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H. THEODORE COHEN: All right, good evening everyone welcome to the March 31st meeting of the Planning Board. We have two hearings scheduled for this evening, but first we'll start with an update from Acting Assistant City Manager.

IRAM FAROOQ: Good evening. Thank you, Ted. Not a lot of updates today. Just that after today's meeting when we have Webster Avenue and the Alexandria parking amendment on public hearings in addition to the BZA cases, next items -- next week we will be coming back to you with Volpe Zoning language and more thoughts on some of the questions that you had asked, particularly focusing on the open space and the housing component.
Before that, though, the day before we have a round table on Volpe with the City Council. So that is at 5:30 on April 6th.

Tomorrow we have a hearing at the Ordinance Committee on the Normandy Twining Zoning which you have, which you have also heard. And I think other interesting things coming up in April will be on the -- on April 15th. At the Ordinance Committee there will be a public hearing on the C2 Planning, and I think the -- the focus is really the planning piece as opposed to specific zoning.

And then on April 22nd, the Housing Committee will take up the incentive discussion, incentive zoning discussion, for the second time. So that's at 5:30 in the Sullivan Chamber on April 22nd.

That's really it for announcements except if you voted for participatory
budgeting last week, the votes results party is on Tuesday, so people should go.

Thank you so much.

JOHN HAWKINSON: During the Planning Board meeting?

IRAM FAROOQ: No, it's right before the Planning Board meeting. It starts at 6:30.

STEVEN COHEN: Iram, on the round table next week, Volpe is that a round table with Planning Board members? I mean -- are there any one of those items where you think it's especially advantageous or urgent or recommended that we attend?

IRAM FAROOQ: I think the round table would be a good meeting to go to just because there is so much overlap in the work and also because your meetings are on consecutive days and we'll be talking about
some of the same things. Although the focus at the Council has not really been part of the Volpe discussions the way that the Planning Board has over the last several months, so they're going to -- we'll be starting at the very beginning with them and they'll be hearing from the DOT and the GSA. So if people want a refresher on all of those pieces, it would be definitely good to go. I think the Council, on topics like that, sometimes really values hearing from the Planning Board. There aren't those many opportunities to come together, so I would say the round table's probably a good one to attend.

Yes, Hugh.

HUGH RUSSELL: My recollection is we did not make a recommendation on the planning; is that fair?
H. THEODORE COHEN: I think that's correct, I don't think we included our hearings.

HUGH RUSSELL: When are we going to put that on the agenda?

IRAM FAROOQ: We tentatively are thinking about April 28th for the Normandy Twining second hearing at Planning Board, but we are awaiting information from the proponent before actually firming that up, because we want to make sure that there's an opportunity once we get information from them for us to be able to get staff comments in a timely manner to the Board and to the community ahead of scheduling a hearing.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Since you said nothing about April 14th is my assumption correct that Planning Board is not having a meeting that evening?
IRAM FAROOQ: We don't have anything scheduled on the agenda for April 14th, so it could very-- and Jeff is on vacation, so it's very unlikely that we'll be able to get a lot of work done.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Excellent.

I would urge all the members here who can attend the round table to do so.

STEVEN COHEN: What time is it?

IRAM FAROOQ: 5:30.

H. THEODORE COHEN: 5:30 in the Sullivan Chamber.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: That changed?

H. THEODORE COHEN: That changed, yes. You should be receiving e-mails from the City Clerk about it.

Liza, are there any transcripts?

LIZA PADEN: Two transcripts; one for February 17th and one for February 24th
which both have been certified.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Anyone want to make a motion to accept them?

HUGH RUSSELL: So moved.

STEVEN COHEN: Second.

H. THEODORE COHEN: All those in favor?

(Show of hands.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Now, the two ZBA cases that we requested information about, perhaps we can start with 27 Corporal Burns Road.

LIZA PADEN: So 27 Corporal Burns Road is a Special Permit to construct a parking space in the front yard setback. I sent out the plans to people. I have a copy here if anybody wants to see them.

HUGH RUSSELL: Sure.

I guess my question is is front yard
parking common on Corporal Burns Road or not?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes, I went and took a look today, and on one side of the street everyone has a driveway, the other side of the street maybe 50 percent. And it's a very small street. It's only one block long.

LIZA PADEN: Right.

H. THEODORE COHEN: The concern with this one is that it will be a very tight spot and it will be very close to the abutter.

LIZA PADEN: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: But it seems appropriate enough for that street, but I think it's one that we can leave up to the BZA to decide especially if they get comments from other people on the street how they feel about it.

STEVEN COHEN: Yes, I never want to
go on record actually endorsing front yard parking. There may be exceptions and I leave it to the ZBA.

H. THEODORE RUSSELL: Yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: I guess the other thing about this one is that they have enough room to pull a car back beyond the face of the house.

H. THEODORE COHEN: It gets very narrow, they really don't. I think it's as far back as they can go is where the house jogs.

HUGH RUSSELL: It shows a chimney to be removed?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: Even so. Okay?

H. THEODORE COHEN: It's a very tight spot. It will be a very tight spot and very close to the abutting house.
Liza Paden: So leave it to the Board of Zoning Appeal?

H. Theodore Cohen: I think we can do that.

Hugh Russell: Yes.

Liza Paden: Okay.

The other case that people were interested in is the sign variance for the Marriott Hotel which is on Memorial Drive. And the way the sign is currently is they have a frame on the rooftop, the very top of the mechanical, which is being replaced with a sign -- I'm passing around a photograph, as being replaced with a sign that's mounted on the facade of the building.

So, the non-conformity is of course the height of the hotel sign, but in a hotel that is an allowed location for a sign. The Zoning allows each individual hotel sign at
this location to be 100 square feet. And one of the signs they're proposing exceeds 100 square feet. And together, the two signs together cannot exceed 200 square feet, so they're requesting a sign facing each direction on Memorial Drive. So the two signs together I believe are 220 square feet.

H. THEODORE COHEN: So they are allowed two signs; is that correct?

LIZA PADEN: Yes. Right, yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And these are both going to be on the brick facade?

LIZA PADEN: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And the one that's currently on the roof will be --

LIZA PADEN: Removed.

H. THEODORE COHEN: -- removed?

And so the non-conformity is one sign it is too large and the two together are too
large?

LIZA PADEN: Correct.

HUGH RUSSELL: By about ten percent.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes.

Well, I think certainly the one on Memorial Drive is a big improvement over the one on the roof. I guess I question their need for the one on the side street since there is a pylon sign right on the ground, but I guess if you were going heading towards Boston on Memorial Drive--

HUGH RUSSELL: Then you're coming off the pike or something.

H. THEODORE COHEN: You would see it. You won't see the one that is actually on Memorial Drive. And so if they're entitled to have it, they're entitled to have it, it's just a question of whether it's too large or not.
HUGH RUSSELL: That we could probably leave to the Zoning Board.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes.

LIZA PADEN: Okay.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: You're welcome.

Any other comments?

(No Response.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: And they've also appeared to have been painting all the white black which actually makes the building look better. They changed it from the photos, so if you -- where you see white sort of concrete stripes, they're now a matte black, whether they're finished or not, because there's scaffolding up there.

HUGH RUSSELL: Didn't we permit a substantial addition to this building?

LIZA PADEN: So, the Planning Board
granted a Special Permit for a residential addition which was going to be on the river side of the building, and it was never used. So that permit expired.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay.

And seven o'clock having arrived and passed, we have a public hearing on 305 Webster Avenue. Planning Board No. 295, Special Permit to convert an existing industrial building to mixed use for 35 multi-family dwelling units and retail or office space on the ground floor. The project requires project review Special Permit and also a Special Permit under adaptive reuse to permit the dimensions of the existing building to be retained.

If you're ready to start.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Is it appropriate to keep the podium here?
H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes, we're doing a new procedure.

We're still determining how well this works. So if it becomes really awkward, please let us know --

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: We'll make do.

H. THEODORE COHEN: -- and we can move things around.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Good evening, Mr. Chair, Members of the Board.

For the record, attorney Sean Hope, Hope Legal Offices in Cambridge. I'm here tonight on behalf of the applicant, M & H Realty Trust. I'm representing the trustee Jim Glassman. He's a third generation owner of the property at 305 Webster Ave, the subject of the Special Permit application.

We also have project architect Mr. Jai Singh Khalsa who is going to walk you through
the design.

We have the LSP for the site, Mr. Joe Higgins. Mr. Higgins has been working with the property owner for several years, has attended the public meetings with the neighborhood, and is here to answer any questions about any soil or remediation efforts.

And we also have a representative from Blair Hines Associates. And I'm not going to try to say the name, but you could have it for the record if you have any questions about the landscaping.

This is an application, as the Chair said, requesting Special Permit relief to convert the former Columbia Auto Parts retail store into a vibrant mixed use residential development containing 35 residential apartments with 35 parking spaces below grade.
and ground floor retail.

Jai, could you go to the next slide?

The site highlighted in red is approximately 18,000 square feet and is located in the Business A Zoning District. This Business A Zoning District allows for a range of uses, including commercial retail and residential which is being proposed today.

There are two elements of relief: One is a project review Special Permit required because the project is over 20,000 square feet which triggers that review, as well as an adaptive reuse of a Special Permit to convert the existing building. This is critical because the adaptive reuse provisions allow us to keep the existing building footprint as a setback.

We are proposing a conforming addition
at the second and third story. Those meet all the requirements of the base zoning district. In this area the existing building footprints apply above and below grade. There is a full height basement for the majority of the property, and so there is -- I've been down there, I think there's approximately eight to nine feet sufficient to have cars and vehicles down there.

There is going to be some excavation required for the underground parking, but there is that space that has been used as a current retail use as the former Columbia Auto Parts.

So this site -- and, Jai, go to the next slide.

This site is unique. It's a triangular shaped lot and it's unique to its shape -- can you actually go one more to have the
aerial view?

Okay. This site is unique in relation to the shape of the lot, but also in relation to the street. The northern part of the corridor of Webster Ave. has had a history of commercial, industrial uses. And many of those relate back to the 1920s. In the recent years in relation to the high demand on housing, as well as the oncoming train station in Union Square, which is within a quarter mile of the property, there has been conversions of commercial buildings into residential use. So this is continuing that transformation.

We believe that once the train station is installed, Webster Ave., which is really not pedestrian friendly is going to be transformed into a pedestrian corridor. We anticipate travelers from our property as
well as people coming from the train to be using this. So when we -- in addition to looking at the building, we paid close attention to the public realm. We looked at the streetscape on Webster Ave. as well as on Columbia Street.

