



CITY OF CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

PLANNING BOARD

2011 MAR 22 P 1:24
CITY HALL ANNEX, 344 BROADWAY, CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

NOTICE OF DECISION

Case Number:	254
Address:	223, 225, 231 Concord Turnpike
Zoning:	Special District 4A, Parkway Overlay District, Floodplain Overlay District
Applicant:	CPC-T, L.P. 1102 Taylor Pond Lane Bedford, MA 01730
Owner:	CAM Cambridge Ventures, LLC, et al. 195 Concord Tpke Cambridge, MA 02140
Application Date:	December 20, 2010
Date of Planning Board Public Hearing:	January 18, 2011
Date of Planning Board Decision:	March 1, 2011
Date of Filing Planning Board Decision:	March 22, 2011

Application: To construct a 254,000 square-foot residential use with 227 dwelling units; seeking Project Review Special Permit (19.20), divergence from front yard green area open space requirements of the Parkway Overlay District (20.63.7), Flood Plain Overlay District Special Permit (20.70), increased height and waiver of yard setback requirements in Special District 4A (17.42), FAR waiver for above-ground parking in a flood plain (5.25.42)

Decision: **GRANTED, with conditions**

Appeals, if any, shall be made pursuant to Section 17 of Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 40A, and shall be filed within twenty (20) days after filing of the above referenced decision with the City Clerk. Copies of the complete decision and final plans, if applicable, are on file with the Community Development Department and the City Clerk.

Authorized Representative of the Planning Board: Jeff Roberts JCR

For further information concerning this decision, please contact Liza Paden at 617 349 4647, or lpaden@cambridgema.gov.

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED

Application Documents and Supporting Material

1. Special Permit Application submitted by the Applicant titled “Residences at Alewife,” dated December 20, 2010, including Volume I: Project Introduction, Special Permit Application Cover Sheet, Special Permit Application Project Summary, Narrative in Support of Special Permit Application, Noise Narrative, Photographs and Graphical Plans, Floodplain Elevation Certificate, Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design Memorandum and Checklist, Cambridge Conservation Commission Order of Conditions; Volume II: Traffic Impact Study and TIS Certification; also including 11x17 plans by CUBE3 Studio Architecture dated December 20, 2010 including Title Sheet, Existing Conditions Plan, Demolition Plan, Site Preparation Plan, Layout & Materials Plan, Grading & Drainage Plan, Utility Plan, Civil Details I, Civil Details Sheet II, Civil Details Sheet III, Civil Details IV, Garage Level Plan, Level One Plan, Typical Level Plan, Fourth Level Plan, Building Elevations (2 pages), Building Sections (2 pages); also including Appendix I: Dimensional Form for Residences at Alewife.
2. Slide Presentation by the Applicant to the Planning Board dated January 18, 2011.
3. Letter to the Planning Board from Richard McKinnon (on behalf of the Applicant) dated January 25, 2011.
4. Materials submitted by the Applicant titled “Residences at Alewife: ... Planning Board Responses,” dated February 22, 2011, including Volume I: Memorandum; Volume II: Exhibits.
5. Slide Presentation by the Applicant to the Planning Board dated March 1, 2011.

Other Documents

6. Certification of Receipt of Plans by Cambridge Traffic, Parking and Transportation Department, dated December 22, 2010.
7. Certification of Receipt of Plans by Cambridge Department of Public Works, dated December 22, 2010.
8. Certification of Receipt of Plans by Cambridge Water Department, dated December 22, 2010.
9. Memorandum to the Planning Board from Sue Clippinger, Director of Traffic, Parking and Transportation, dated January 18, 2011.
10. Letter to the Planning Board from E. Thomas Flynn dated February 4, 2011.

11. Memorandum to the Planning Board from the Cambridge Bicycle and Pedestrian Committees dated February 22, 2011.

FINDINGS

After review of the Application Documents and other documents submitted to the Planning Board, testimony given at the public hearing, and review and consideration of the applicable requirements and criteria set forth in the Zoning Ordinance with regard to the relief being sought, the Planning Board makes the following Findings:

1. Waiver of FAR Requirements for Above-Ground Parking in a Flood Plain (5.25.42)

The Board finds that the proposed project meets the applicable criteria to waive FAR requirements for above-ground parking in a flood plain, as set forth below.

(5.25.42) Where an above ground parking facility in a structure is proposed to be constructed (a) in the 100-year flood plain, identified as the Zone A flood hazard area (See Section 11.70), or as determined by credible evidence and calculations from a registered professional engineer or (b) on a contaminated site that is listed by the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection under the Massachusetts Contingency Plan (310 CMR 40.00) with a Release Tracking Number and has been tier classified, the Planning Board may grant a special permit to waive the limitations of this Section 5.25 so that the parking facility is not subject to the requirements in this Ordinance as to Floor Area Ratio provided only the minimum number of parking spaces required for the uses on the site are provided.

