

Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012

1

PLANNING BOARD FOR THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

GENERAL HEARING

Tuesday, August 21, 2012

7:00 p.m.

-- held at --

Second Floor Meeting Room, 344 Broadway

City Hall Annex -- McCusker Building

Cambridge, Massachusetts

Hugh Russell, Chair
William Tibbs, Member
Pamela Winters, Member
Steven Winter, Member
H. Theodore Cohen, Member
Ahmed Nur, Associate Member

Community Development Staff:

Susan Glazer
Jeff Roberts
Taha Jennings
Iram Farooq

-----REPORTERS, INC.-----

CAPTURING THE OFFICIAL RECORD

617.786.7783 - www.reportersinc.com

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p style="text-align: center;">P R O C E E D I N G S - - -</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: Good evening. This is a meeting of the Cambridge Planning Board. The first thing on our agenda is an update which I believe Susan will probably give us.</p> <p>SUSAN GLAZER: Good evening. This is our second meeting in August. So, in September we -- there are two meetings on the 4th and 11th. And on September 4th, we hope to continue the discussion of Kendall Square, although the specific natures of that discussion may depend on tonight's work by the Planning Board.</p> <p>On September 11th, there are two public hearings, one an infill housing project at 54 Cedar Street, and then a much larger housing development at 165 Cambridge Park Drive.</p> <p>As indicated by the calendar there won't</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">4</p> <p>October 2nd, the second part of the North Point public hearings will take place.</p> <p>So that's what we have at the moment.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Excellent. I think we can proceed. We adopt the transcripts.</p> <p>LIZA PADEN: August 7th we received the August 7th transcript and they have been certified.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Does anyone have any question about that?</p> <p>Do I have a motion to accept it?</p> <p>THEODORE COHEN: So moved.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: Ted moves to accept it. Is there a second?</p> <p>PAMELA WINTERS: Seconded.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: Pam. All those in favor? (Unanimous vote.)</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: We're all voting in favor.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">3</p> <p>be any meetings on the 18th or 25th.</p> <p>In October, there are a number of public hearings scheduled. One is a citizen petition by Susan Yano and other members of the Area Four Neighborhood.</p> <p>And then another to discuss private way off-street parking regulations.</p> <p>On October 6th -- and I should say that we perhaps will have the first of two hearings for a major amendment on North Point, the North Point Development, on October 2nd.</p> <p>We haven't received the application yet. That's why I say it will depend on whether they get the materials to us in time.</p> <p>And then on October 16th, is the refiled Trolley Square map discussion that really accompanied the North Mass Ave zoning.</p> <p>And then if all goes well, on</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <p>It's official.</p> <p>The next item on the agenda is a design review of the entrance landscaping for the Novartis project on Mass Ave, Windsor Street and several other streets, which I can't recall to mind at this instant.</p> <p>Osborn Street and State.</p> <p>PAMELA WINTERS: State Street and Albany Street and Windsor Street.</p> <p>JAMES RAFFERTY: Good evening, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Board. For the record, James Rafferty on behalf of the applicant, Novartis Institutes of Biomedical Research.</p> <p>I'm happy to be back this evening with a revision to the courtyard design proposal that was before the Board, I believe back in July.</p> <p>We heard a number of comments. The</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: center;">6</p> <p>majority of which were quite helpful and formed some later thinking about ways to approach this.</p> <p>And Ms. Solano worked with the architectural team, Mr. van Valkenburgh's office is charged with the landscape. But you will recall there are two different architects for each of the buildings, and this has been very much an integrated design approach.</p> <p>So, with the continued collaboration of Ms. Lint's office as well as Toshiko Mori's office, I think we've come up with some improvements that are consistent with what the Board had identified for us.</p> <p>So, Ms. Solano will walk through that.</p> <p>We did have an opportunity to meet with Community Development staff a few weeks ago to show them what we had.</p> <p>I think it's fair to say they were very</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">8</p> <p>entrance, the Windsor Street and the Osborn Street.</p> <p>And I would like to talk about the Windsor Street first which is here (<i>indicating</i>).</p> <p>The issue at hand, the last time that we were before you was whether or not we could look at the possibility of making the portion of the path that was outside, in other words, on the public side of the fence, a gradient that wouldn't require handrails.</p> <p>We were able to go one step beyond that, and in looking at the redesign of this path, we actually have an acceptable walkway, which is under five percent, so just under five percent, all way the from Windsor Street into the courtyard.</p> <p>So we have eliminated completely any language of ramps. So, no more rails, no more</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">7</p> <p>supportive and encouraging us in the direction we were pursuing.</p> <p>There's also an issue around operational access to the courtyard you'll recall.</p> <p>And Mr. Lockwood is here this evening to update the Board on a modification of what is the policy around access.</p> <p>So, Ms. Solano would be happy to walk you through the changes, and then Mr. Lockwood -- answer any questions and then Mr. Lockwood could give you a brief update as to what the contemplated access would be.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.</p> <p>LAURA SOLANO: Good evening. Nice to be here on this beautiful August night.</p> <p>We're gonna talk about three entrances into the property.</p> <p>Of course, the Massachusetts Avenue</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">9</p> <p>landings. It, in fact, meets the ADA code for an accessible path.</p> <p>In addition to that, sort've coming off of the way the design on Osborn Street works, there's an accessible path here, but for those who prefer to use it, there's also an insertion of a small set of steps that would allow you to go across. So, this is simply just a -- it's not many feet away. So it's a pretty integrated design, I think.</p> <p>So looking at the perspective for this, you can see now that these have absolutely no rails back here or back here (<i>indicating</i>). That's the position of having the gates opened. And then this is when the gates are closed (<i>indicating</i>).</p> <p>Then moving on to Osborn Street. Essentially that design remains as it is.</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">10</p> <p>There's an accessible path. There are handrails and steps up there (<i>indicating</i>).</p> <p>And I think that last time that we were here -- and that's in your package -- you wanted to see just what those steps looked like with the handrails in place.</p> <p>And so those -- the perspective that you have in your package shows that.</p> <p>We're intending on, as you can see from the perspective, a fairly light rail. So that it doesn't really -- it provides the necessary requirements for the code and for the ADA, but it isn't a particularly heavy design element.</p> <p>And then that's the perspective at night.