So as you can see here, the bottom picture, the front of the, the front of the property has a wide intersection with Columbia and Webster Ave., and so this area here, this is the apex, this is the area you would see if you're coming from Cambridge Street going north on Webster Ave. So currently there are vehicles being parked there. There are two large curb cuts on either side of this apex, which has cars entering and exiting on either side. It's very pedestrian unfriendly, and there's no adequate way to go from Webster Ave. to
Cambridge Street. So we're hoping, as part of the redevelopment of this site, we are going to make improvements.

This front area here, as you're going to see, is going to be a front yard plaza. We are proposing ground floor retail in this front area here. We're going to landscape this whole area here to create some opportunities to accessory to the proposed retail in the ground floor.

So this is an example of -- from an aerial from above of what the project would look like superimposed on the site. As you can see, this area here is going to be green. We're also connecting with this green area here. This is public property. And then eventually when this site is developed, we're hoping that a portion of this university monument site would also be green, and this
would create a sense of maybe a semi-public and private space for these connectors. We also think closing up the curb cuts on both of these sides would allow for a safe pedestrian environment all along this corridor.

This right here, this is not currently here. This is what's being proposed. We've been talking with DPW about ways to improve the circulation and the pedestrian experience, although it is only paint, I think there are examples when you have transitional areas going from commercial to residential, putting things like a crosswalk or striping can change the traffic flow or orient pedestrians to use -- cross in a safe manner. There's not a stop sign currently at the corner. Again, we're working with DPW in terms of their suggestions on how to treat
this area here to make sure that the pedestrian, the residents who are now living in these units, as well as others who are coming down this thoroughfare, would have safe access to Cambridge Street.

During our public comment or, excuse me, our neighborhood outreach, again, there was a lot of focus on the public realm, and we thought it was important to show graphically what that experience on Webster may look like.

Next slide.

And so this is an image here looking from Cambridge Street at the building. This is again Columbia Street, and this is Webster Ave. And as I mentioned before, these are open curb cuts that will now be closed.

On Columbia Street there are actually six curb cuts; one large one here and there's
a total so along the side those are all going
to be closed up.

We have, as part of the landscape plan, we're introducing street trees along both facades. We also have a series of plantings that we are, in coordination with the city arborist, proposing to implement in this area here.

There was conversation about whether or not this area should be fenced in or some kind of separation. We heard comments either way. We heard in some cases that if it's going to be a public realm, then it should be opened. We heard anecdotally because of the ENC Bottle, this is a place where weekly, there's a mecca of people with recycling bottles that often use carriages. And so there may be an opportunity for loitering and just undesired behavior. So one, we know if
this is developed, if the Board approved it, this would have to be a highly managed area. I think we've come up with some ideas, but we haven't settled exactly on how they should be separated or fenced in. If not, we're open to suggestions from the Board, but that was one of the questions raised.

So, when we started our public outreach, we started in the summer. We had two large meetings. One of the meetings was in the building, the existing building, and we also had a meeting at the Frisoli Center. Those meetings actually changed the project, and let me summarize some of the elements that were important.

So the initial proposal had only one-and two-bedroom units, and we also had parking at grade that was exiting onto Columbia Street. We heard from the neighbors
and certain individuals that they wanted us to introduce three-bedroom units. And so we actually introduced three, three-bedroom units. Because of the size and the shape of the lot and the fact that the units above on the second and third story need to be set back in ten feet from the property line, the four plates for the three-bedroom units worked best on the first floor. Also the initial proposal had 990 square feet of retail. We've increased that to 1780 square feet. Also the retail was not sited at this front apex, and so we feel like this is the most prominent part of the building if you're driving from Cambridge Street going north to Somerville. And so we've actually oriented the retail from the front node facing the apex which is adjacent to the outdoor area, and we've also increased the glazing along
the side to really try to activate the streetscape.

Next slide.

And so this is a view of the street if you are facing the building with Cambridge Street to your right, and I can't see it that well, but this is an idea, and Jai will talk about this. This building has some really interesting fenestration, and so part of the idea was to try to keep as many of the remaining window patterns along Webster and Columbia Street as possible. We did hear the desire for either more retail or more retail oriented to Webster Ave. Currently the retail stops approximately about this window pane, maybe a little earlier. And there are two units that are facing Webster Ave. And in discussing with the owner, these are residential units as being proposed, but we
are open to those potentially being live/work space. And the idea is as the huge train station comes and this becomes more of a pedestrian environment, this may -- these spaces may support other uses besides residential. We don't believe we're at that point now, but we talked about the design and Jai can speak to how these potentially may be able to be converted into something more interesting than the existing residential units. But that was a suggestion made and that we're keeping open to that concept.

Additionally, the idea was that we should reach out, and we did, to Jesse Baerkahn of Graffito as a broker. They do a lot of the retail leasing in Kendall Square and surrounding areas. And we reached out to him in terms of talking about what retail might work there. We believe it has to be
neighborhood retail if it's going to survive. There is no parking for the retail. And right now on Columbia Street, due to the width, there is not actual parking on our building side of Columbia Street. So the main parking in this area is on Webster Ave. And there is some metered parking on Columbia Street.

Adjacent to the site -- and I think, Jai, if you go back to No. 6.

So the property's surrounded by industrial properties. This is Seal and Bottle and this is GNC Bottle, the auto repair and recycling. They had different considerations than some of the other neighbors. To the issue they expressed was that you're introducing residential into a mostly commercial area, and they had concerns about the viability of their business and the
impacts. One of the things that we looked at was the design on this facade here and what would be the side of the rear facade. And we're going to be implementing that, and Jai can talk about sound windows and other mitigation efforts as a way to soften those uses. These uses are daytime uses and, you know, they do end at five, six o'clock at night. But there is a reality to a transforming neighborhood. This is not the first residential development to do this along this corridor, and we do think we can design the building in a way that would help mitigate that.

Generally we received positive responses to the design and the idea of adapting and reusing this building. We actually did a tour with the Cambridge Historical Commission in the process just to
get their feel for the building and its relationship to the street, and I believe there is a letter in the file that speaks to that. This is in no way a landmark building, but we did think that without being able to adapt and reuse the building, we would then have to tear the building down to be able to meet the ten foot setback or to seek a variance. So we thought that the building was interesting and has a history and richness to the area, and our proposal is seeking to maintain with the design as well as adequately adding addition.

And I’m now going to turn it over to Jai.

JAI SINGH KHALSA: Can I grab that mic and bring it over here?

LIZA PADEN: Sure, if you want.

JAI SINGH KHALSA: Jai Singh Khalsa,
Khalsa Design, I'm the project architect.

Sean covered a lot of ground on this. This -- just to sort of finish out the tour around the site, this is Columbia Street, the back corner of the building, and existing and then your proposed view of that back corner of the building as well.

Now, a lot of the -- a lot of the areas where we have the larger in-fills are either garage doors or very large industrial type of windows in the building now. So we wanted to keep the pattern of the existing building. And the original building has some art deco gripped detailing on it so we wanted to preserve that as well.

The building up above is somewhat neutral in its treatment. We wanted to keep it as a background to highlight the existing building more. There's not a tremendous
amount of detail on the existing building, but we thought it was important to create the contrast because the existing building is so close to the street. And on this side of the building we've stepped the building back. It angles up above where we've introduced a series of balconies, albeit small balconies, but at least someone can get out and get some fresh air.

Also on the top of the building are three roof decks, private roof decks connected specifically to the two units, and then the balance of the building roof is green roof on it.

Where the building is stepped back to the 15 feet all around, we do a series of terraces, four units, and other green roof treatment areas.

And then back in this corner here the
cars turning to come down a ramp that comes back in the back little triangle on to the building there.

In terms of the site usage, the entrance and exit from the parking is up on Columbia Street, coming down a ramp into the existing basement. The basement has a waffle slab now. It has fairly -- the first floor rather has a waffle slab which is a certain kind of concrete slab that allows you fairly decent spans, and it lays out fairly well for the adaptive reuse for parking in that area. And we needed every inch of it.

This line here is your setback line going around the building, okay?

So that line there is what we complied with as far as the addition above. And this little red area here is where we've put addition in on the ground floor, which is
also compliant. And then you have landscape area here and landscape areas back in here. I'm gonna move on to this zoning diagram here.

So here is your existing building and here is the addition within the existing building. So the existing building has one- and two-story areas that we're utilizing that outside setback -- here it is again, for terraces and green roof areas.

This is along Webster here.

This is along Columbia here.

And that's the front portion there where we bring down that bay coming forward from the building.

One thing that was noted in your planning department review was they were concerned about putting a metallic type of panel finish on this, and we have kind of a
diamond shape that we're proposing, because I wanted to keep as much brick as possible. This part of the building is CMU. There's nothing special about it. Quite frankly, we wanted to hide it and put a more architectural finish on it. Anywhere where we have the nice yellow brick, except for we have the one little point coming out here, that has our commercial main entrance in it, we have kept the brick and we're gonna do a restoration of the brick. It's kind of a yellow, yellow/orange type of a brick.

And then we have the three private roof decks.

This area here is your condenser farm.

All of the roof access is through pop-up full hatches. We don't have any head houses on the roof, to keep everything within the height limits that are required.
We do bring a canopy out on this side here over our -- we have a main entrance on Columbia and we have a secondary entrance over on -- I'm sorry, Webster and a secondary entrance on Columbia.

This is where you've got your one entrance here on Columbia and your other main entrance here on Webster.

This is your retail space here, which spills out into an outside cafe area potentially if a cafe was to be the actual user.

On this side here we have community rooms, and then we take advantage of our exterior facade to pick up as many windows within units as possible.

One thing I would like to mention is that we start -- when we started our community process, we had 39 units which is
the upset limit of what is allowed for the project. And right now we're at 35 units. At the request of the community to reduce the number of units, but also at the request to reduce the retail as well. But also at the same time we absorbed some of the units together to get three-bedroom or two-bedroom plus interior study units out of it to get some larger family type of units provided.

These two units here are additional ones we're saying could be work/live space. If we did that type of thing, we would put the bathrooms in and we would leave the rest of the partitioning out. Even would leave the kitchen out.

This is your landscape treatment plan. If you want to return to it in greater detail, we can. But basically we have a whole series of street trees. That's our
ramp coming down. We have a cluster of trees here and then we have hardscape and softscape up in this area here within the fenced-in area adjacent to the retail.