According to the Application Documents, the proposed project includes an above-ground parking facility to be constructed entirely within Flood Zone AE as detailed in the Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map Number 25017C0419E dated June 4, 2010. The project proposes establishing the minimum number of parking spaces required for the proposed uses, specifically, 227 parking spaces for a residential project with 227 dwelling units.

In granting such a special permit, the Planning Board shall find the following:

- (1) Where in a flood hazard area, the construction of a parking facility underground is (a) not technically feasible due to the requirements of the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act (M.G.L. ch. 131, s.40), (b) would require construction that would violate requirements or limitations of the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act, (c) would, in the view of the Cambridge Conservation Commission, seriously compromise the wetlands protection objectives of the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act, and (d) would result in costs of construction that are significantly greater than would otherwise be typical for the location were it not in a flood hazard area;*

According to the Application Documents, the construction of an underground parking facility would be infeasible given the existing site topography, the requirement to provide compensatory flood storage, and the requirements of the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act. The Cambridge Conservation Commission has approved the project as proposed in the Order of Conditions (DEP File Number 123-216) dated October 30, 2008 and recorded on November 21, 2008, and included in the Application Documents.

- (2) *Where the site is contaminated, the construction of a parking facility underground (a) would, in the opinion of a Licensed Site Professional, pose significant risks to public health or the environment through disturbance of hazardous materials and could not be reasonably mitigated in accordance with state and federal regulations, (b) require construction that is prohibited by state or federal regulations related to hazardous wastes, and (c) would result in costs of construction that would render the project financially unfeasible;*

Site contamination is not applicable to the proposed project.

- (3) *The above ground facility is designed so as to reduce its actual or perceived bulk through, among other possible techniques, limiting the number of parking spaces it contains, placement of portions of the facility below grade where feasible, or its location relative to actively occupied portions of the construction. Construction above grade is discouraged that would increase the amount of impervious area on the lot.*

The number of parking spaces proposed is limited to the minimum number required by zoning. The design of the parking facility is integrated into the design of the overall building, with appropriate façade design, planted areas to provide screening, and active building entrances at the ground level to mitigate the appearance of an at-grade parking structure. The proposed design maintains a 100-foot permeable, vegetated buffer between the parking structure and protected wetlands and provides all vehicular access at the front of the building, opposite from the wetlands.

2. Waiver of Height and Yard Requirements in Special District 4A (17.42)

(17.42.2) Yard Requirements. The minimum yards required in the Districts may be waived by the Planning Board by Special Permit. In no case, however, shall the front yard required in the Parkway Overlay District, Section 11.60, be waived.

The Board finds that it is appropriate to grant the requested waiver of yard setback requirements, as set forth below.

The required yard setbacks in Special District 4A are the same as the requirements of the Office 2 District, which calculates the required yard setbacks by formula depending on the height and façade length of a given side of the building. For the proposed project, the required setbacks would be 123.3 feet (front), 66.4 feet (left), 51 feet (right), and 123.3 feet

(rear). The project proposes a minimum 25-foot front yard setback, 18-foot left and right side yard setbacks, and 82-foot rear yard setback.

The Board finds that the proposed design is consistent with the intent of Special District 4A. The project will establish a 100-foot buffer from protected wetlands, restoring land to open space that is currently paved parking, and will limit the overall amount of impervious surface on the lot. The project also will provide adequate flood water retention, as described further below in these Findings, and will not have an adverse impact on abutters. The proposed front setback conforms to the minimum 25-foot requirement in the Parkway Overlay District.

(17.42.3) Maximum Height. The maximum height in the Districts shall be sixty (60) feet except that it may be increased to eight-five (85) feet for nonresidential uses and ninety (90) feet for residential uses, by special permit from the Planning Board. The special permit shall be granted where the applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Board that the additional height will better serve the objectives of this Section 17.40 to increase the amount of open space in the district and to limit the extent to which building and other hard surfaces cover the ground.

The Board finds that an increase to a maximum height of 70 feet, with a typical building height of 65 feet as illustrated in the Application Documents, will not result in any detriment to the project or to abutting uses. The proposed project, as designed, serves the objectives of Section 17.40 by increasing the amount of open space and minimizing the amount of impervious surfaces on the lot.

3. Divergence from Front Yard Green Area Open Space Requirements of the Parkway Overlay District (20.63.7)

(20.63.7) The development standards specified in this Section 20.60 shall apply to all development within the Parkway Overlay District not exempted by subsections 20.63.2, 20.63.3, and 20.63.4. Divergence from these standards may be allowed only by issuance of a special permit from the Planning Board as specified in Subsection 10.45. The Board may grant such a permit upon its determination that the development proposed will better serve the objectives of this Section 20.60 than if the standards were followed and that the criteria specified in Section 10.43 will be satisfied.