</p> <p>Perhaps the most discussed portion was, of course, the entrance to Massachusetts Avenue. And we have done quite a bit of thinking about this, working with the architect, looking at</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">12</p> <p>Likewise, the size of it is not -- there's really nothing about it, to be honest, that may reflect Milynn's design.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: Except for the location.</p> <p>LAURA SOLANO: Excuse?</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: Except for the location.</p> <p>LAURA SOLANO: Except for the location.</p> <p>PAMELA WINTERS: I am glad that there's going to be a water fountain there. The sound of water and the water element there, I think that's great.</p> <p>LAURA SOLANO: It seemed like a logical place to put an activating element.</p> <p>But I think more critically the location the we placed the fence and the gates that go into the property. If you recall last time, the bed was configured just a little bit differently, but there was a fence and gate at this location,</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">11</p> <p>several design iterations, and really -- we went back to the beginning and we kinda allowed ourselves to rethink this area.</p> <p>So what we have come up with is we still have the plant bed that's in the front, we reconfigured that a little bit to make it feel as if it's more broadly based on Massachusetts Avenue. We've also eliminated, or I should say moved, the fountain that was at the base of this column. It's now been moved interior to the courtyard at what are two main entrances. So there's that entrance, which is right here (<i>indicating</i>) and there's another main entrance to that building as well.</p> <p>I can tell you the way we're illustrating that fountain is pure fiction at this moment simply because Mylar, the artist, has not had an opportunity to advance the design.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">13</p> <p>it went across a plant bed and then changed, it joined to these gates.</p> <p>What we've done is actually pushed it quite a bit back. So now, on this side, the fence and the gates align off of the building. They go through a plant bed so that, again, the fence is imbedded in the planting, they take a jog and create fence and gates there, and then take another jog through the plant bed and across.</p> <p>I will tell you that this gate and fence is in the same location as it was before, and so, these have actually been moved backside to the back. So, if you were just looking at this elevation, they go much deeper.</p> <p>I think the perspectives show that we no longer have that fence at the front, but, in fact, this piece of the plaza is acceptable to</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">14</p> <p>the public at all times.</p> <p>So again no fence there. You can see the fence pushed further back. The gates are open. It's a little hard because of the angle of this to see the gates open. But we do have a view that shows that a little bit better.</p> <p>So this is the dusk view of that closed gate and fence system, and then just so we ourselves and you, of course, could understand what the relocated gate and fence is going to look like, we have done a perspective that is taken from this location looking in that direction (<i>indicating</i>).</p> <p>So you can see that this is really pushed much further back, comes off of the wall. It allows easy access into that area.</p> <p>Then when it's closed, again, pushed a little further back, people can get in and out of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">16</p> <p>PAMELA WINTERS: And she approves?</p> <p>LAURA SOLANO: Absolutely.</p> <p>PAMELA WINTERS: Thank you.</p> <p>STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair?</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.</p> <p>STEVEN WINTER: Are we asking questions at this point?</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: Questions about the design.</p> <p>STEVEN WINTER: I would like to confirm that the area remains pedestrian permeable during the daytime?</p> <p>LAURA SOLANO: Yes, it does.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: Let's cover the second part, the operation.</p> <p>Should we go on to that?</p> <p>JEFF LOCKWOOD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">15</p> <p>that door easily.</p> <p>So I think we all agree that the -- even we ourselves, I think, believe that the circumstances for where that gate and fence occur really improve the entire entrance into the building. We feel it's much more complimentary to the public realm and the interface between the courtyard and public.</p> <p>The gate systems still work the same way. They collapse and they're completely open. So our goal is when these are open, that they will look the least prohibitive as possible. So we're imagining gates that kinda fold together in one place so they could have pretty free access as well as views into that courtyard.</p> <p>PAMELA WINTERS: Have the new landscape designs been run by Mylar, has she seen them?</p> <p>LAURA SOLANO: Yes, absolutely.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">17</p> <p>Based on certainly the feedback from this Board and from others and after much internal debate, there was a discussion about weekend access to the courtyard, and we've decided to initiate a policy that will have it open and accessible on the weekends from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., as a starting point, and see how that goes, and hopefully that will be successful and will be able to continue that policy throughout, but that's our intention at this point.</p> <p>THEODORE COHEN: Have the weekday hours changed at all?</p> <p>JEFF LOCKWOOD: No, the weekday hours will remain the same, 6 a.m. to 7 p.m.</p> <p>THEODORE COHEN: 7 to 7?</p> <p>JEFF LOCKWOOD: 6 a.m. to 7 p.m.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: I have a question for Laura.</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">18</p> <p>Looking at the perspective on Mass Avenue because the gates are in the open position --</p> <p>LAURA SOLANO: The new one or oblique view or the head-on view?</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: The head-on view.</p> <p>LAURA SOLANO: Okay.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: And I'm just observing that there are two places in the middle of that wide entry where you have fence posts and folded gate sections. Did you explore anyways around that so that could be wide open during the day?</p> <p>LAURA SOLANO: We did. We looked at the technical possibilities for that and discovered that the thicknesses of the members, et cetera, would get a little bigger, and we felt it was more important to keep the scale of the members down versus having those two areas because those areas are fairly wide. They're about -- they're</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">20</p> <p>a number of places that are not readily overseen from the street. And it's different than other kinds of open spaces.</p> <p>So I think that to me, is the ultimate reason why you need to fence it and you need close it when it's not been actively used.</p> <p>Bill?</p> <p>WILLIAM TIBBS: I think the Mass Ave fence is definitely an improvement. I think just moving it back and giving just more -- it gives it more inviting feel, but it also once the fence is closed, it doesn't feel like you were fencing it off right at the -- or close to the sidewalk line, which, given how much stuff you have in there, is not very inviting.</p> <p>So, I think moving that portion of the fence back is definitely an improvement, from my perspective, since I had a very big concern about</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">19</p> <p>about -- those are about 12 feet or so between each of them.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: That's a very wide access point.</p> <p>LAURA SOLANO: Right.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: So you could accomplish that if you made the whole access smaller, but that would not be what we're trying to do.