A close-up view of that, little vignette sketch of how that landscape might work. And then some of the thoughts around what the landscape paving would be, and sort of the quality of what the treatments at that edge would be.

More planting types.

I think it's interesting and important to look at these views in that, because you can see the outline of the existing building here, and here's your outline of the existing building, still kept very prominent. And you can see we've worked within the existing window pattern and similar texture of what the existing mullein patterns are.
Where the garage door is we introduced our main entry. Where we have this other big garage door we added fenestration. And then we opened up this facade here which was a CMU facade with something of the same -- a similar meter to the garage door openings for the residential treatments along that face.

Again, on your Webster Street facade, this is the Webster Street facade. You've got a little bit of arts -- sorry, Beaux-Arts type of detailing in these areas here.

That's your existing building maintained, and then you have a fairly neutral background behind it. But we did want to pick up and say, okay, you've got something special in this building on the corner, so we've added a lot more glazing at the corner there. So you have a view down from Cambridge Street. You've got some, you
know, visual attraction to say beyond the softscape of the building that you have this grazed tower at the end, and it would help to create the transition down to Webster Street.

The areas again up in here where you've got these parapets that go above floor lines are being used as outside landscape spaces. And in this area where you've got a two-story building that is used as part of the units there.

This is the blank wall that goes along the can recycling.

This part of the building here is set back quite a distance from the property line here, and then we open up for a little bit more light along there. But we're not proposing to do anything right up against where the can recycling happens.

This area in here overlooks our ramp,
so it's somewhat set back from that property line where the cans occur.

And then I think this is your last elevation view here, which is -- this is along Columbia. It's kind of an oblique view along Columbia. And you can see where we're bringing that glazed treatment down at the new bay that we introduced at the end of the building there to build some interest on that facade as it faces.

And then we found the prerequisite shadow studies that indicate in the summer that we have very little light trespass on anybody. Spring and fall you've got some early morning trespass that just gets across the street. Midday you have a little bit on the can shop, and at the end of the day you mostly have it on your ramp here but then it goes, you know, over to the can area. And
then the winter there's always a struggle for everyone with shadow, so you've got a lot of shadow trespass in the winter regardless of what you try to do.

I don't think I need to go through all the rest of these slides. We have some further details on how units are laid out. We have some further details on how civil is laid out but I don't think that that's necessarily the best use of our time here unless you have specific questions.

We do comply with all of the Zoning requirements in terms of height area, bulk, setback. One of the things that's interesting, of course, about this Res. B-2B Zone is that if you did a fully commercial building, you could be at a zero lot line, and a residential building you have to pull back from the lot line. And, again, we've
got one of these triangular lots which is a challenging thing to work with.

I did provide you with a cut sheet on the noise control window which has an SDS of 56 which is very high level. That was being requested along Webster because you have the automotive businesses there and any windows that we put in adjacent to the can business, recycling business, it was also requested along there. So that's where we're suggesting where we would go along with those treatments. And additionally, then we're using a heavy cementitious siding and a metal siding that we can treat with an acoustical manner that we can get in a higher separation in there.

Thank you.

Would you like to have a discussion about landscape at this more detail at this
point?

H. THEODORE COHEN: No, why don't you proceed with questions. We'll get back to them.

JAI SINGH KHALSA: Okay.

So I'm done with my presentation.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay.

Anyone else? You're concluded?

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: For now.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Do any board members have any questions or comments right now? If not, why don't we proceed to the public hearing.

So, first person is Michael Gill (sic). Come on up and speak at the podium.

MICHAEL GRILL: Thank you. And if you can leave that there, that would be great. So thank you very much.

Hi, my name is Michael Grill. That's
with an R in there.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Grill? I'm sorry.

MICHAEL GRILL: That's okay. I'm Chairman of the 432 Columbia Street Condominium Trust which is the owner of 1035 Cambridge Street which is the building, the large office building that's directly adjacent from 305 on Columbia Street.

I'd like to provide our full support to the petitioner's proposal to convert the industrial building to the residential use. I've talked to attorney Sean Hope and Jim Glassman on several occasions during this process, and most recently with Jeff Glassman. And I appreciate their willingness to listen to our concerns about the project and the construction's effect on 1035 Cambridge Street. Our biggest concern about
305 Webster Ave. is the project's effect on Columbia Street both during construction and after completion. 1035 Cambridge Street relies on Columbia Street for access to three separate parking areas and loading docks.

There are approximately 40 businesses and 350 employees in 1035 Cambridge Street. It's a very large employer to the area and it has traffic throughout the day. Over the last few years the condo trust has worked with the City of Cambridge Traffic and Parking division and the police department to keep two lanes of traffic open on Columbia Street especially in the area to the entrance to our building's front parking lot and the intersection of Webster Ave. and Columbia Street.

Sean, could I use that, could I use the pointer?
JAI SINGH KHALSA: Sure.

MICHAEL GRILL: So right here this is our front entrance. Front parking lot entrance where we have approximately 60 cars, and here's the intersection of Webster and Columbia Street. This is where our primary traffic is. We also have loading docks in the rear here and additional parking areas back here. There's Fed-Ex trucks, U.P.S. trucks all day long coming in both these loading docks as well as the front parking area.

Columbia Street during construction is -- we have some concerns. One, is we want to keep, while construction is occurring, two lanes of traffic on Columbia Street because we have cars coming out of our parking lot and we have cars going into our parking lot.

I understand there's a new water line
required. And if in fact that occurs, then, again, during that water line construction, from the plans that I've seen from the Water Department, it appears that those -- the water line is relatively close to the sidewalk on -- at this end. If in fact there's construction that occurs in that area, then if in fact the parking that's in that location right now, there's parking from here all the way down as well as in this direction, then I request that that parking be removed and construction occur in that location as well -- just so two lanes of traffic can go back and forth on that street.

While the petitioner has agreed in its proposal to continue a no stopping zone along the west side of Columbia Street, which is this side of Columbia Street towards 305, the petitioner's last rendering, and as just
described today, shows the building's main lobby entrance would be directly opposite from our parking lot. The main entrance be right here and our parking lot entrance is right here. So if you were to come here during the day, you'd see cars constantly leaving this location. Now the -- Mr. Glassman and Sean Hope have suggested that well, this is still going to be a no stopping area. Anyone who has seen operations of an apartment building realize that people have well, I'm just stopping for a second. You know, just leaving the car here for a couple seconds and I'll be gone. That happens all day long right now with the CLM cars that are parked there. And we've over the years have developed a relationship with the police department and CLM and Traffic and Parking to try to move the cars.
I'll just be a minute, guys.

So to put the main entrance of a building right in front of the main parking lot where we have trucks all day long moving in and out, is just to cause a nightmare. We've suggested to Mr. Glassman that the parking lot -- sorry, the main entrance be moved to just the other side where I understand from the fenestration he showed earlier, there's another large opening that I believe is the original parking garage that's being used right now as the entrance to the parking structure inside. Without that move then we're gonna -- we're just gonna have problems all day long from people leaving their cars there again, having deliveries, U.P.S. trucks showing up. U.P.S. and Fed-Ex trucks are always saying we're only going to be there for a moment.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Mr. Grill, can you conclude your comments? We have received a letter from you and we're aware of that.

MICHAEL GRILL: Okay.

Over the years our experience with Mr. Glassman has been mixed. He's a very nice man with good intentions. He's had a -- he's done a miserable job with taking care of his property. We're very concerned that during the construction project Mr. Glassman does not have any development experience. He has experience owning this property but no development experience. Very concerned that whether he hires a development manager or a construction company, the property will get out of control. Right now he's leasing the property to CLM. He cannot work with CLM. It's been very difficult to control the CLM activities during the -- during their
operation of the building. It's horrifying to me to have the notion that Jim is going to manage the project during construction and while we operate the building.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Mr. Grill, would you please wrap up? Many of your concerns relate to construction and that would be -- if this is approved and goes forward, that will be monitored by the staff and by the Traffic Department and by the Public Works.

MICHAEL GRILL: Great. I do like this project and I look forward to its completion. And I agree with the petitioner that the restaurant uses or the retail uses along Webster Ave. can wait a little bit further. That I see that will come over time.

Thank you very much and appreciate your consideration.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

The next person.

RUDY BELLARDI: Rudy Belliard. Webster Avenue. I live nearby. I live like five minutes from there.

The big concern is this: That it seems that this is, this is building conversion there is a desire of keeping the building without, without touching much. And the concern is how can it be clean properly, the soil, without moving anything? Maybe you will address this later or it's been already addressed, but it is for sure, it is not that clear.

This site has been, as seen attempted to clean several times and couldn't complete because they found more things to be cleaned. So the neighbors or the people living nearby they are concerned about the cleaning. This
is the only comment I have. I have to say that it's a little bit better than the original project. That more units and that was considering ground floor be residential, given the subway station would be nearby, it seems an opportunity to have a retail on the ground floor.

The other concern is of course parking. And I guess many people already brought it up.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Heather Hoffman.

HEATHER HOFFMAN: Hi. Heather Hoffman, 213 Hurley Street. And first off, I want to say that it does my heart good to see industrial buildings being reused and -- because I know that we have several in East Cambridge that are a tremendous addition to
the neighborhood. So I hope that this reuse will be similarly an addition to this neighborhood. I'm here to talk about something somewhat more nitpicky and that has to do with the dimensional form in the application. And I was noticing a pretty interesting bit of slight of hand in here. You've heard me recently talking about inclusionary units. I've recently discovered the joys of looking at dimensional forms and looking at what people are doing about this. I go to every City Council meeting, and affordable housing is on the agenda every week. You go to almost any community meeting, people are worried about affordable housing. And now we look at this dimensional form and they're playing fast and loose.

If you take a look, it says the maximum number of units that they could have here is
30, but they say that they're only having 27 base units. Well, what's the difference between 30 and 27? One affordable unit. And you say well, that's just one. And I say yeah, that's just one. And the next project it's just one. And another projects says -- that have been before you recently, it's been six. If we don't do something, and this Board has recently spoken out very forcefully in a different project very close to my house, about the need for affordable housing and changed the result. So I hope that you will, even though this is not strictly within your purview, I hope that you will express your intention that the Ordinance be strictly complied with. And just so there's no question about that, let me just read you one sentence: Any inclusionary project shall provide 15 percent of the total number of
dwelling units up to the maximum allowed as of right as affordable units.

There is nothing anywhere else in the Ordinance that makes that number less.

Thanks.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

To reiterate, you were correct, the determination of the affordable units is not within this Board's purview, it will be determined by the Building Department and by the Community Development Department at the appropriate time, and I am sure they will comply with the Ordinance to its fullest extent.