The proposed project diverges from the requirements for Front Yards set forth in Section 20.64.1 of the Zoning Ordinance, specifically, because space within the front yard setback is proposed to be used for visitor parking and for vehicular delivery and loading areas, not solely for green area open space, vehicular access and egress as required in 20.64.1. Approximately 36% of the front yard area will be paved and dedicated to vehicular access and parking, with the remaining 64% dedicated to green area open space.

The Board finds that the proposed design better serves the Parkway Overlay District objectives of Section 20.60, and moreover, better meets the objectives of the base Special District 4A. The reason for the proposed configuration is that it allows all access by

automotive vehicles to be restricted to the front side of the building, along Concord Turnpike, and prohibits automotive vehicle access (with the exception of emergency vehicles) at the rear portion of the building, where the lot abuts protected wetland and conservation areas. In addition, the proposed vehicular access will be subject to approval by the Massachusetts Department of Transportation, which has jurisdiction over Concord Turnpike (State Route 2), and the Applicant has indicated that the proposed design for vehicular access and egress has been developed in consultation with Department of Transportation officials.

4. Flood Plain Overlay District Special Permit (20.70)

(20.75) Criteria. The Planning Board shall grant a Special Permit for development in the Flood Plain Overlay District if the Board finds that such development has met all of the following criteria in addition to other criteria specified in Section 10.43:

The Board finds that the proposed project meets the criteria to grant a special permit for development in the Flood Plain Overlay District, as set forth immediately below, and meets the criteria specified in Section 10.43, as set forth further below in these Findings.

1. *No filling or other encroachment shall be allowed in Zone A areas or in the floodway which would impair the ability of these Special Flood Hazard Areas to carry and discharge flood waters, except where such activity is fully offset by stream improvements such as, but not limited to, flood water retention systems as allowed by applicable law.*

According to the Application Documents, the base-level floor slab has been designed at elevation 7.4 (NAVD 88), the elevation of the 100-year flood plain, placing the first floor of the building and garage parking level at approximately elevation 8.4 (NAVD 88). This design will allow floodwater from a 100-year event to flow beneath and around the building without entering the garage or lobby area. The proposed project has received from the Cambridge Conservation Commission an Order of Conditions (DEP File Number 123-216), as referenced above, approving the project as proposed and confirming that the project will not impair the ability of the applicable flood hazard areas to carry and discharge flood waters.

2. *Displacement of water retention capacity at one location shall be replaced in equal volume at another location on the same lot, on an abutting lot in the same ownership, on a noncontiguous lot in the same ownership, or in accordance with the following requirements.*

According to the Application Documents, the Applicant has analyzed the existing and proposed conditions of the site on a foot-by-foot incremental elevation basis, in accordance with the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection performance standards for work within a Bordering Land Subject to Flooding (BLSF), with the results of this analysis included in the approved Notice of Intent filed with the Cambridge Conservation Commission. The footprint of the existing building on the site was not included in this analysis because there is no existing flood storage within that area. The

proposed project will provide flood water retention in the form of compensatory flood storage on the site, including storage under the building. The flood water retention on the site will provide compensatory flood storage on a foot-by-foot incremental elevation basis, allowing flood waters to flow and recede unrestricted. Thereby, the displacement of existing water retention capacity on the site will be replaced with flood water retention capacity on site.

3. *All flood water retention systems shall be suitably designed and located so as not to cause any nuisance, hazard, or detriment to the occupants of the site or abutters. The Planning Board may require screening, or landscaping of flood water retention systems to create a safe, healthful, and pleasing environment.*

The proposed compensatory flood storage located underneath the proposed building will be screened appropriately to ensure that there will be no adverse impacts on building occupants or abutters.

4. *The proposed use shall comply in all respects with the provision of the underlying zoning district, provisions of the State Building Code, Wetlands Protection Act, and any other applicable laws.*

The proposed project will comply with applicable provisions of the Cambridge Zoning Ordinance, as set forth in these Findings, and will comply with the State Building Code. The Order of Conditions issued for the proposed project confirms that the project as proposed will comply with the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act.

5. *Applicants for development in the Alewife area shall be familiar with area-specific and general city-wide land use plans and policy objectives (e.g. Concord-Alewife Plan, A Report of the Concord Alewife Planning Study, November 2005; Toward a Sustainable Future, Cambridge Growth Policy, 1993, Update, 2007; Section 19.30 – Urban Design Objectives of this Zoning Ordinance) and shall demonstrate how their plan meets the spirit and intent of such documents in conjunction with the requirements of this Section 20.70 - Flood Plain Overlay District and Section 20.90 – Alewife Overlay Districts 1-6.*

The proposed project will comply with the land use plans and policy objectives of the districts in which it is located, as well as the general land use policies of the City of Cambridge, as set forth in these Findings. The proposed project is not located within the Concord-Alewife Study Area, and the specific regulations of the Alewife Overlay Districts do not apply.