</p> <p>LAURA SOLANO: Right.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: Yeah. My comment on all of this is that all of the issues that I wanted to see addressed have been addressed. I believe that seems very creative, and so while we might hope that some day somebody might take down all those fences. But, nevertheless, I think, you know, it's a very workable scheme and remains quite inviting when the gates are open.</p> <p>And the other thing is that this area has</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">21</p> <p>it being so close before.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: Pam?</p> <p>PAMELA WINTERS: Just a thought. I was wondering -- since Hugh brought up the issue of the two posts, I was just wondering if you had contemplated making them a little bit more decorative, or something that would resonate a little bit more with the sponge coral-like quality on the building and make it more of an art, you know, kind've -- not an art project, but something more artistic.</p> <p>I was just wondering if that thought had crossed your mind, or if it was possible even.</p> <p>LAURA SOLANO: Well, we had discussed different fence designs with both of the architects, and Mylar in particular, and sort've collectively concluded that the more benign the fence was, the better because like, you know, I</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">22</p> <p>think having anything that would compete with portions of the building, et cetera, was something that Mylar in particular didn't want to do.</p> <p>PAMELA WINTERS: Got it. Thank you.</p> <p>WILLIAM TIBBS: I'll follow up on that, just to sort've say when the fences are open, you're going to have to very -- even though there's only going to be one spot where you're not going to see the fences kinda lined up in the back, so I can see your thing. It looks like you would have a very thin profile there just on those two open posts. The same issue Hugh was something was would they consider keeping it wider. It seems like if you're going to have posts there, you might want to consider something that anchors it a little bit more. And you're gonna see the open fence.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">24</p> <p>hearing.</p> <p>STEVEN WINTER: I wanted to strongly concur with the comments you made that I think we have done a really good job here. I want to congratulate the proponent for coming forward with a very thoughtful and, I think, neighborly resolve to the issues. I think it's a real good example of a good corporate neighbor and a good dialogue at the city level and I think we're really on the right track here.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: What action do we need to take on this?</p> <p>AUDIENCE MEMBER: Would you permit a comment?</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: No.</p> <p>JEFF ROBERTS: I see folks looking at me. That's my fault for sitting here.</p> <p>The Special Permit decision, if I recall</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">23</p> <p>I assume it's going to be there and supported, and that's gonna be pretty noticeable even though it's not quite that noticeable in this one. So that's something to consider, but...</p> <p>And another thing I just wanted to say about the operations, I think -- I would suggest that you might want to be more flexible with your weekday hours, and it goes both ways in the winter. You actually might want to close the gates even a little earlier than 8:00, and just sort've -- so as you're looking at the weekend time seeing how that works, you might want to just not be quite so rigid. You can try that, but just begin to see how that works 'cuz I think it really does -- it can vary from season to season.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: This is not a public</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">25</p> <p>correctly, has a condition -- I believe Mr. Rafferty may add his note to this -- but has a condition stating that the Planning Board would review and approve the fence design, the courtyard fence design prior to issuance of any building permit for aboveground construction on the site. So this would be an action that the Planning Board would take prior to a building permit.</p> <p>JAMES RAFFERTY: That's correct. Condition 5 calls for review and approval by the Board prior to that. So we would hope that as a result of our two appearances here, there would be a determination by the Board that they approve this, and we could proceed.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: So would anyone like to offer a motion to approve?</p> <p>THEODORE COHEN: I move that we approve</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">26</p> <p>the courtyard fence design in accordance with the August 21, 2012 plans submitted to the Planning Board.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: Is there a second? Pam?</p> <p>Discussion on the motion? All those in favor? (Unanimous vote.)</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: Everybody's in favor. JAMES RAFFERTY: Thank you very much. HUGH RUSSELL: I would echo Steve's words of thanks and congratulations.</p> <p>JAMES RAFFERTY: I think last month's exercise was helpful in a number of levels to be able to report back to people in other jurisdictions that they needed to rethink a few things.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">28</p> <p>generally what the bicycle parking needs and issues were in the city and laying out some of the recommendations, the basic recommendations for zoning changes.</p> <p>Today, the purpose is to discuss and review the zoning language that was provided. This is a draft zoning language at this point, and our hope is that after taking some comments and going and doing some refining, and even over the past week I found a few formatting and typo issues that need to be corrected, that we would come back later, and, you know, depending on the number of questions and issues that we need to resolve, it could be sooner rather than later with a -- with final zoning language advanced as a petition from the Planning Board to the City Council.</p> <p>So just to recap, last time we talked</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">27</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: The next item on our agenda is discussion of the bicycle parking zoning, draft language.</p> <p>JEFF ROBERTS: Hi. Thank you. Jeff Roberts from CDD, and I'm just going to briefly run through some of the provisions of the bicycle parking zoning which we sent to the Planning Board as the draft zoning language. And I have additional copies available if anyone needs a copy.</p> <p>This is just to briefly go through. I added some visual aids to try to explain some of -- what the provisions are, but this should be very brief, and then, we'll go right to questions and discussion.</p> <p>So just to know where we are in the process, back on May 15 we were at the Planning Board, gave a presentation that covered more</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">29</p> <p>about a couple of things. One was the importance and the need to have a standardized set of design requirements for bicycle parking.</p> <p>It's something that up until about 2008 was somewhat scattered around the city.</p> <p>People were installing bicycle parking of various different types and varying degrees of usefulness.</p> <p>In 2008, the city published a city bicycle parking guide which has helped to create a set of standards, and the idea behind the zoning recommendations is to make the requirements more consistent and in line with those standards.</p> <p>In terms of the capacity of bicycle parking provided, we are relying on the city's goals of accommodating ten percent of trips by bicycle, which is a goal that's been part of the</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">30</p> <p>city's work for a long time now, and, in fact, is a big portion of the city's parking transportation management plans, which has been getting some attention lately in the press which we're happy about.