Is there anyone else who wishes to speak? Yes, please.

SAM SEIDEL: Good evening. Sam Seidel, 43 Harris Street, Cambridge. I rented office space across the street on
Cambridge Street. I think the reuse of this building is entirely appropriate. I think residential is of course the right use there, so I'm very supportive of that. I come mostly to say I hope the Planning Board, and this may be an issue more for the Council, that you spend sometime on this area. As we know, Union Square is about to change. I happened to be at a meeting not too long ago with some officials from the City of Somerville and they said they were certainly open to working with the City of Cambridge on this general area, and included a comment in this sort of offhand way that the Nissenbaum lot which is on the Somerville side, but which is literally 25 feet from this place, has been -- he's received multiple offers to buy that place out. So this, not that anything is gonna happen there immediately,
but that things potentially could happen quite quickly. So I would urge you all in conjunction with the Council and CDD to spend sometime thinking about that because I think it's an important change.

I will make a couple of specific comments. The Columbia Street side, regardless of where the entrance to the building ends up being is truly a gem and it's an architectural opportunity to really do something on that street. So I hope you'll spend sometime thinking about how that can be best used.

And I made a comment in one of their public meetings about looking at green -- not on the remediation side, but in ways of making this building more energy efficient. It's one of the topics we all talk about. This is new construction, they might spend
sometime and you might ask them to think about that.

Thank you very much. Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who wishes to be speak?

RYAN McGEE: My name is Ryan McGee. I split my time between Somerville and 877 Cambridge Street, Abbott's Tavern. I'm the owner of so I get to walk by the building everyday, and a lot of the issues with the pedestrian friendly aspect of Webster Street or the direct responsibility of this building and the current owner, and I definitely want to say that I do have concerns as both the neighbor and somebody that who does walk by the building all the time. If there is any resemblance to the care that's been given to this place over the past decade that I've
lived in the neighborhood and the project going forward, it will be seriously questionable as to whether or not there will be a positive outcome to the project.

That being said, I also would like to agree and say that there is so much development going on right now between -- on the Cambridge line, and there are serious concerns on the back of Hunting Street. There's Willow Street, a lot of development going on that you guys are going to be involved in, and I'd like to make sure that that development with Somerville is being taken into account when you guys are thinking about buildings that are going to be going up on the Cambridge side. We've been doing this for a while and hopefully we can show a good solid effort to do things correctly. And this may or may not be an example of that,
but that's all.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Anyone else who wishes to speak?

FLORRIE WESTOCAT: Hi, I'm Florrie Westcoat. I'm Co-Chair of the public planting committee and along with Maggie Booz, who is also here, and I wanted to thank you for this opportunity for speaking. As a committee, we're hoping to increase communication between our committee and the Planning Board in order to improve the amount and the health of the city trees. In this plan it's admirable to see 20 trees being proposed. I think that's a great number for a small site like this. And so our suggestions really relate to the health of the trees.

And it seems to us that there are small
interventions that can be made to really increase the health and vigor of these trees. A lot of times trees look great going in and they sort of get smaller every year instead of bigger, and we are suggesting that the tree pits that are specified in the plans be elongated. I believe they're speced at four-by-six feet, and we would like to see them increased as much as possible. I sent a little diagram. I hope you received it. And I think they're approximately what I increase them to is I believe 24 feet. We've noticed that New York City now is encouraging continuous beds as much as possible. It makes a huge difference for rainwater harvesting for if there's slight swales they will decrease storm runoff. They provide oxygen to the roots. They -- it's just like a small thing that has a huge impact on a
tree. So along the, along the streets we strongly urge you to increase the beds and still you'll be within the ADA standards if you step back one foot, and they would be three-feet wide, the length of the sidewalks as much as you can.

Similarly in the front yard area the little seating area, which I think is a wonderful idea for, for the community, I think that you could increase the open -- the -- you could decrease the hardscape and increase the planting area without, without decreasing your usable sitting space. So, again, on the diagram I've indicated that -- and I think all of these spaces could be planted with very tough tidy little plants that would not be a lot of fussing. You wouldn't need a lot of maintenance with them. So I think that -- let's see.
Just to close with -- we feel like it would help the green infrastructure, and I think Sam referred to energy efficiency of the building. Somebody else referred to pedestrian friendly spaces. And last but not least it would increase the beauty of our city.

So, thank you very much.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

PHIL McKENNA: Hi. My name is Phil McKenna. I live at 135 Willow Street, about two blocks away, and I work next to our 1035 Cambridge Street offices in the same building owned by Michael Grill. I would like to say that on the whole I'm in very much of support of this project. I think it will be a vast improvement to the current site. I do have a few concerns.

The first that my wife and I, Rachel
Parish and I have raised at some of the neighborhood meetings. We'd like to see more three-bedroom apartments. We are fortunate enough to own a three-bedroom apartment in the neighborhood and we'd like to see other families have the opportunity to live and own in the neighborhood.

Secondly, at some of the prior neighborhood meetings, more than particular, we were given a detailed overview of the environmental abatement, and a concern that I have, a lingering concern, my understanding is part of the abatement would include mechanical fans. That if there were any contaminants that were airborne, that the fans would be removing them from the space. That to me doesn't seem like a good long-term solution. If that still is indeed the case, I would just like to make sure that that's
looked at very closely given an independent assessment.

I would like to see additional retail space. I missed some of the meeting today, but there might be some additions for that. But whatever is possible, I'd love to see more on Webster Ave.

And I had one more point but I can't remember it so I'll end it there.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who wishes to speak?

(No Response.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: None appearing.

Board members have any questions or comments or would you like to hear from staff?

HUGH RUSSELL: So I just want to
understand Columbia Street. It looks like there's a line of parking on the right side in the upper side and then there are two travel lanes one in each direction?

Is that correct?

H. THEODORE COHEN: I believe that's correct.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: And the other question I had was the -- in the presentation it was said that the front door of the building was on Webster Avenue, and Mr. Grill says it's on Columbia Street. So my question is if there were packages being delivered to the building, which entrance would they come to? What's the --

JAI SINGH KHALSA: The intention is -- I know it was said at one public meeting that the main entrance would be on
Columbia, but the main entrance and main entrance canopy is actually on Webster and that's your primary entrance point. And that will be the place that we set up the mailboxes as well is off of Webster not Columbia. So Columbia's your second means of egress. Your secondary entrance point.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Would there be any difficulty in moving the entrance on Columbia a little bit to get it off center line with the driveway in 1035?

JAI SINGH KHALSA: There actually would be a lot of impact to the building in a number of ways. One is in terms of architectural egress, it would be very challenging and you'd wind up wiping out some of the three-bedroom units to accomplish it. We need to keep the egresses a certain distance apart. Again, another challenge
that we would be kind of going backwards on the planning on. You know, ultimately you can rearrange things architecturally, but I think the solution would be awkward to do it, and I think it's the appropriate location for it. And it's the appropriate adjacency to the second means of egress stairwell so that you get a visual connection to your exit point from the stairwell when you come out the stairwell door which is critical under the current code. Five years ago it wasn't part of the code that we adopted. Now it is part of the code that you have to have that visual connection to the exit when you do that. So, it would be very difficult to relocate that from our point of view.

HUGH RUSSELL: I guess my other question is several people have talked about environmental concerns, and although we don't
have jurisdiction over environmental concerns, you did say you had your LSP here. Maybe there could be just a brief discussion about what you'll be doing in terms of any remediation.

    JOE HIGGINS: My name is Joe Higgins. I'm with Innovative Engineering Solutions. I am the LSP for this project.

    There's two pieces of environmental concern here: One deals with lead and metals that are in soil, and the other deals with some chlorinated solvents that are in soil in the ground water.

    The --

    JAI SINGH KHALSA: The site plan?

    JOE HIGGINS: Yes, the site plan would be good.

    The lead and soil is present backup where the ramp is for the parking garage. To
construct that ramp and to get into the parking garage, that soil will be excavated and taken off site.

The soils that contained chlorinated solvents are located at the bottom of the ramp and then down over here in the front part of the building. As part of the construction of the underground garage, improvements for the underground garage, those soils would also be excavated. As a kind of a belt and suspenders approach, we would put in a ventilation system to minimize, abate any impacts that could arise after the excavation is completed.

STEVEN COHEN: With some slab ventilation?

JOE HIGGINS: Yes. It's a standard construction practice.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Will you
ultimately have to put an AUL on record?

JOE HIGGINS: We're hopeful that we won't have to. But if an AUL had to go be implemented for the site, it would just require primarily maintenance for that cap. So any soils that could pose a risk wouldn't be exposed or accessible. But the intention is to remove all of those soils.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And when that's done, there won't be any question that it's an appropriate location for residential dwelling?

JOE HIGGINS: Correct.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: As long as this ventilation system is maintained in the long term?

JOE HIGGINS: Again, our intention is to dig up those soils that are causing the problem.
LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Agreed. So why the ventilation?

JOE HIGGINS: It's easier to have it installed during construction and not need it than need it and have to go back and retrofit it.

JAI SINGH KHALSA: If I could address one thing on that.

Under the State Code now in residences we have to install a sub-slab vent system as a precautionary measure. And we do it standardly on all of our buildings. The one thing that you don't have to do with it is you don't have to put in an accelerating fan, an inline fan to create a negative pressure on it unless you get some kind of a reading. And this is done primarily for radon not for other types of contamination. So the system I believe it's comparable to what a radon
system would be, but you have the inline fan in case you need it to create the negative pressure under the slab, which is going to draw anything from the garage into that negative pressure and it's gonna take it out up and out the roof where it's the concentration of it, would be below threshold requirements. But we're not anticipating that there will be anything of that type anyway. But you have to put -- it's a standard practice now. We have to put that stuff in under the slabs regardless.

STEVEN COHEN: Mr. Higgins, where is the groundwater and what's the condition of the groundwater?

JOE HIGGINS: Groundwater has some chlorinates in it, and the sources of that is from the soil. Groundwater is right below at the bottom of that slab, the existing slab.
In fact, I think portions of the -- the front portions of the building that do get water in that during high rain events right now. So the water comes up there.

STEVEN COHEN: So are you proposing any treatment of that water or are you just --

JOE HIGGINS: Once we dig up the soil that's contaminated, the water will clean-up.

STEVEN COHEN: You're proposing to dig up all contaminated soils on this site? Is that really what this amounts to?