6. *The requirement of Section 20.74(3) has been met.*

An analysis has been prepared by the BSC Group and submitted as part of the Notice of Intent to the Cambridge Conservation Commission detailing how compensatory flood storage will be provided to offset any increase in flood levels for events up to and including a 100-year flood. This Notice of Intent and all supplemental documents and plans are cited in the Order of Conditions (DEP File Number 123-216), referenced above.

5. Project Review Special Permit (19.20)

(19.25.1) Traffic Impact Findings. Where a Traffic Study is required as set forth in Section 19.24 (2) the Planning Board shall grant the special permit only if it finds that the project will have no substantial adverse impact on city traffic within the study area as analyzed in the Traffic Study. Substantial adverse impact on city traffic shall be measured by reference to the traffic impact indicators set forth in Section 19.25.11 below.

(19.25.11) Traffic Impact Indicators. In determining whether a proposal has substantial adverse impacts on city traffic the Planning Board shall apply the following indicators. When one or more of the indicators is exceeded, it will be indicative of potentially substantial adverse impact on city traffic. In making its findings, however, the Planning Board shall consider the mitigation efforts proposed, their anticipated effectiveness, and other supplemental information that identifies circumstances or actions that will result in a reduction in adverse traffic impacts. Such efforts and actions may include, but are not limited to, transportation demand management plans; roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities improvements; measures to reduce traffic on residential streets; and measures undertaken to improve safety for pedestrians and vehicles, particularly at intersections identified in the Traffic Study as having a history of high crash rates.

The indicators are: (1) Project vehicle trip generation weekdays and weekends for a twenty-four hour period and A. M. and P.M. peak vehicle trips generated; (2) Change in level of service at identified signalized intersections; (3) Increased volume of trips on residential streets; (4) Increase of length of vehicle queues at identified signalized intersections; and (5) Lack of sufficient pedestrian and bicycle facilities. The precise numerical values that will be deemed to indicate potentially substantial adverse impact for each of these indicators shall be adopted from time to time by the Planning Board in consultation with the TPTD, published and made available to all applicants.

The Applicant submitted a Transportation Impact Study for the proposed project to the Cambridge Traffic, Parking and Transportation Department, which was certified as complete and reliable on December 16, 2010, as indicated in a memorandum from Sue Clippinger, Director of Traffic, Parking and Transportation, dated January 18, 2011.

The Transportation Impact Study identified six instances where the Special Permit Transportation Criteria cited above were exceeded. Two instances resulted from an existing lack of handicap accessible conditions on the Concord Turnpike (State Route 2) sidewalk, and four instances resulted from the existing pedestrian level of service at the intersection of Alewife Brook Parkway at Cambridgepark Drive and Rindge Avenue. The Applicant has proposed improvements to the sidewalk on Concord Turnpike, subject to the approval of the Massachusetts Department of Transportation. The Applicant has not proposed, and the Traffic, Parking and Transportation Department does not recommend, any changes to be made at the intersection of Alewife Brook Parkway, Cambridgepark Drive and Rindge Avenue.

Therefore, the Board finds that the proposed project will not have a substantial adverse impact on city traffic within the study area, that the Applicant will undertake transportation improvements as recommended by the Traffic, Parking and Transportation Department, and that the Applicant will continue to coordinate with the Massachusetts Department of Transportation on issues related to pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular access and egress along Concord Turnpike.

(19.25.2) Urban Design Findings. The Planning Board shall grant the special permit only if it finds that the project is consistent with the urban design objectives of the city as set forth in Section 19.30. In making that determination the Board may be guided by or make reference to urban design guidelines or planning reports that may have been developed for specific areas of the city and shall apply the standards herein contained in a reasonable manner to nonprofit religious and educational organizations in light of the special circumstances applicable to nonprofit religious and educational activities.

The Board finds that the proposed project is consistent with the urban design objectives set forth in Section 19.30, as described below.

(19.31) New projects should be responsive to the existing or anticipated pattern of development.

The proposed project is in an area with few other developed uses. The largest use in the area is the Alewife Brook Reservation, a state-owned conservation land. The proposed project will not impact the reservation and will provide a vegetated buffer adjacent to protected wetlands. The other uses are a mix of office, hotel, and retail/recreation. The proposed development will add housing units that will contribute to the mix of uses in the area, consistent with the city's overall growth policies.

(19.32) Development should be pedestrian and bicycle-friendly, with a positive relationship to its surroundings.

The proposed project includes convenient pedestrian and bicycle connections to the adjacent Discovery Park property, which connects to the Alewife Reservation and Alewife MBTA station, which will be an attractive commuting option for future residents of the building, and will also provide connections to the several bikeways and pedestrian amenities that serve the Alewife district. Bicycle parking is provided within the building as required by zoning. While Concord Turnpike is currently not bicycle or pedestrian friendly, the project proposes to improve pedestrian and bicycle access along that edge, subject to approval by the Massachusetts Department of Transportation.