</p> <p>And in terms of residential use of bicycle parking, some information that we've had showing that bicycle ownership is really much higher than what the zoning would suggest it should be.</p> <p>So, the -- oh, and I should mention, too, briefly, when I say "we," when I'm talking through these things, the team that's primarily been working on this has been myself, Adam Shulman from the Traffic and Parking and Transportation Department and Stephanie Groll, our PTDM officer who, I think, would be joining us, but maybe is not here, and Cara Seiderman who</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">32</p> <p>is a set of bicycle parking requirements that are subsumed within the requirements for a general auto parking, and we're sort've freeing those and making them their own set of requirements.</p> <p>And you can see from the size of it, we're beefing them up a little bit. But still -- but if you look at the overall just the size and scope of the requirements, it's still not as much as what the parking requirements are.</p> <p>The draft that I gave -- that was submitted to the Planning Board is about 50 pages of mostly the text of Article VI.</p> <p>If you reviewed it, you noticed that most of what is on those pages is basically a disambiguation of what we need by when we say parking that we mean just auto parking, and then when we want to refer to bicycle parking as well that we specifically say bicycle parking.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">31</p> <p>has been sort've the bicycle program's guru in CDD who is on vacation, so can't be here tonight.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: We have a city Bicycle Advisory Committee, is that correct?</p> <p>JEFF ROBERTS: Yes.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: And, in fact, they have been involved in this program?</p> <p>JEFF ROBERTS: They have. We have met with the Bicycle Committee. I'm not sure that they've communicated anything to the Planning Board yet at this point, but we imagine they'll be part of the process they go through.</p> <p>We have reviewed the recommendations with them and they have given their initial support.</p> <p>So the -- just to -- this is sort've my illustration of the thrust of the -- sort've the overall thrust of the zoning requirements which is to take what we have now in our zoning, which</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">33</p> <p>These are the substantive changes and I'll step through each of them very quickly.</p> <p>I will note there were some numbering issues, and I'll go back up -- I'll go back through and clear up some of those later.</p> <p>But mostly this is in Article VI with a couple of small changes to Article II which is the definitions portion as it relates to gross floor area and then Article V, which is the dimensional regulations for lots.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: In the handout you gave us, it basically starts on Page 41, is that correct?</p> <p>JEFF ROBERTS: That's where the major section of the bicycle parking begins.</p> <p>But I just wanted to touch on a couple things that are -- that come prior to that in Article VI because I think there's some relevance</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">34</p> <p>to it, and we skipped over them kinda quickly the last time.</p> <p>The first has to do with the applicability.</p> <p>In the current zoning for auto parking, the requirements are -- the requirements to provide parking are triggered when you have an increase in intensity of a use of at least 15 percent.</p> <p>What that essentially means if you increase your gross floor area by more than 15 percent, if you increase your units, if it's residential dwelling units, or if you change -- have a change of use where you're going from a one type of intensity of use to another type of intensity of use where you would trigger it at that sort've 15 percentage increase.</p> <p>The distinction to make here is that when</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">36</p> <p>residential parking for that entire use.</p> <p>So it's not really a complete departure, but it's somewhat different from what the requirements are now.</p> <p>And the plan requirements that are laid out in that zoning language, when you see a parking plan, which typically looks something like this, then you can try to find where the bike parking is. It's not always easy to tell, and it's also when you're looking at something at a parking plan scale, you can't really tell whether the bike parking meets the standards that are laid out.</p> <p>So just making it clear there that when you show your bike parking, you have to show a zoomed-in view at a one to ten scale at a minimum.</p> <p>So now getting into the main part of the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">35</p> <p>we're talking about bicycle requirements, our proposal is that unlike auto parking where you -- what you're required to provide is just the increase of intensity on that lot, that we would require that you provide bicycle parking for the entire extent of the use that's there.</p> <p>And the idea behind that is, of course, bicycle parking, something that hasn't been typically provided to the extent that we would like to see it provided, and that those increases in intensity are opportunities to make sure that we're providing adequate amounts of bicycle parking.</p> <p>In terms of the auto parking, there actually is one exception to this rule that's on the Board, which is that -- and when you convert from a nonresidential use to a residential use, you're required to provide the minimum amount of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">37</p> <p>changes in establishing a new section of bicycle parking, just to note the purpose briefly, that it's important to establish what the purpose is because as we go through the language and see that there is some stances where there's some relief that may be -- that may be provided by the Planning Board, it all starts with this basic notion of why we're requiring bicycle parking, and it really ties very closely into the overall purpose of Article VI, which actually states straight out that the purpose is to reduce reliance on automobile travel and to promote walking and cycling as other options.</p> <p>So, we talked the last time about the types of bicycle parking. I won't go into that two much.</p> <p>There's long-term which is for residents, employees, people who are parking all day or</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">38</p> <p>overnight, and then short-term, which is for people who are making short trips.</p> <p>The standards we set for long-term parking is you would have to be secure, which means it's indoors, or it could be in the form of lockers or sheds -- I'll talk a little bit more about that later -- and that it has to be within the building that it's serving or within 200 feet of a separate structure.</p> <p>We actually got comments about some projects, such as the new dormitory that was actually a renovated dormitory at MIT where they added large bicycle parking because they couldn't accommodate within the building. They added a shed next door, and even though it's right next door, it still requires that 200 feet distance to get from one to the other.</p> <p>So, we thought that was a reasonable</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">40</p> <p>can be used more broadly by the general public, which we know is a big need.</p> <p>We talked at the last time quite a bit about the design and layout standards. We kept the text fairly simple, and we will continue to rely on the bicycle parking guide as an illustration that kinda much like our design guidelines in other aspects of development help to show developers what they're -- and designers what they're supposed to do.