JOE HIGGINS: There are two areas that are causing sources for the chlorinates, those are the areas that we're proposing to dig up.

STEVEN COHEN: Are there other contaminated soils on the site?
JOE HIGGINS: I addressed the lead soils at the beginning. Those are up by the ramp. Those are also going to be excavated and taken off site.

STEVEN COHEN: Again, just trying to clarify. So are you excavating and removing all contaminated soils on the site or are there some contaminated soils that are remain --

JOE HIGGINS: Our intention is to take out most -- all of them.

STEVEN COHEN: Most or all?

JOE HIGGINS: Again, you know, it's the subsurface. It's been characterized fairly well. There is some excavation that's going to be required to do construction for the garage and to put the ramp in. Those soils will be monitored during excavation, tested, and taken offsite as well as the
soils that we know where there's source material.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: So, the soil below the slab is saturated, correct?

JOE HIGGINS: Yes.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: And this water is contaminated?

JOE HIGGINS: Some of it is, not all of it.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: I don't know how you contaminate some of the groundwater.

JOE HIGGINS: There's a piece here in the front that has some low levels.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: The soil is contaminated.

JOE HIGGINS: Groundwater as well. Low levels of groundwater contamination in the front of the building. Higher concentration's over there, and then
everything down there is clean.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: So that has no -- that soil isn't wet?

JOE HIGGINS: Correct.

HUGH RUSSELL: So in a way we've learned that this is a very complicated business and that's why the state has developed the procedures using licensed site professionals.

STEVEN COHEN: It's interesting, as you know, the state has more or less privatized the regulation and treatment of such conditions, so there's a DP that doesn't really get involved itself, and we rely entirely on Mr. Higgins --

JOE HIGGINS: One thing to be aware of, development of this property affords the opportunity to clean it up. Other attempts have been to clean it up, they've been
somewhat successful, but ultimately this will be the most successful approach to clean-up the property.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: I have another question. Are you going to completely remove the slab on the basement level?

JOE HIGGINS: I need to talk to the architect about that and the construction people about that.

JAI SINGH KHALSA: To be quite frank with you, I'm not sure the exact extent of removal at this time. I do know that any, any concrete that's left in place in terms of foundation and slab will be treated with a -- there's a thing called a crystalline treatment to it. That is -- it's a -- you saturate the slab with water and you put this treatment on, it goes and chemically bonds in the concrete and it makes it waterproofed,
sealed. And we are going to be treating any concrete which is left with that type of a sealant.

STEVEN COHEN: But now you've confused me a little bit. You're talking about a sub-slab ventilation system. That implies that a new slab --

JAI SINGH KHALSA: Well, if the parts of the slab were left in place, you're going to have the vent system put on top of the slab and have another slab put on top of that. But that exact determination, the level of detail at this point we have not -- have not locked in from an architectural point of view. Okay?

But essentially you would create a sandwich slab otherwise.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: I guess I have one more. There are existing drains and are
you going to reuse them in the basement?

JAI SINGH KHALSA: Quite frankly I'm not sure if there are existing drains. I tend to think no, but I'm not 100 percent sure. And the answer is we will not be reusing them if they are there.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: And you'll be installing a new drainage system?

JAI SINGH KHALSA: Yeah. We'll have to do a new drainage system, new pitch. We'll have to do an oil/water separator, a highland tank type of system because it's internal to the building as opposed to an MDC trap. And that level has to be done because you have six or more cars in the parking garage.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Exactly.

JAI SINGH KHALSA: And then it will have carbon monoxide detection and
ventilation for carbon monoxide as all standard garages have.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Ahmed.

AHMED NUR: No, I'm just saying that maybe we spent too much time on the subject. I know that the department --

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, if you have any questions about it?

AHMED NUR: Okay. So, yes, I just wanted to comment, a general comment, but I wanted to ask you first if you wanted to go to the staff with regarding to questions before I open up my general comments?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, that's fine.

Suzannah, do you want to give us some of your comments about the design and any questions you have?

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: Suzannah Bigolin,
We've looked at the site quite a bit and we're really pleased that this redevelopment will be occurring and assisting with the transformation of this district.

The retail and open space will also be a terrific opportunity and a link through from Cambridge Street to the new T station as well. So they're really positive outcomes, and the improvements to landscaping and public open space and the public realm improvements are also really positive urban design results.

We also appreciate the sort of retention of the existing industrial buildings and using that fabric to add character and to create this sort of unique district that's a little bit different from some areas of Cambridge.
In recognizing the prominence of this site, we feel that there's sort of still some elements that could be fine tuned and further developed in terms of the addition and the architectural treatments. We're looking at some of the details in terms of the materials and the colors. We didn't see some of the renderings I think that you have on your desks as well, so there's probably more detail in that in terms of the color and finishes than what we saw in the application materials that would be good to look at further.

And looking also at the architecture in terms of the articulation and how the addition is treated in terms of the windows and the changes in materials, I think is quite important. And the sort of the idea of retaining the integrity of the existing
buildings and then this more neutral building in the background, whether that should have a more contemporary feel which is showing the metal siding in some locations, but then the clapboard is also in there as well, so it kind of seems to be a mix of materials and sort of architecture styles in that sense.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Anyone have questions for Suzannah?

STEVEN COHEN: Suzannah, I guess the architect and you had described the new construction as a neutral background, and I guess that could cover a host of assets or sins and I'm having difficulty sort of reading from the drawings that we have what it actually will look like. And I am concerned that it might not look like much. So I guess in part my question is, you know, how much of the background building will we
actually see from the street because of the setback?

And, you know, I guess at what point does neutral become sort of a boring and lost opportunity and, you know, just sort of a pedestrian commercial not enough?

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: I think we'll see quite a lot of the new buildings. The existing structures are only single story, and there is a part of a two-story building. So it will be quite visible. The data is I think where that issue could be resolved in terms of how contemporary it is and how sort of sleek and neutral the building can look. So with the metal siding, how that fits in with the clapboard and the changes in materials, probably quite an issue to consider. And then also the cornice line I think is relatively flat, and that could be
accentuated and given more definition.

STEVEN COHEN: You're saying there's room for improvement?

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: Yes.

STEVEN COHEN: Is that an area where you would be working with the applicant or is that an area where we should be opining? Or what would be the best way to address that issue?

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: I think staff would be happy to continue working with the applicant, but the Planning Board is welcome to further comment and provide advice on those issues as well.

STEVEN COHEN: Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Suzannah, am I -- when I look at the plans, I'm concerned about what we see on the roof lines. It seems everything is encased in fencing; is
that correct?

JAI SINGH KHALSA: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: So we won't see any independent chimneys or anything other than the one --

JAI SINGH KHALSA: No.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Other than the one, I guess it's the head house for the stairs or something?

JAI SINGH KHALSA: Actually we took the head house for the stairs off and we're just doing a full cover hatch for the staircase because there was some concern about a --

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: The height limit.

JAI SINGH KHALSA: The thing about the height limit.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay. So what I
had looked at earlier with the head house, that's now gone?

JAI SINGH KHALSA: Yeah, the revised plans we gave out to you today, the head house is gone. All of the condensers are within a ventilated enclosure so they shouldn't be visible. We should have vent pipes coming up, but those come up two feet above the roof line. Those shouldn't be visually obvious from the street. And then the bulk of the roof actually has green roof on it, has alpine planting on it that will certainly help in terms of the energy considerations and also aesthetically when you're up in those areas.

HUGH RUSSELL: If I could weigh in on this subject.

The -- I think the Columbia Street side of the building is more successful than the
Webster Avenue side. And I think the difference is the breaks in the cornice and the -- because it seems sort of kind of arbitrary on Webster Avenue. There's one, two, three, four different sections with red stripes between them, but they're all flat and the roof line is running straight. So I think there's an opportunity to get some articulation that would improve the appearance without any fundamental change to the building. I mean, maybe you need to -- we might try putting in some more of those mini balconies. The actual living/dining areas seem to be fairly generous so that you might be able to get -- do something like that just as a way to, in a way, try to make one side of the building and the other use the same vocabulary. And I think it's -- I mean, I'm quite comfortable to delegating our
review to Suzannah and the other rest of the staff. I mean, I -- I love the point. I think Jai Singh loves to do these buildings that come to points or maybe he just gets clients to do that, but he's celebrating it. And I think that's exactly the right thing to do. So I think the big moves are all being done right here. It's just some, a little bit of articulation on the Webster Avenue would make it nicer.

THACHER TIFFANY: I have a couple of -- I have a couple design questions.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Go.

THACHER TIFFANY: So stay with the design team on the web -- sorry, Columbia facade. There is these windows that you described as new. Yes, those. The closed sort of garage door stylish ones. What do those look into? Are those -- are there
units there? Is the ramp behind them?

JAI SINGH KHALSA: We have units there.

THACHER TIFFANY: Okay. And then I guess my follow-up question would be why are they so low, and what's that white panelling at the base?

JAI SINGH KHALSA: The panelling at the base is solid.

THACHER TIFFANY: Okay.

JAI SINGH KHALSA: And you got the window grids up above it. So you've got the ability for furnishing and the privacy issues are going to have to be taken care of with window treatments. But we thought it would be nice. And in the style of the building on that side, there's a series of garage doors there that were closed in with CMU. They're basically wanting to reopen that look and
give it that sort of garage door look along there. I do agree that we should articulate the Webster side. And the balcony thing is an easy thing to accommodate, and to get that soft type of day look is easy to accomplish.

THACHER TIFFANY: There's something -- the second comment that sort of relates to these windows. There's something perplexing at looking at the building where you have, maybe you have lower ceiling heights in the new additions so that when you, when you look at the fenestration, you get, you can really see that there's these different ceiling heights. Is that what -- can you maybe explain that a little bit, what the logic is there?

JAI SINGH KHALSA: We wound up with pretty similar ceiling heights throughout. What happens is that on your drawing in this
area here, we don't want to take the building down so you wind up --

H. THEODORE COHEN: Could you show us on the screen so the public can see it, too?

JAI SINGH KHalsa: Sure. Actually maybe I can show it on this diagram. In the areas here where the building appears taller, that's actually an enclosed court for that unit. And it's raised up above the ground because we didn't want to do anything to effect the cornice line of this existing building. We do want to re -- we do want to restore it. We do want to make that the strong cornice, and that's also specifically why we didn't introduce a strong cornice at the top. We wanted to keep it down at this line here and not reintroduce it there. I thought it would be conflicting between the
two. So these areas here appear to be higher. At one point the roof was up at that height. We're taking the roof out and moving it down so that it properly relates to the floor level of the building behind it or we're maintaining that as a parapet or a rail -- solid rail type edge for those units behind it. But the floor to floors are pretty consistent and the --

THACHER TIFFANY: That makes sense. You're lowering the existing roof down?