(19.33) The building and site design should mitigate adverse environmental impacts of a development upon its neighbors.

In adhering to the requirements of the Flood Plain Overlay District, and providing a vegetated buffer adjacent to protected wetlands, the proposed project mitigates the

potential adverse impact of a development adjacent to an environmentally sensitive area. In addition, the proposed building height, scale, mechanical systems, and loading operations are designed to not adversely impact the only abutting building, a hotel use. Outdoor lighting will be designed to provide safety while minimizing light impacts on adjacent open space. Stormwater Best Management Practices will be implemented, including Low Impact Development design features. The stormwater management system will provide attenuation of the peak runoff rates from the 2, 10, 25, and 100-year, 24-hour storm events.

(19.34) Projects should not overburden the City infrastructure services, including neighborhood roads, city water supply system, and sewer system.

According to the certified Transportation Impact Study provided for the proposed project, the project will not create a substantial additional burden on roads in the area. The Applicant has consulted with the Department of Public Works to ensure that sanitary sewer and drainage can be adequately provided to the site without adverse impacts on municipal wastewater systems, given improvements that are being undertaken as part of this and other projects in the area. The Applicant has also consulted with the Cambridge Water Department and has proposed improvements to ensure that water service can be provided to the site without adverse impacts on the municipal water system. The project is designed to include water-conserving plumbing features. The project will seek certification under the Energy Star Home program and the LEED-Homes rating system, demonstrating adherence to sustainable building standards.

(19.35) New construction should reinforce and enhance the complex urban aspects of Cambridge as it has developed historically.

Historically, the area in which the project is proposed has an urban character that is largely inconsistent with Cambridge's citywide development goals. Existing uses are auto-oriented due to their location along Concord Turnpike (State Route 2), with extensive paved area and surface parking. The existing site contains a long-vacant former nightclub use with no historic preservation value and a pattern of development that is not friendly to pedestrians or bicyclists and not sensitive to its adjacency to a protected wetland. The proposed project better reinforces the pattern of more recent development in the neighborhood, which is more sensitive to the adjacent wetlands, and aims to encourage pedestrian and bicycle travel with direct pathway connections to the Alewife MBTA station and other existing and planned amenities in the area.

(19.36) Expansion of the inventory of housing in the city is encouraged.

The project will add 227 units of housing, with a mix of studio, one-bedroom, and two-bedroom units. The project will provide permanently affordable housing units in compliance with the Inclusionary Housing requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

(19.37) Enhancement and expansion of open space amenities in the city should be incorporated into new development in the city.

The proposed project complements the nearby Alewife Reservation, a major open space conservation area, with the addition of vegetated open space with native plantings, a rain garden, and pedestrian/bicycle pathways at the rear of the building. Courtyard open space will be provided as an amenity for residents, and the new pathways will enhance connections to recreational open space pathways throughout the area. Play space for children, which does not currently exist in the area, will also be provided for residents of the project, subject to approval by the Cambridge Conservation Commission.

6. General Criteria for Issuance of a Special Permit (10.43)

The Planning Board finds that the project meets the general criteria for issuance of a special permit, as set forth below.

10.43 Criteria. Special permits will normally be granted where specific provisions of this Ordinance are met, except when particulars of the location or use, not generally true of the district or of the uses permitted in it, would cause granting of such permit to be to the detriment of the public interest because:

(a) It appears that requirements of this Ordinance cannot or will not be met, or

The requirements of the Cambridge Zoning Ordinance will be met, according to the Application Documents and the Findings made above.

(b) traffic generated or patterns of access or egress would cause congestion, hazard, or substantial change in established neighborhood character, or

Based on a review of the certified Transportation Impact Study, the traffic generated will not create any new congestion, hazard, or change in neighborhood character. Patterns of access and egress are designed in consultation with the Traffic, Parking and Transportation Department and are subject to the approval of the Massachusetts Department of Transportation.

(c) the continued operation of or the development of adjacent uses as permitted in the Zoning Ordinance would be adversely affected by the nature of the proposed use, or

The proposed housing use will not adversely affect the operation or development of adjacent uses, and is designed to minimize impacts on adjacent protected wetlands.

(d) nuisance or hazard would be created to the detriment of the health, safety and/or welfare of the occupant of the proposed use or the citizens of the City, or

The proposed housing use will not create a nuisance or hazard to occupants, abutters, or others.

(e) for other reasons, the proposed use would impair the integrity of the district or adjoining district, or otherwise derogate from the intent and purpose of this Ordinance, and

The proposed housing use is consistent with the intent and purpose of the Zoning Ordinance in this district, and will not impair the integrity of the district, and moreover will enhance the integrity of the district by redeveloping a long-vacant site.