</p> <p>This is, again, just to note without such standards, you could get any of the -- the way bicycle racks are marketed and sold, you could end up with any variety of things which may look great, but don't really meet the needs that they need to serve.</p> <p>And in terms of access standards, we -- in this sense, we have tried to make the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">39</p> <p>outside distance for long-term parking.</p> <p>For short-term parking on the other hand, we want it to be closer to the building entrances and so, we set a 50-foot standard. But also provided that if you have more than eight spaces within a particular area, which you could visualize is for bicycle parking racks next to each other, then you could be more flexible outside of that into where you provide it.</p> <p>And also there's a provision in there which is a little bit interesting, which is that if you provided on the -- if there's bicycle parking provided on the public sidewalk, that you can meet your requirements in that way, which provides the option and some encouragement for uses that are right on the sidewalk to participate with the city and partner with the city to provide appropriate bicycle racks that</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">41</p> <p>standards very close to applicable standards for handicap accessibility. We didn't tie it specifically to those requirements, but we figured by -- first of all, it's a similar type of approach because you're trying to, you know, be able to take something, automobiles, into a secure -- into a location without having to go through any impediments.</p> <p>But also because it's something that we think designers would be able to fulfill and be familiar with how to fulfill them.</p> <p>The no obstructions issue is one that does come up frequently, and I have a little illustration. I wouldn't say who -- where this -- I won't say where any of these plans came from, but can you spot the problem of that bicycle parking?</p> <p>But that's the kind of thing that's been</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">42</p> <p>often seen when you aren't specific in the zoning about what the requirements should be.</p> <p>Again, the last time we talked at some length about the required quantities of bicycle parking and that's all laid out in a chart.</p> <p>Just in terms of formatting the approach we took was to separate long-term and short-term and to put uses in different categories based on the impacts for employee use and for visitor use.</p> <p>And so, if you go through the table of requirements that are in Article VI, it's a little bit of kind've a matching game where you -- for a particular type of use you may be in one category for long-term and in a different category for short-term, but when you put them together, you're doing -- you're providing what's needed for that particular category of use.</p> <p>And then I wanted to explain the section</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">44</p> <p>necessarily want people to be doing too much detrimental things to the building or lot, we provide some additional flexibility that you can provide your short-term parking somewhere else on the lot, or, again, you can enter into the agreement with the city and you can try to find a place where that parking will serve the overall public if it can't be accommodated right in front, if you have too narrow of a sidewalk, for instance.</p> <p>So then as we get to the Special Permit provision, it's intended to be able to waive any of the specific requirements, and the purpose of it is to provide an opportunity for a proponent to essentially make a case for why they're providing an equal or a better alternative to what the zoning would provide.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(Ahmed Nur enters Board meeting.)</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">43</p> <p>about modification by Special Permit, but I wanted to first note that there's some flexibility built in without a Special Permit, including a provision to convert some long-term bicycle parking to short-term. Again, acknowledging the need for bicycle parking that's available to the general public and providing some flexibility.</p> <p>So if there's an opportunity to provide a little bit more, that we can allow that and also to provide some flexibility -- I will talk about this a little later -- for instance, such as small residential projects where you might want a little bit of flexibility to locate bicycle parking in a different place.</p> <p>Also, for existing buildings, if you imagine that an existing building on a lot may have particular constraints that you don't</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">45</p> <p>And the reason for including this -- we're always going to be ask the question, you know, why do you set these standards if you're then going to provide an opportunity to waive all of them?</p> <p>We realized that bicycle parking is something that continues to evolve even over recent years thinking about how best to provide bike parking to a community has gone through changes, and we can't always anticipate where it's going to be in the future.</p> <p>So we -- so some of the possibilities for where this type of provision could come into play is where you have new technologies being introduced.</p> <p>The pictures here are meant to show -- the one on the left is a promotional photo of some stackers which are -- which have been</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">46</p> <p>proposed even recently as an alternative for bicycle parking.</p> <p>The image and the reality aren't always the same. We have -- I think that's some interns -- I don't know if they're still here -- but they're interns from the city who actually are trying to demonstrate some of these technologies. And I think in some cases finding that they're really not as convenient as they ought to be to be able to serve bicycle users.</p> <p>And so it's important to be able to -- I think the key is important to be able to look at those closely, if it's new technology, to be able to test it, and to be able to provide the opportunity for someone who is looking at an entire area of parking to provide an integrated type of master plan for bicycle parking.</p> <p>So, for instance, a university campus or</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">48</p> <p>except?</p> <p>And the intent, I think, is to take all the facilities that are meant exclusively for bicycle parking.</p> <p>And an important aspect of that is making sure that on the plan when a proponent is submitting the plan, that they have clearly illustrated and demarcated what space is for bicycle parking.</p> <p>And the city staff in administering the regulations and issuing building permits can approve that.</p> <p>Now I just want to address a few of the questions that came up at the last meeting.</p> <p>One of the questions was: How will this affect single family, two-family townhouses, which currently aren't subject to bicycle parking requirements, but would be subject to bicycle</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">47</p> <p>large PUD development might want to propose to the Planning Board that they have an alternative for how they're going to arrange their bicycle parking, which may not meet all the exact requirements, but may still meet the spirit and the intent of the regulations.</p> <p>The exemption pieces are mainly meant to be clarifications. It's already the practice and it's incorporated into the zoning that bicycle parking shouldn't interfere with your gross floor area limitations or setback limitations.