JAI SINGH KHALSA: Correct.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Just to be clear for the public, while you're showing it there in red, it's not intended to be red brick?

JAI SINGH KHALSA: No, I think if we go -- if you want me to go to one of the renderings.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right, could you
go back to the renderings?

JAI SINGH KHALSA: That's -- really a zoning diagram for descriptive purposes. And then I've gone -- I've gone too far the wrong way. Let me go back.

Here you're showing a mix of clapboard treatment and a metal shingle type treatment up here. This is the original kind of tan -- yellow/tan colored brick here. And this over here was CMUs, and we showed the diamond pattern of a metal siding again on there that we're also introducing inside the balcony edges, while the faces of it are more of the clapboard material. So we get a little further relief as we cut into the building by exposing that metal up above, and we would do that similar treatment over on Columbia -- I'm sorry, on Webster.

And then Webster now you can see this
line here on down is the existing building.
This is that higher glazed treatment that
I -- the new element at the corner. And this is the more neutral above here.

The treatment up here will get changed so that it's similar to Columbia and the location of the clapboard, and then the shingle metal, shingle material will be of the same rhythm that we have on Columbia. We'll introduce that along where we have these French balcony treatments here up above creating the same kind of rhythm.

THACHER TIFFANY: One last question. Can you respond to the tree bed suggestion, widening the tree wells?

JAI SINGH KHALSA: Are you good with that? She's good with it. I'm good with. This is Kaya with Blair Hines and Associate.

KAYA PODSIADLO: Kaya Podsialdo,
K-a-y-a P-o-d-s-i-a-l-d-o. Blair Hines.

So I -- we received the comments from the public planting committee and we really appreciated and agreed with the intent to increase the amount of pervious softscape versus hardscape in this instance along the streetscape where we're increasing the street trees. What's there now, two trees to -- I can't remember if there's eight or something new street trees. Our tree pits range from about three feet by six feet in size along Webster. No, excuse me, Columbia. And I think eight by three and a half feet along Webster. So we're increasing green and pervious surface along the streetscape by virtue of adding the street trees.

In addition, if it's desired, and we would -- basically what we propose in response is to create a larger root growing
zone beneath the concrete paving. Instead of introducing new or additional or lengthened tree pits, we'd like to propose in between each tree pit to continue to increase sand based structural planting medium which is suitable for laying concrete on top of, but allows trees to grow into that zone. So it's a combination. It has like a -- there are a lot of voids in the aggregate so that air can be in there and water can get in there and roots can grow through there.

And we proposed -- do you have the other plan up? So, yeah, between each of these tree pits which is invisible on this, this portion of the concrete paving would be built on top of the sand based structural planting medium. However, if it's desired by the Board or, you know, we're -- you know, still in favor of more pervious surface. In
other words, we could introduce wider or longer or extended tree pits and plant something in them. However, we're worried that they would just get trampled. And you may be familiar with tree pits that have, you know, pretty much covered in muck and people walk on them, and it's almost compacted and impervious as a concrete pavement. If it was desired to lengthen the tree pits, we propose to put like a little 18-inch or two-foot high metal picket fence around portions of it to protect the planting if there were going to be smaller low shrubs or something. So there's a series of things that need to be considered.

This is the public realm. This may be that DPW may not want to bump into with their snowplows so there's a little bit of a maintenance issue.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Do you have any further comments about the triangle, whether to put a fence there or some shrubs or to leave it open?

KAYA PODSIADLO: The proposed patio adjacent to the commercial retail space?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes.

KAYA PODSIADLO: It's of a size that can accommodate more or less what we show for tables, but depending on the retail or occupant may want to be decreased in size or enlarged. I don't think it should be much larger. There isn't much more space, although we do provide planting around the perimeter of that so that there is a buffer of some low shrubs and we could expand that more so the way the woman Florrie described with some larger floor beds and accommodate some dining tables.
JAI SINGH KHALSA: If I could address one thing on that?

It was a specific request of our abutter across on Columbia that we should do at least some kind of a fencing in there. I guess he's had frequent, or I don't know how frequent at this point, but it was mentioned he had occasion to request that people who were sleeping and lounging and semi living in his little park areas to relocate, he really suggested that we have the fence to mitigate that. And we embraced that suggestion.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Anyone else have any other questions for -- about landscaping?

STEVEN COHEN: A quick one on landscaping. And that's as I'm looking at the rendering, I see green all along the parapet wall. Is that actually part of the plan to have flower boxes or something along
that --

KAYA PODSIADLO: Yeah, I believe. I don't know if it's at the top of the parapet wall in addition to green roof, but I believe a majority of the roof deck where there are not private paved or decking for private patios, there would be green roof like an extensive green planting bed of like four-inch depth, lightweight soil, medium for the appropriate kinds of plantings.

STEVEN COHEN: I was going to ask you about the green roof in a moment. But just here in the adaptive reuse building it's showing --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Green.

JAI SINGH KHALSA: We are planning to put on planters in the space.

STEVEN COHEN: You are planning. So it wasn't just artistic license?
JAI SINGH KHALSA: No, it's intended. Yeah.

STEVEN COHEN: And actually green roof, I've never done that. I hear from people who tried to do green roofs, pretty frequently issues, challenges, problems waterproofing and so forth.

I mean, Hugh, you must be much more familiar in this than me. Is that a non-issue somebody says they want to do green roof, it's doable, it's easy, it's knowing how to do it? It will actually happen?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, you -- this is a -- as I understand from Jai's description, this is a not intended as a walkable surface. It's a -- fairly thin plants are very drought tolerant that can deal with the conditions in that. Yes, you have to have the proper separation between them and the roofing
material to protect the roofing material, but it's not terribly complicated and, you know, I'm sure there are places where it has worked and there are places where it hasn't.

And, Jai, do you have more experience with this particular system?

JAI SINGH KHALSA: Well, we actually have a tray full of green roof product that our office, which has been out on our deck for four years now that we've been torture testing. You know, it's about six inches deep and it's a -- there's two plants in there. One is called sedum, and I don't remember the name of what the other one is. But they're both alpine plants. So they're made so that the root system -- the plant is tolerant in that the root system can freeze and thaw and freeze and thaw throughout the season. What kills plantings here is if you
have that cycle happen with New England plants, they need want to be frozen throughout the winter or not. And this particular planting is tolerant to that. And so it comes in a plastic bed. It sits on top of your rubber roof. There's a whole sort of pad system that goes between the two to protect the rubber roof. And it's -- and it's something that's not cheap. It cost you about 10 to 14 bucks a square foot to install it, but it's, you know, part of the quality and the look of what we want to be presenting with this building.

STEVEN COHEN: Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay, are there other comments from staff that they wish to make now or is everything else in the memo? Jeff.

JEFF ROBERTS: I'll just mention
briefly that there are -- just to put on the record for the transcript that there were also comments from the Department of Public Works and there was some commentary from the Historical Commission that were included, and that could be taken into consideration. I think the Department of Public Works' comments generally had to do with issues that would be addressed when a project goes into Building Permit phase.

H. THEODORE COHEN: So I guess the question now is what is the Board's pleasure? Are there issues that we want to get further information on before we decide this or are we comfortable enough with what we've seen now and leaving the issues to staff for final resolution?

HUGH RUSSELL: I guess I feel like I would be ready to vote tonight.
STEVEN COHEN: I think the only thing that I'm uncomfortable, the concept, you know, is great. It's a good project in so many respects.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Can you use your microphone?

STEVEN COHEN: Sorry.

It's just that, you know, I look at the rendering and I'm not -- I guess this is the Webster Street rendering, and the building -- it's just the architecture that you talked about, and it just looks very flat to me in every respect. I mean, even the windows themselves, there's just no dimensionality to the windows. You know, the parapet line is very straight and flat. I mean, you know, if that front at the point is great and that's, you know, where we -- where you really put some design and that's really cool. It's
just what I'm looking at in the back just seems very flat. And if it's going to be very visible, I guess I kind of like to see what -- where it's going to end up. And so the question is do we need to see where it ends up or do we simply leave it to staff?

HUGH RUSSELL: Well, I think the principle that Jai basically explained was -- after my comment, was that it will look a lot more like it does on Columbia Street. I mean, that treatment of the interruption of the cornice.

STEVEN COHEN: I have difficulty figuring out what's what here.

H. THEODORE COHEN: That's Columbia.

HUGH RUSSELL: That's the goal is to try to pick up the things on the elevation and give it more character. And we would then need Suzannah to monitor that process.
And as usual, if she feels she needs more muscle from the Board and then she'll bring it back to us. But I don't think that's apt to happen.

JAI SINGH KHALSA: If it's appropriate for me to interject for a minute?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Surely.

JAI SINGH KHALSA: You've got about two-thirds the number of living rooms on the Webster Street side as you do the Columbia side, so you'll have about two-thirds as many bays happening there. So, you know, every living room will have a cut that comes into it like that and we'll do the same alters of -- alternating of materials as we do with the clapboard, and then cutting in with the metal of the base cut in and with the metal. But essentially it will be this very similar pattern of treatment that you see here will
be along the Webster Ave.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I think what we've done in the past is that if, you know, one or more members of the board wanted more follow up before we took a vote on it, then we would continue the matter and come back. And if that's your feeling, that's fine. And we can do that. And Suzannah's nodding her head so maybe that is the appropriate route to go, which is fine. What I would like to say -- just, I think we, you know, want to make your comments clear and I will start. You know, I think this is a perfect building for an adaptive reuse, and I think it makes a lot of sense to not demolish the existing building which the Historical Commission, while acknowledging is not a landmark building, really a historic building, is preferably preserved. And so I
think that it makes perfect sense to grant the Special Permit to allow the residential use to not have to be set back as required by the Ordinance, and I think you received our other comments. You know, this is a great place for a mixed use residential building. You know, I applaud that you've added some three-bedroom units. I know I and the board members would like to see more three-bedroom units in everything that's built these days, and so when you're reviewing things, if you can take that into account, I would appreciate that. And I understand your comment about not wanting to relocate the entryway on Columbia Street. While you're looking at things again, if you could look at that again and be prepared to defend it again if you opt not to move it at all. And I guess I would be curious about whether the
materials could be made a little more exciting.