(f) the new use or building construction is inconsistent with the Urban Design Objectives set forth in Section 19.30.

The proposed project is consistent with the urban design objectives set forth in Section 19.30, as described above in these Findings.

DECISION

Based on a review of the Application Documents, testimony given at the public hearings, and the above Findings, the Planning Board hereby GRANTS the requested Special Permits subject to the following conditions and limitations. Hereinafter, for purposes of this Decision, the Permittee shall mean the Applicant for the requested Special Permits and any successor or successors in interest.

1. All use, building construction, and site plan development shall be in substantial conformance with the Application Documents dated December 20, 2010, and all supplemental documents and information submitted by the Applicant to the Planning Board as referenced above. Appendix I summarizes the dimensional features of the project as approved.
2. The project shall be subject to continuing design review by the Community Development Department (CDD). Before issuance of each Building Permit for the project, CDD shall certify to the Superintendent of Buildings that the final plans submitted to secure the Building Permit are consistent with and meet all conditions of this Decision. As part of CDD's administrative review of the project, and prior to any certification to the Superintendent of Buildings, CDD may present any design changes made subsequent to this Decision to the Planning Board for its review and comment.
3. All authorized development shall abide by all applicable City of Cambridge Ordinances, including the Noise Ordinance (Chapter 8.16 of the City Municipal Code).
4. Throughout design development and construction, the project shall conform to the Green Building Requirements set forth in Section 22.20 of the Cambridge Zoning Ordinance.
5. The Permittee shall implement the recommendations set forth in the Memorandum to the Planning Board from Sue Clippinger, Director of Traffic, Parking and Transportation, dated January 18, 2011, which is attached to this Decision. The Permittee shall consult with appropriate City staff on the implementation of these measures. Prior to the issuance of an Occupancy Permit for development authorized by this Special Permit and subject to the

approval of the Massachusetts Department of Transportation and other applicable property owners, the Permittee shall complete the proposed Bicycle/Pedestrian Path to Discovery Park and the proposed Fire Lane in the manner described in the aforementioned memorandum. The Permittee shall commence implementation of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures in the manner described in the aforementioned memorandum within one year subsequent to the issuance of an Occupancy Permit for development authorized by this Special Permit, in regular consultation with the Traffic, Parking and Transportation Department.

6. The Permittee shall continue to consult with the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) on the detailed design and operation of access and egress along Concord Turnpike (Route 2), which is within MassDOT's jurisdiction. The Permittee is encouraged to seek improvements that will improve pedestrian safety and comfort on Concord Turnpike while conforming to the standards set by MassDOT. Notwithstanding any minor design modifications that may be required to ensure MassDOT approval, all final plans for access, egress, and travel within the site shall be in substantial conformance with the plans submitted to the Planning Board dated February 22, 2011. Any substantial deviation from these plans shall be presented to the Planning Board for review.
7. The Permittee shall seek approval from the Cambridge Conservation Commission to install an outdoor children's play area, as described to the Board on March 1, 2011, in a manner that is consistent with all applicable regulations and the City's conservation goals. Subject to Conservation Commission approval, such play area shall be installed prior to the issuance of an Occupancy Permit for development authorized by this Special Permit.
8. The Permittee shall continue to consult with CDD, through the continuing design review process set forth in Condition 2 of this Special Permit, to refine and improve the design of the proposed tower element at the northwest corner of the building. The final design of the tower shall be approved by CDD prior to certifying the building permit plans to the Superintendent of Buildings.

Voting in the affirmative to GRANT the Special Permits were Planning Board Members Tom Anninger, H. Theodore Cohen, Hugh Russell, Steven Winter, Pamela Winters, and Associate Member Ahmed Nur, appointed by the Chair to act on the case, constituting at least two thirds of the members of the Board, necessary to grant a special permit.

For the Planning Board,



Hugh Russell, Chair

A copy of this decision #254 shall be filed with the Office of the City Clerk. Appeals, if any, shall be made pursuant to Section 17, Chapter 40A, Massachusetts General Laws, and shall be filed within twenty (20) days after the date of such filing in the Office of the City Clerk.

ATTEST: A true and correct copy of the above decision filed with the Office of the City Clerk on March 22, 2011, by Jeff Roberts, authorized representative of the Cambridge Planning Board. All plans referred to in the decision have been filed with the City Clerk on said date.

Twenty (20) days have elapsed since the filing of the decision. No appeal has been filed.