</p> <p>In the application of those requirements, there have been some issues. When you think about bicycle parking spaces, there's often a question of how much -- if you're exempting it from gross floor area, what do you exactly exempt? Do you only draw a line around the space where the bike can park and that's all that is</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">49</p> <p>requirements. They would only be subject to new construction? And they would only be subject for -- just to point out -- new construction. So if you're building new single-family, two-family or townhouses or if you're expanding by some significant margin, 15 percent or more, there are a number of possibilities for how you could accommodate a small number of parking -- bicycle parking spaces on a lot. There are lockers and sheds you can buy. There are lockers you can buy. Consumer products that are easy to get and easy to assemble. You can design your own.</p> <p>These are pictures I actually just kind've took off the web. The one on the top is sort've -- I think it's from Portland, and there's a designer there who specializes in some extent in building bicycle sheds that fit in with site design and can incorporate into the</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">50</p> <p>architecture of a building.</p> <p>You could also have enclosures that are actually built into your building. We've had some people, I think, float the idea of having -- if building new buildings having a small porch on the back that would be an enclosure for a bicycle.</p> <p>And we in terms of the flexibility that I mentioned before, if you're really constrained and there's really no way you could have a structure, you wouldn't want to have a structure, you would still have an opportunity, as long as you're putting the bicycle parking behind some sort of protected area that's covered and behind the building, you can -- we allow the possibility to leave it outside in that case, but it still has to be able to be secured.</p> <p>There's another question about what the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">52</p> <p>regulations is by providing a convenient and attractive to users place to store bicycles. You avoid some of the complications, you know, for instance, if there's no bicycle parking provided having bikes chained up to front porches, having bikes -- and, as you mentioned, if someone who owns their own home might feel like it's appropriate to have a place for, you know, to bring their bikes inside certainly in the basement. But if it's a rental property making sure that some -- a new tenant moving in would have a place to store their bicycle and wouldn't have to drag it upstairs and hang it from the wall or anything like that, which is the case in my apartment.</p> <p>PAMELA WINTERS: Jeff, I have a question about the sheds.</p> <p>So supposing you have like a six-foot</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">51</p> <p>aesthetic impacts are? I think here --</p> <p>WILLIAM TIBBS: Excuse me, Jeff. Can we go back to that one?</p> <p>JEFF ROBERTS: Yeah.</p> <p>WILLIAM TIBBS: What about inside the house if you're a single family?</p> <p>JEFF ROBERTS: Well, you could provide it inside the house.</p> <p>WILLIAM TIBBS: Like most people they have their bike inside somewhere, not necessarily in a rack or anything. It might be against the wall in a basement along -- like in my house, it's right in the stair hallway. That's okay.</p> <p>JEFF ROBERTS: It is okay. I don't think we're trying to prohibit folks from storing their bikes wherever they like.</p> <p>The philosophy here is that -- the philosophy, I think, throughout all these</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">53</p> <p>fence, you know, separating your property from the neighbor's property and they put a shed in there that's higher than six feet, because we have this in our -- we can't see it because we have greenery -- but wouldn't that look kinda ugly, like I'm thinking about, you know, what's the one down in the right-hand corner?</p> <p>Aesthetically it would block off some of the sky or some of the -- whatever. Is there a -- does it have to come to the top of the fence, or like, how does that work? Is there any restrictions?</p> <p>JEFF ROBERTS: Yeah. Typically the sheds are not particularly tall. I don't imagine they would have to be more than six feet --</p> <p>PAMELA WINTERS: Okay.</p> <p>JEFF ROBERTS: -- in order to accommodate a bicycle. That's something I didn't look at</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">54</p> <p>particularly in the zoning, but we could try to look at ways in the zoning language to make sure that that doesn't create an issue.</p> <p>PAMELA WINTERS: Yeah, because it does in our back -- in one of the units in our backyard, but, again, we can't see it because there's greenery there, but possibly the abutting neighbor could, and I was just wondering about that.</p> <p>If you have a six-foot fence and you have a, you know, 12-foot, you know, storage facility, it might be aesthetically not too pleasing to see this thing sticking up.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>THEODORE COHEN: I have to say the whole aspect of this as it relates to single, two- and three-family houses is very troublesome to me.</p> <p>It seems like we're -- and I can</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">56</p> <p>even if we're talking about new construction, it has to be designed that way.</p> <p>But I know on my block I would say nobody's got a backyard that would accept a locker like that without taking up a huge amount of the open space.</p> <p>Which also leads to the question: Does the space that a locker takes up gets to be counted in mandatory open space or does it get eliminated from it?</p> <p>I just find with regard to existing residential properties -- and I understand you got a question about tenants and rental properties and what they're going to do, but, I think for homeowners, it's very really onerous.</p> <p>And I would also like to go back and maybe you haven't gotten there fully, talking about what is going to happen on large retail</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">55</p> <p>understand perhaps with new construction, but if we're talking about a 15 percent expansion with regard to every non-conforming single, two-family and three-family house in the city, we're making an incredible, I think, very onerous requirement on homeowners who, I think, should be allowed to decide what they want to do with their own backyards, side yards or with their own bicycles however many they may have.</p> <p>It seems to me nowhere else do we mandate what has to be on a residential property with the possible exception of an automobile parking spot, which in most cases is just a flat area.</p> <p>Now you're mandating that people have lockers, or they have some or other enclosed area, and it just seems to me -- you know, I have no problem with talking about it in, you know, large complexes, large buildings, and perhaps,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">57</p> <p>blocks, you know, any block in Central Square, you know, is there just going to be bike parking lockers and other facilities just proliferating all over the sidewalk?</p> <p>I just don't quite understand how it's going to work in very congested areas.</p> <p>I understand the purpose of it, and I applaud the purpose of it, you know, but I think the aesthetics is not something that can just be pushed aside very easily because we talk about aesthetics here all the time. We talked about a fence for one building for two nights, and now we're talking now about the huge proliferation of structures all over the city.</p> <p>And that's -- with new construction, I can see it can be mandated and dealt with, but for a lot of the things that are already in existence, I'm having a great deal of difficulty</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">58</p> <p>understanding how it's going to function and what it's going to look like.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: I don't disagree with the observation, but I do think that a lot of our dwelling units in the city are residential apartments and two- and three-family houses.</p> <p>And there probably are many instances where it doesn't require too much difficulty to actually accommodate them.