You know, I think we've heard both deco and sleek and some other adjectives used, and I would recommend that you work with Suzannah and our staff members to really come up with something that will make you and your client happy and make us and staff happy.

Anyone else?

STEVEN COHEN: One question. Is the mechanism available to us to actually vote an approval tonight with a condition that staff be satisfied, and then part of that condition is that it comes back to us? Because I would really like to hear Suzannah come to us and say, you know, I worked with them, they made some changes, and now I love it.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, then I think we ought to postpone and continue the
Hearing to a later date and let them work on it.

HUGH RUSSELL: There's a -- I mean I'm -- as being in the development business, and I'm an architect, I understand how time is important. So we took a move on Ames Street the last time which was to ask that the Department draft decision because we felt the basic features were correct so that when at the same time we would be seeing the response to the design questions, decision would sort of be ready to go and that would combine those two activities in one. That might be appropriate to do that here.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I think that would be fine. Is staff prepared to do that?

JEFF ROBERTS: Sure.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And I think staff had already gone through the various
findings in their memo that we would have to make, and so obviously if they were incorporated in the draft decision, we can review them when we get the new plan back.

STUART DASH: That's fine.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Stuart.

STUART DASH: And I wanted to add two things: One is for staff review of the garage exhaust, and for the tree pits work with Public Works on that.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Definitely.

Ahmed.

AHMED NUR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I just -- I agree with everything that's being said. This is a project that I congratulate the proponent for picking out this spot. This is not an easy spot to invest in the way you have, and considering the auto body and the redemption center and
the tow truck and the recycle tires and auto parts and everything else that's underneath the building as well as probably some abatements. So I appreciate that work and also working with the abutters and everyone else and coming to support means a lot. And so I'm all for it.

I also ask for you to consider Heather Hoffman's point, because this is the sort of headquarters for low income people that have nothing. And so if you got to go up to the absolute maximum profit and say I can only do 27 units as opposed to 30 units and I'll do that one unit, I ask you to go and do. This is a place to extend your arm, and if you can do one more, much appreciated.

And my last point, I'm glad that this is happening. This is the entrance to Somerville to last few properties waiting for
this development to take place, so that string of housing hopefully will follow as well as or an exit from Cambridge or entrance to Somerville. So this, this is a good location.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay.

Liza, is it possible to schedule a date for this to come back now or is that --

LIZA PADEN: No, I can do that. The 7th the Volpe discussion is the only item on that agenda. So the 21st or the 28th.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Would that give you enough time? Mr. Khalsa, would that give you and your clients enough time to work with staff?

JAI SINGH KHALSA: Is that April 21st and April 28th?

LIZA PADEN: April 21st and April
28th.

JAI SINGH KHALSA: I'll have to send somebody else from my office. I won't be there. This is adequate time to do the revisions.

LIZA PADEN: 21st?

H. THEODORE COHEN: What is scheduled for the 21st now?

JAI SINGH KHALSA: It's okay with me.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: The client can do the 21st.

IRAM FAROOQ: It would be, it would just be helpful for us to have enough time to pull it together, a decision, just given all of the other elements that are going on --

H. THEODORE COHEN: And Jeff is going to be out of town for a while?

IRAM FAROOQ: Right.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Does the 28th give you another time or would you rather go a week or two beyond that?

JEFF ROBERTS: So, I'll be on the spot here. The practice that we've employed in the past with these continuations when we're -- when there's additional work to be done, is we usually try to meet with the applicant first and go over the work plan of how long it's going to take. And, you know, we don't want to delay it too much. And I think in this case there's a limited set of issues to still review. So I imagine after meeting with the applicant, we can choose a date and still have enough time to run an advertisement of when the continued hearing will be.

H. THEODORE COHEN: If that's what staff would like, that's fine.
JEFF ROBERTS: That's my preference.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay.

That's fine. So then it will be continued to a date to be determined by staff and --

LIZA PADEN: I have to advertise it because we don't have a date certain.

H. THEODORE COHEN: It will be advertised again. Okay.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: One question for the Chair. Is public comment still considered open?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes, public comment is open, but when we come back, we will attempt to limit it only to changes that have been made. And I think most of it's design issues and not been too much public comment about that. But, yes, these days we do not settle in closing public comment until
the moment we're ready to vote on it and have a final discussion on it. Okay?

Thank you all.

I think we'll take a five minute break and then we will return to our next public hearing.

(A short recess was taken.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: All right, everyone take their seats, please.

LIZA PADEN: We're going to start the second hearing, please. Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: The hour of 8:30 having come and gone, we're ready for the hearing on Planning Board No. 243, a proposed Minor Amendment by Alexandria Real Estate Equities to reduce required parking for the residential parking at 270 Third Street and 161 First Street.

Are you making a presentation?
ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Sure.

JEFF ROBERTS: I'll start, Mr. Chair.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Mr. Hope, very successfully used the podium.

JEFF ROBERTS: Mr. Chair, before the applicant starts, I was just going to make some -- just a little bit of an unusual application, and they'll provide the details, but this is one of the cases where there's a provision that allows a reduction in the ratio for residential parking by Special Permit, and at the same time there is an existing PUD Special Permit which needs to be amended in order to grant the requested relief. So this is one of those where it's a, you know, a reduction in parking requires a Special Permit with one public hearing, an amendment to a PUD requires either no public
hearings for a Minor Amendment and just a written determination, or two public hearings for a Major Amendment. And this seemed to be one of those situations that fell kind of in between where it's appropriate to have the hearing on the Special Permit to reduce required parking, but since the proposal doesn't particularly change the concept of the PUD in terms of density, floor area ratio, language, height provision, and open space, etcetera, and it really is just a small change in the overall parking for the project that we felt it was appropriate to view it as a Special Permit but also a Minor Amendment which would require a determination on top of that Special Permit.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Good evening, Mr. Chairman. For the record, James Rafferty. I'm an attorney with the law firm
of Adams and Rafferty located at 675 Massachusetts Avenue appearing this evening on behalf of Alexandria Real Estate Equities. Joseph Maguire seated in the front row along with his colleague Michelle Lauer (phonetic). Traffic consults are here as well from VHB. Meghan Hewlett (phonetic) and her boss Susan Sloan-Rossiter maybe.

And this is a, as Mr. Roberts noted this would be a moment when Sue Clippinger could stand up and say I told you so. Because what happened in the life of this PUD, if you recall, as we were getting down to the final parking supply, she was really suggesting that Alexandria should look at a less than one per dwelling unit parking requirement for residential. Residential is a requirement in the rezoning that took place here this PUD-3A District had an obligation
to include housing. Candidly Alexandria was not a housing developer. I had an occasion to talk about Brian Murphy not that long ago about his skills as a negotiator. Brian and David Maher were the two co-chairs of the Ordinance Committee when we were going through the amendment that created the changes to this PUD district, and we had covered, we thought everything, and we had conceded and provided significant amounts of open space, the Foundry Building, and everything else. And there was one last thing Brian then told us, now we have to talk about affordable housing. And we said, well, we're not doing housing, we're doing life science buildings. Well, you're going to have to do some housing here, and you're going to have to do affordable housing and a component of moderate housing. So at 270
Third Street as a result of the changes that were created in the PUD-3C District we're required -- 3A, I'm sorry. Alexandria is required to provide certain amounts of housing before they can exceed a certain commercial threshold, and it's kind of tiered that way. It kind of follows an example that was used in the CRDD district where you can get so far with your commercial and then you have to provide the open space. So in this case there's a 200,000 square foot residential unit requirement and Alexandria could get so far and then they have to deliver the first 70,000 square feet. So the Board approved a design review a while ago, a residential building at 270 Third Street. In that building it has a shared parking garage, underground parking facility with 75-125 Binney Street. This is the stretch of Binney
between Third Street and Second Street which is -- contains a building that's nearly complete. I think we're hoping to get COs and close it out in the very near future. But when we were working out the parking supply in this district, Ms. Clippinger really suggested that we can take less than one per dwelling unit. And what we agreed -- we were uncertain about whether the market would support that and there was some anxiety on the part of Alexandria admittedly not housing developers whether that would make sense. And what Sue Clippinger recommended and it's contained in her memo, which is attached and appended as a condition of the PUD Special Permit, it actually says that when the residential building is ready for occupancy, that the applicant should examine existing parking demands for nearby
residential. And if study -- if analysis supports a reduction, then they should seek a Special Permit to do so. So the reason I think that this is really a no brainer as a Minor Amendment is that this isn't -- this was totally contemplated and in fact nearly required, if you look at the language of the PUD Special Permit for Alexandria to go through this exercise.

So we prepared the application, as noted by Mr. Roberts, pursuant to Section 6 of the Ordinance, 6.31 which does indeed allow for the reduction in parking. We didn't seek it in the initial Special Permit, PUD Special Permit because we weren't convinced at that time that that was appropriate, but we were required to do this analysis. So submitted with our application is the analysis done by Ms. Hewlett and VHB
and they examined a number of residential buildings in Eastern Cambridge to understand the parking demand. And one of the buildings you'll be very familiar with, 303 Third Street, because we were back to the Board not too long ago with Alexandria about changing the parking in that building to allow for some commercial parking while they're constructing 100 Binney Street. And I apologize for all the moving parts here. But if 303 Third Street, as you'll see in the VHB memo, when that analysis was completed back in the spring of last year, the results showed that of the 483 units only 275 vehicles were parked overnight resulting in a 0.57 percent parking ratio demand. Well, this data along with other data of the surrounding buildings certainly provides the support and rationale for what Ms. Clippinger
had challenged us to do, which is when the time comes to lease out this building, look around and see what other people are doing and if you see that the parking demand doesn't exist, then go and seek a Special Permit.

We had a little bit of a philosophical discussion as to whether an applicant can be required to seek a Special Permit for reduction, so it was a gentle suggestion. But like most things around here, the Traffic Department gets what it wants. So here we are and we're -- and if Sue were here, I'd tell her it's another one of those cases where Sue said, you know, I don't think you're going to need as much parking as you think you'll need. And we said okay. And to Mr. Maguire's credit and Alexandria's credit, they said okay, we'll look at it when the
time comes. The building is soon to be completed and it's a -- it's a handsome building, but more importantly it is the first building that I'm aware of under this new regimen in this PUD district that will also have moderate units. So the number of affordable and moderate units actually exceeds the number of market rate units in the building. So it's going to be a very interesting building.