DATE:

City Clerk of Cambridge

Appendix I: Approved Dimensional Chart

	Existing	Allowed or Required	Proposed	Permitted
Lot Area (sq ft)	173,909	5,000 min	173,909	No Change
Total GFA (sq ft)	~ 26,445	339,123 max	254,000	254,000
Residential Base	Not applicable	260,864 max	195,385	Consistent with Application Documents and applicable zoning requirements
Non-Residential Base	Not applicable	198,256 max	0	
Inclusionary Bonus	Not applicable	78,259 max	58,615	
<i>Exempt above-grade parking</i>	Not applicable	<i>Per 5.25.42</i>	<i>Floor area not specified</i>	
Total FAR	~ 0.13	1.95 max	1.46	Consistent with Application Documents and applicable zoning requirements
Residential Base	Not applicable	1.50 max	1.12	
Non-Residential Base	Not applicable	1.14 max	0	
Inclusionary Bonus	Not applicable	0.45 max	0.34	
Total Dwelling Units	0	333 max	227	227
Base Units	Not applicable	290 max	201	Consistent with Application Documents and applicable zoning requirements
Inclusionary Bonus Units	Not applicable	43 max	26	
Base Lot Area / Unit (sq ft)	Not applicable	600 min	865	
Total Lot Area / Unit (sq ft)	Not applicable	Not applicable	766	
Lot Width (ft)	~ 498	50 min	~ 498	No Change
Height (ft)	~ 22	55 → 85	70	Consistent with Application Documents
Front Setback (ft)	~ 24	~ 123.3	25 (at least)	
Side Setback – West (ft)	336	~ 51	18 (at least)	
Side Setback – East (ft)	0	~ 66.4	18 (at least)	
Rear Setback (ft)	172	~ 123.3	82 (at least)	
Private Open Space (as % of lot area)	42%	15%	71%	Consistent with Application Documents
Off-Street Parking Spaces	95	227 min	227	227
Handicapped Parking Spaces	Not applicable	7	7	Consistent with Application Documents, PTDM and other applicable requirements
Bicycle Spaces	Not applicable	114	114	
Loading Bays	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	



CITY OF CAMBRIDGE
Traffic, Parking and Transportation
344 Broadway
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

www.cambridgema.gov/traffic

Susan E. Clippinger, Director
Brad Gerratt, Deputy Director

Phone: (617) 349-4700
Fax: (617) 349-4747

MEMORANDUM

To: Cambridge Planning Board
From: Sue Clippinger, Director *Adam Druhan for Sue Clippinger*
Date: January 18, 2011
Re: Residences at Alewife (Faces site)

The Traffic, Parking & Transportation (TP&T) Department has reviewed the Transportation Impact Study (TIS) for the proposed Residences at Alewife project located at 223,225 and 231 Concord Turnpike by Criterion Development Partners. We certified the TIS as complete and reliable on December 16, 2010.

The proposed project consists of demolishing the existing vacant Faces building and constructing a 227 unit apartment building with 227 parking spaces including 7 visitor parking spaces. The project proposes 114 long-term bicycle parking spaces plus 12 short-term bicycle spaces. Access to the project will be provided through a right turn entrance driveway and egress through a right-turn only exit driveway from and to Route 2 eastbound.

The project will generate a total of:

- 1,226 daily vehicle trips, including 94 AM and 115 PM peak hour vehicle trips,
- 304 daily transit trips (24 AM/29 PM),
- 18 daily pedestrian trips (1AM/2PM),
- 48 daily bicycle trips (4 AM/5 PM).

The TIS indicated that there are six Planning Board Special Permit Transportation Criteria exceedences. Two exceedences resulted from an existing lack of handicap accessible conditions on the Route 2 sidewalk and four exceedences resulted in existing Pedestrian Level of Service (PLOS E) at the intersection of Alewife Brook Parkway at CambridgePark Drive and Rindge Avenue (the full summary is attached).

TP&T has the following recommendations for this project:

1. **Planning Board Exceedences.** The Alewife Brook Parkway at CambridgePark Drive and Rindge Avenue intersections are currently coordinated and exclusive for pedestrians; we do not recommend mitigation at this location. The 160/180 CambridgePark Drive development project has a special permit mitigation requirement to design and reconstruct the intersection of Alewife Brook Parkway/CambridgePark Drive. We believe existing Planning Board exceedences for the Route 2 sidewalk will be mitigated by the Project's proposed pedestrian/bicycle connection to Discover Park and sidewalk construction on the site's Route 2 frontage which must meet ADA/MAAB requirements.
2. **Access to Route 2.** Site Access is proposed from one curb cut off Route 2 eastbound and one curb cut onto Route 2 eastbound. The project will need a permit from the state (MassDot). It is possible that MassDOT will want changes to the plan as currently proposed.