</p> <p>And there's some places I am thinking of like some of the blocks in East Cambridge where the houses are built right on the street, and there may be a side yard or not be a side yard. So you could have an indoor space, but you might have to take it in your front door, carry it through the house and try to get it down what is undoubtedly a really tiny, twisted stair to get to the basement.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">60</p> <p>riding, but we're also putting bikes and bike riders into a preferred status, it seems to me, above not only automobiles, which may be that wants to be a policy, but also it seems to me over pedestrians that requiring parking to be -- you know, say, within 200 feet and 150 feet, people who take the T frequently are walking four or five or six blocks to get from their house to the T.</p> <p>And where we're in areas where automobiles are not required to have parking right in front or part of their building, the drivers are walking some distance to their automobiles.</p> <p>And so, it just seems to me mandating such proximity for every situation may not necessarily be the appropriate solution.</p> <p>You know, obviously this committee has</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">59</p> <p>So how do you try to meet the intent of the ordinance which is to facilitate bicycle parking in these kinds of instances without creating burdens that are impossible or difficult to do?</p> <p>Now, the ordinary way we do that here is we have a permit process that says essentially come to the Board, show your best effort, and we can say we agree, that's the best that can be done.</p> <p>Now, I don't particularly want to spend our evenings here reviewing Special Permits for bicycle parking, or to put that on the Zoning Board particularly.</p> <p>So it's an interesting problem.</p> <p>THEODORE COHEN: Yeah, I understand that. And it also seems to me that we're, to a certain extent, you know -- yes, we're promoting bike</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">61</p> <p>been working on this a long time and I'm not saying I know what the answer is. I clearly don't know what the answer is. But I'm just having a lot of difficulty with some of these provisions.</p> <p>You know, the goal is certainly admirable, but it just seems to me that it's -- sometimes it's a very draconian solution and would impact very harshly on a lot of people.</p> <p>And if you do the Special Permit route, then it's going to impact very harshly upon this Board, or the creation of some bicycle parking board or something.</p> <p>It just seems to me there might be some other solution.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: I think some of those solutions have to be in the cooperative realm with the city. I mean, I -- I bicycle everyday</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">62</p> <p>that I don't have to drive out of the city, which is two-thirds of the time, and I work in a place where there's really very adequate bicycle parking, Harvard Square. I tend to park two or three blocks from my office usually.</p> <p>And part of it's, you know, like, well, I have an old bicycle lock and it takes a long time to get it, so I stop at Au bon Pain, run in and get a breakfast sandwich, and there's almost always parking along that because Adams provided there's a lot of parking spaces along that street with the meters and the signs.</p> <p>And I, as a member of the Zoning Board, 35 years ago required Au bon Pain to install 20 bike racks on the side of Holyoke Center, which figured out five years how to do. They're usually full by the time I get there. I mean, so I walk two blocks. I don't find it actually as a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">64</p> <p>And, you know, as a user, I would like to see those racks, so...</p> <p>WILLIAM TIBBS: Hugh?</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.</p> <p>WILLIAM TIBBS: Again, I just want to say I agree with Ted. I think there's a line between trying to make it more convenient for people to use their bikes, and mandating things that kinda require that people have them.</p> <p>I actually think that is part of the discussion -- that's the core of the discussion is where those lines -- I think a lot of things that you're suggesting, Jeff, are good ideas.</p> <p>And I think, Ted, you hit it right on the nose. I think when you get to single family and two families and maybe even triple deckers which are kind've of -- are pretty comparable dominant form, we have a lot of things where that's kinda</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">63</p> <p>big burden to walk those two blocks.</p> <p>Right now and it was actually provided me, somehow indirectly, I believe, with a beautiful orange bicycle rack with a huge flashing sign on it that is right across the street from my office that says "BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION UNDERWAY SEEK ALTERNATE ROUTES."</p> <p>But it's actually designed so you can put quite a few bicycles on it. I'm the only person who dares do that.</p> <p>But still, if somebody in my building fell under purviews of this ordinance where there really isn't sidewalk space to do bike racks, but they can start looking across the street, they can look around the corner. There are places in the public realm that don't have bicycle racks that could have bicycle racks that are possibly within 200 feet.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">65</p> <p>break is, you know, the three family, it's a break because of that because they tend to be a lot of them still can be, at least owner occupied or maybe if you say -- we have to understand where those things are. Because you want to make it convenient for the Hughs of the world to use their bike and get around. Even me if I have a bike, make sure I use it, but, I think, when you're starting to mandate single family that you have to provide a bike space. If you have a single-family house I think that's beginning to cross the line and I think that's where -- you know, as part of the discourse, that's where those lines and even where we'd obviously -- and there may be some existing situations particularly in very dense areas of the city where we have to figure out a way to have language and get some flexibility there.</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">66</p> <p>But I just want to say that I do have a similar concern of Ted's, but I'm not quite sure where the boundaries are for my concern.</p> <p>PAMELA WINTERS: Jeff, were you considering these for single-family homes, also, these sheds? Were you considering these for single-family homes?</p> <p>JEFF ROBERTS: Yes. If I could sort've jump back into the discussion. This is a great conversation because I think -- I mean, in maps with a lot of what we have been discussing in our group, and just to take sort've many steps back just into the basics of zoning, you know, the purpose -- the purpose of having these regulations is for people to comply, to make sure that people can comply with them, and that they can do them -- and do so in a way that is sensible and that provides bike parking. That's</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">68</p> <p>thinking about what are we providing in terms of bicycle parking. You have to do it for auto parking, and we think that you should be able to do that for bicycle parking too.</p> <p>And in terms of the aesthetics, to kinda segue back into my next slide, I think the -- to refocus the concern a little bit that we have been really trying to address with the aesthetics sort've not, you know, what the aesthetic impact of having bike parking versus not having bike parking in the sense of the structure or the rack itself.</p> <p>But when you don't have the appropriate amount of bike parking, where do the bicycles go and what is the alternative?</p> <p>So, I think the approach, and I think to get to your question at little bit of how, you know, what happens in a large retail block,</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">67</p> <p>he point of it.