So we're looking to go get that parking reduction to a 0.75 ratio. And there's support for that as you know in the K2 recommendations and some of the recent discussions around residential parking. So we're asking to -- for the Board to approve this Special Permit for the parking reduction for the reasons set forth in our supporting statement that's provided for under 6.31.
And the generic 6.31 requirement is also an element in that section that talks about the need to provide a residential parking study so that the VHB analysis that is called for in the PUD Special Permit is serving multiple purposes, because it's also a required element of the 6.31 Special Permit on the reduction of parking. And so as we indicated, the analysis clearly demonstrates that this, that the reduced supply is appropriate.

So for all of those reasons, we're asking that the Board allow not only in this building, but you'll recall in this Special Permit, there is a second residential building to come, the balance of the square footage, the remaining 120,000 square feet of housing will be located on First Street, at 161 First Street across from the back side of
River Court if you will. If you think about First Street just as it's approaching Binney Street. But the architect last week had a name for that building, I didn't -- it's an old mill building, but I didn't recognize that name. He called it the Lathem (phonetic) and something building, do you remember?

Yes, it's that mill building that's there. So that's going to be, that's going to the second residential building. And this parking reduction would apply for all residential uses within the PUD district. And these are all within the PUD Special Permit area, and these are those two buildings. The 0.75 reduction, it doesn't really change the footprint of the existing garage that's there. That will stay the same. What it will mean is that when they go
to build at 161, they'll be able to build fewer parking spaces there because this parking garage will accommodate the commercial tenants at 75-125 as well as the, as well as the residential building at 270. And as I said, I think Mr. Maguire tells me that both buildings are soon to be activated and used. So both the residential and the commercial building will work. It's a single, below grade garage that was approved as part of the design, a review and approval process for 75-125 Binney Street. So that garage has a connector underneath over to the residential building. So that's why we're here.

It is very much consistent with the plan that the Board approved, which is one of the test as to whether it's a Minor Amendment or a Major Amendment what's being sought
consistent with the plan approved, and I
would say not only is it consistent, it's all
but obligated that we be here and do this.
So I think it feels like a pretty
straightforward application, and we hope the
Board would be able to act upon it this
evening.

We have VHB here and Mr. Maguire is
here and I bet he has some things to add and
perhaps correct.

JOSEPH MAGUIRE: Just one thing.
It's 220,000 square feet of housing.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: And I said
200,000?

JOSEPH MAGUIRE: You said 200,000.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Which
translates to about 220 units, is that the
rough math?

JOSEPH MAGUIRE: It might be a few
more units.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay. Do any of the board members have any questions or comments right now?

(No Response.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: Before we open up to public hearing, I mean my perspective on it is that indeed it is a Minor Amendment. It was, I would say required by the PUD Special Permit. It was envisioned that this would come before the Board, and so I don't think it is in the category where it's a significant change that would be considered a Major Amendment.

So it looks like we're all in agreement with that.

Was there any sign-up sheet for the public?

LIZA PADEN: There was, but nobody
signed up.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Nobody signed up.

Is there anyone who wishes to speak?

(No Response.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: None appearing.

Does anyone have any questions or comments?

Catherine.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Well, I'll make a couple of quick comments first. I agree with Ted that this is clearly contemplated in the original Special Permit and, therefore, I'm comfortable that even though it touches changes in parking, it's -- it is a Minor Amendment. I do think it's good to see that the data is bearing out, that the 0.75 that has been recommended in K2 and generally supported by the Department and
this Board in the area is showing up in parking studies as being appropriate for the area. I think that's going to be especially true with that mix of moderate and low and market rate units that you're talking about. And I think the -- it's an excellent change and one I'm glad to see that is happening.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Anyone else?

I know that we did receive a memo from the director of Traffic and Parking who is in support of the proposal. Now he does make a recommendation at the end that Alexandria either assign 165 spaces for residential use only or demonstrate, as part of the project's yearly PTDM monitoring, than no more than 108 spaces are being used for commercial uses at any time. Plus the standard spaces for the building.

Is that acceptable to the proponent?
JOSEPH MAGUIRE: Yes.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Yes.

And that's just affirming what the, what the mathematical formula within the PUD allows for. We're not changing the amount of commercial GFA. So obviously the overall number of spaces will be reduced even though the commercial parking is unchanged as a result of this proposal.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Any other comments?

Then to authorize the request for Special Permit reduction in parking, we have to find that the lesser amount of parking will not cause excessive congestion, endanger public safety, substantially reduce parking availability for other uses, or otherwise adversely impact the neighborhood, or provide environmental or other benefits based upon
the review parking analysis provided by the applicant.

We have reviewed that analysis. We've gotten a memo from Traffic and Parking supporting the reduction.

Is there anyone who has any difficulty with making such a finding?

HUGH RUSSELL: Fine.

H. THEODORE COHEN: No?

And we've already concluded it's a Minor Amendment because it does not alter the PUD concept in terms of floor area ratio, etcetera, etcetera.

HUGH RUSSELL: Do we need a specific motion on that?

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Yes, I think we benefit from a motion on both. A motion to find that it's a Minor Amendment for the reasons set forth, and then a motion
to approve the Special Permit pursuant to 6.31 --

Catherine Preston Connolly: I can make the --

Attorney James Rafferty: 6.35.1.


Catherine Preston Connolly: Okay.

First I will move that the Board find that the change is a Minor Amendment to the PUD and that it does not alter the PUD concept and can move forward without a public hearing on the Minor Amendment.

H. Theodore Cohen: Is there a second for that?

Hugh Russell: (Raising hand.)

H. Theodore Cohen: Discussion?

(No Response.)

H. Theodore Cohen: All those in favor?
(Show of hands.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: It's unanimous.

And --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I then move that the Board make the finding that the lesser amount of parking will not cause excessive congestion, endanger public safety, substantially reduce parking availability for other uses or otherwise adversely impact the neighborhood or provide environmental or other benefits based on the review of parking analysis provided by the applicant and subject to the conditions as listed in the memo from Traffic and Parking.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Is there a second?

AHMED NUR: (Raising hand.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: Any comments?

HUGH RUSSELL: I have a comment. So
we voted it was a Minor Amendment. Do we have to vote to make it to allow that amendment as well as grant the Special Permit?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Jeff, does the Minor Amendment, do we need to make a motion on the determination?

JEFF ROBERTS: Probably good to have it on the record.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Could never have too many votes.

JEFF ROBERTS: The Board not only finds it as a Minor Amendment but approves it as a Minor Amendment.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: All right. We'll back up then.

So we're tabling that finding.

STEVEN COHEN: You can do that.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I move
that we approve the Minor Amendment.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Second?

AHMED NUR: (Raising hand.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: Any further comment?

(No Response.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: All those in favor?

(Show of hands.)

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: All right.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And the motion to grant the Special Permit?

HUGH RUSSELL: (Raising hand.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: All those in favor?

(Show of hands.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: Unanimous.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Thank you
very much.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Any other matter to come before the Board?

STEVEN COHEN: Mr. Chairman, if I may address the board for just one moment?

So apparently we have data, you know, establishing that the -- we need a 0.75 ratio parking. And I guess, you know, the occasional concern that I express is well when we get this kind of data, does that mean that really one quarter of the unit owners or tenants really don't have cars or does it mean that they just don't want to pay for parking and they're parking their car elsewhere in the neighborhood?

And I, I'm just -- is there any way that the methodology that's used to investigate these things to --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Traffic
and Parking is the right department to have that discussion with since they actually get the data on who has resident permits and whether or not there are permits associated with those addresses.

STEVEN COHEN: Yes. So they can actually correlate that.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: They can. And they have at times done so.

IRAM FAROOQ: And more recently they've also looked how many cars are registered in Cambridge. So I mean there could be some people who choose not to register their car in Cambridge, but then they wouldn't be able to park on the street because you couldn't get a permit if you don't have your car registered. So that analysis shows that across all of Cambridge there are 0.9 cars per household registered
in Cambridge, but what we find is that the ownership is much less when you go to the multi-family, particularly rental buildings as opposed to single-family residential where people might own multiple cars.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: So if you, if you look at the memo from VHB, which Mr. Rafferty has helpfully handed to me so I could find easily, they have actually looked here for the census data for this specific census track as to car ownership as reported to the census. Obviously they don't have access to the residential sticker database, but that's at least one measure and that's showing 0.65 cars per household unit in the census track. I think there are 30 census tracks in Cambridge, so it can get quite geographically specific.

STEVEN COHEN: We don't know whether
if they actually did a tracking of identities of tenants in a particular building or whether they have permits --

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Well, it's still America, we don't do that.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: And, again --

STEVEN COHEN: We're going in that direction, Jim.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: That's the information you want.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Again, this is, I mean this is --

STEVEN COHEN: I want it.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I mean they are talking about census data here, but that is --

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: But that's
the point it's census data. I mean --

STEVEN COHEN: It's, that's a sort of gross measure and then it's a good --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Right.

And, again --

STEVEN COHEN: It's a sort of gross measure. I mean it's data.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Again, Traffic and Parking has other data. There's no one from Traffic and Parking here tonight to even talk to you about what they could provide us.

STUART DASH: And, Steve, we're aware of this has been an issue and we're aware that it's an issue does it match up to information. And the actual work that you need to do to match up how many permits are purchased and how many people are parking in other buildings where we've come with data
saying there's data showing that we're very solid on that. Very solid thing makes us feel 0.75 is very solid because the data shows some less than points --

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: The Board heard the data on 10 Essex Street, we conducted our own census about parking in the Holmes Building, and we found it to be significantly low, and then Traffic matched that against vehicle registrations and they found I think the discrepancy was less than ten vehicles. So there were the utilization of that garage was around 50 percent with 70 -- no more 72 -- originally 72 and now over 90 units and three night surveys of the garage occupancy, management company shows 50 percent and there were only ten vehicles that Traffic could find where there were registered. So these people were clearly in
that category. They made an election not to pay for parking on the street. So the number supported the notion that to the extent that even existed it wasn't a material number.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Heather, do you have a quick comment?

HEATHER HOFFMAN: 303 Third Street that was before you not too long ago actually did that analysis for their tenants.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Right. And that was in our study. That's what we used.

HEATHER HOFFMAN: And that one, they got thanks because no one else had ever come to the neighborhood with actual numbers like that.

AHMED NUR: Watermark, Watermark, too, didn't we? The Watermark buildings?

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: I don't
know.

STEVEN COHEN: Thank you for indulging my skepticism on the subject.

HUGH RUSSELL: We have to talk about planning.

H. THEODORE COHEN: All right. It's 9:25. We are adjourned.

Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 9:25 p.m., the Planning Board Adjourned.)
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