- 3 **Pedestrian and Bicycle Connection to Discovery Park.** We strongly support the pedestrian/bicycle connection to Discovery Park. We believe it is a critical component of the project because it will help mitigate the Route 2 pedestrian and bicycle Planning Board exceedence by providing an alternative accessible connection to and from Alewife Station. We have the following comments and recommendations for the connection:
- a. The Proponent should provide proof of the connection in an agreement letter to the City and a legal agreement prior to the Building Permit.
 - b. The path should be wider than the proposed 8.5 feet. For the intended and anticipated use it should be 12' (10' absolute minimum).
 - c. The path should be straightened in the way people will travel, which may also make maintenance/snow clearing easier.
 - d. The proposed asphalt path should be lighted and plowed in winter and treated for ice; there should be a clear commitment to doing this as part of the special permit.
- 4 **Fire Lane.** We have the following comments on the proposed Fire Lane:
- a. The Fire Lane on the east side of the building (from the bike parking area in front of the building to the path connection to Discover Park) must be a paved, smooth, accessible surface, lighted, and cleared of snow and ice in the winter. This is because bicyclists will want to use the fire lane to go from the bicycle parking to access the path to Discovery Park (most of the bicycle parking is in the front of the building). Using the fire lane would be a more convenient route than going through the garage, (in some cases having to go through 4 doors).
- 5 **TDM Measures.** We recommend that the project implement the following TDM measures to encourage residents to choose non-SOV modes of transportation:
- a. Provide at least two car-sharing parking spaces on-site, if desired by a local car-share company. Car-share vehicles will be available for use by the general public as well as the residents.
 - b. Provide an MBTA Bike Charlie Card, with the value of a combined bus/subway pass (currently set at \$59, but that is subject to MBTA fare increases) to each adult member of a new household at the time the household moves in, but in any case not to exceed two Charlie Cards after the household has established residency.
 - c. Provide air pumps and other bike tools, such as "fix-it" stand in the bicycle storage areas.
 - d. Encourage car/vanpooling in coordination with MassRides, CRTMA or other private ride-matching organizations, such as ZimRide.
 - e. Become a member of a Transportation Management Association (TMA) if one is established in the area in the future.
 - f. Parking should be charged separately from the rent. The Permittee shall present the summary of on-site parking fees to the TP&T for review, and shall subsequently implement said fees, that will provide appropriate pricing to discourage on-street parking while balancing the desire to discourage auto ownership. The Permittee or any subsequent owner shall provide written update to TP&T whenever the fees are changed.
 - g. Establish a transportation information center located in an area that is central, visible, convenient, and equally accessible to all residents and visitors. The center will feature information on:
 - a. Available pedestrian and bicycle facilities in the vicinity of the project site. Include clear information about the connection for bicycles between the project and the bike paths such as, multi-use path to Alewife Station, Minuteman, Linear Park, Belmont path and Fresh Pond path.
 - b. MBTA maps, schedules, and fares.
 - c. Area shuttle map and schedule, if one exists.

- d. "Getting Around in Cambridge" map (available at the Cambridge Community Development office)
 - e. Bicycle parking.
 - f. Ride-matching.
 - g. Car-sharing.
 - h. Other pertinent transportation information.
- h. Designate a transportation coordinator (TC) for the site to manage the TDM program. The TC will also oversee the marketing and promotion of transportation alternatives to all residents at the site in a variety of ways:
- a. Posting information in a prominent location in the building and on the project's website and property newsletters.
 - b. Responding to individual requests for information in person and via phone and email.
 - c. Performing annual transportation surveys.
- i. The TC shall implement a monitoring program to include: annual monitoring of mode split, counts of parking space utilization and auto ownership. All surveys and counts shall be designed and conducted in a manner approved by CDD. Approval of the form of any survey instrument or monitoring method is required before issuance of the first Certificate of Occupancy. Monitoring and surveying shall begin when the occupancy of the building has reached ninety percent (90%) or within one year of the date of the first Certificate of Occupancy, whichever is sooner. If the Certificate of Occupancy is issued between September 1st and February 29th, the monitoring should take place during the months of September or October and be reported to the City no later than November 30. If the Certificate of Occupancy is issued between March 1st and August 31st, monitoring should take place during the months of April or May and be reported to the City no later than June 30.
- j. In addition, the TC will compile and distribute up-to-date information explaining all transportation options to all new residents as part of their New Resident Packet. The packets will contain information on both the range of options available and any building manager programs to support the use of these options. As discussed above, packets will also contain a Charlie Card with the value of a combined bus/subway pass (currently set at \$59, but that is subject to MBTA fare increases) for each adult member of a new household.
- k. The TC will be on-site during a minimum of 2 hours per week and will be available to residents via email and telephone. Email and phone information for the TC will be posted in the transportation information center.
- l. The TC will participate in any TC trainings offered by the City of Cambridge or local TMA and will oversee any City of Cambridge monitoring and reporting requirements.
- m. Investigate the use of the Discovery Park shuttle bus for residents of the proposed site.

Cc: Susan Glazer, Susanne Rasmussen, Stuart Dash, Roger Boothe, Les Barber, Liza Paden, Cara Seiderman, Stephanie Groll, CDD; Adam Shulman, TPT; Rich McKinnon; Heather Boujoulian, Criterion Development Partners; Scott Thornton, VAL.