN: This one where a lot of the neighbors showed up --

LESTER BARBER: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: -- because how close --

LESTER BARBER: They irritated the neighbors in this case as we've experienced and other circumstances, and I have no idea whether they've resolved the conflicts with the neighbors or not.

The BZA may, indeed, sort all of that out before they have to come back to you, but I don't think any of these are significantly different from what you approved. I think they could be approved by you as a design change to the plans, the more significant requirement is just secure the variances that are necessary, so...

STEVEN WINTER: I'm not sure what our actionable item would be.

LESTER BARBER: It's only if you want to -- which might be a little difficult since we haven't reviewed the plans in detail whether you want to comment to the BZA at all or just leave it to the BZA make their determination.

PAMELA WINTERS: And it will come before us.

LESTER BARBER: You can't take any action -- well, I mean, you could, you could look at it and say it's fine and we recommend

the variances or you can allow the BZA to make their determination and then approve your plan alteration.

HUGH RUSSELL: I would say our best move is to make no comment.

PAMELA WINTERS: So now this meeting is adjourned.

*(Whereupon, the planning board meeting was adjourned at 11:10 p.m.)*

**CERTIFICATE**

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS  
NORFOLK, ss.

I, Jill Kourafas, a Certified  
Shorthand Reporter, the undersigned Notary  
Public, certify that:

I am not related to any of the  
parties in this matter by blood or marriage  
and that I am in no way interested in the  
outcome of these matters.

I further certify that the  
proceedings hereinbefore set forth is a true  
and accurate transcription of my stenographic  
notes to the best of my knowledge, skill and  
ability.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto  
set my hand this 9th day of March 2009.

---

Jill Kourafas  
Notary Public  
Certified Shorthand Reporter  
License No. 149308  
My Commission Expires  
February 26, 2010

**THE FOREGOING CERTIFICATION OF THIS  
TRANSCRIPT DOES NOT APPLY TO ANY  
REPRODUCTION OF THE SAME IN ANY RESPECT  
UNLESS UNDER THE DIRECT CONTROL AND/OR  
DIRECTION OF THE CERTIFYING REPORTER.**