</p> <p>The purpose is not to do something that is going to restrict someone's ability to do a project or something that's gonna force -- simply force a property owner to have to seek relief or seek a variance to do it. So that's why --</p> <p>As I was describing here, I think, maybe I don't -- I think visually I was trying to be a little fancy with what's being shown.</p> <p>I mean, typically what bicycle parking for a three-unit building could constitute is simply, you know, three bike racks out in the back of the building that are under a cover of some sort.</p> <p>The idea is just that -- the principle is really that we want all developers -- and this is, you know, again for starting at an increase of intensity of at least 15 percent, to be</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">69</p> <p>retail area, we want to provide flexibility so that if someone has a -- is opening a restaurant where there used to be some, you know, sort've less impact, maybe it was an office and then they're opening a restaurant and they need to provide some outdoor bike racks, they can talk to the city and say, you know, "Can we fit bike racks within 50 feet of our entrance? And if the sidewalk doesn't really accommodate that, can we do something else? Can we put it down the block someplace or around the corner, in a place that's going to be more generally beneficial to everybody in the city?"</p> <p>I think that what you said, Bill, is very -- this is also very much on our minds of what is the -- what is that balance between mandating something that's going to be onerous, and then at what point do you just say, "Well, you know, we</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">70</p> <p>care about bike parking, but at this point we're not really gonna push it."</p> <p>And I think that the approach we've taken at least for now is to say let's -- before we tell somebody "You don't have to worry about bike parking," let's see how far we can get down that road and between making it a little easier, if we can we make it a little bit easier, and, you know, how easy can we make it for someone to comply with bicycle parking requirements before it becomes -- before it loses all of its meaning or its effect.</p> <p>So, I think all very good questions. And our proposal is meant to address those and maybe we need to provide a little bit more information as to how we would see it play out.</p> <p>You're right that not everyone -- I got a phone call, kinda surprising, several weeks ago</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">72</p> <p>that doesn't necessarily mean that every household has a bike. Typically, it's more along the lines of two per -- half the households have two or more. That's kind've how it works.</p> <p>THEODORE COHEN: If I can go back to the -- you didn't have to change the slide -- to the lockers on the sheds. Are those going to be considered structures under the bylaw which you're going to have to comply with setback requirements?</p> <p>JEFF ROBERTS: Well, that's the approach I mentioned previously that they would be exempt from setback requirements.</p> <p>I think, as Pam raised, the issue of the height of the structures, we could work on that a little bit more to make sure that they -- if they're exempt, they would be designed in such a way they wouldn't be obtrusive over a fence.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">71</p> <p>from someone that said they were designing a bike rack for -- or a bike shed for their, I think, three-unit or four-unit house, and wanted to know, you know, how do you go about -- what are the regulations for that and how do you go about doing it? And that was sort've intriguing to me, but certainly not everyone, particularly a homeowner is not necessarily going to want to be told that they have to put a bicycle parking rack, a storage unit, an accessible storage unit when they feel like they could just put it anywhere they like.</p> <p>PAMELA WINTERS: Also, if they don't own a bike.</p> <p>JEFF ROBERTS: Right. And that's the -- again, part of the balance. We know that from surveys in the city, we know that there's more than one bicycle per household in the city, but</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">73</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: I think there would also have to be a limitation on the exempt size per bicycle because somebody might label something a bike shed that you could have a pool table in.</p> <p>JEFF ROBERTS: Yeah. I mean, that's something in the zoning. Obviously not everything is particularly easy to enforce. But that's one of the provisions in the bicycle parking is that bicycle parking is only for bicycle parking. You can't build a pool house or something and say, "Well, there's a bike rack in there, so it's all bike parking."</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: I guess a great deal of bicycle parking is going to be involved in new buildings or additions or things that are governed, basically by issuing building permits.</p> <p>So creating a very flexible structure</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">74</p> <p>doesn't work very well with the Building Department.</p> <p>They clear things, they can measure their application against, does it meet it or not, or does this department advising the department on whether they could grant a permit or not.</p> <p>JEFF ROBERTS: Right that's correct. And that's part of the plan requirements is specifying at what level do you need to have -- do you go -- do you submit a plan for your bicycle parking that's reviewed by the Traffic -- by ISD and the Traffic Department and approved and the -- and you're right, that's part of the importance of having a clear and specific set of standards, and while we want to allow flexibility, we do it in such a way where we say "If you can't do this, then you can do that, if you can't do that, then you can do that."</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">76</p> <p>conditions upon moving in is I would build them a bike shed in my backyard. And I didn't want to build a bike shed in my backyard, so I managed to build a ramp besides the stair in the bunker going down the basement and put a different kind of lock on the door, so it was easy to operate and I put a light switch for the basement lights over next to that door, and then they said, "Okay, that's workable."</p> <p>So, I thought it was interesting, one, this was a requirement that these people made, they were going to have bicycles and they were going to be inside something and be covered. This is like 12 years ago.</p> <p>But there was an approach which I believe would meet the requirements of the ordinance until there's a heading requirement because the basement is pretty low.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">75</p> <p>But in each case we're being specific about what it says you can and can't do. So that people don't get caught looking for a building permit in a vague interpretation of what the rules are.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: I mean, it would be -- in part to respond to Ted's request for the one-, two- and three-family structures you might wish to basically say "Do your best job in providing bicycle parking, and if you can get it covered, that's good, and if can be, you know -- here are some guidelines that represent what good bicycle parking is and try to get there." You can't write -- if you write that, then the Building Department will be unhappy.</p> <p>Even though that may be the sensible line, I have to tell a little story. I had a couple roommates in my house, and one of their</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">77</p> <p>JEFF ROBERTS: I think it would be the ramp -- the slope of the ramp too and we could thing about ways to provide some of that level of flexibility.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: I mean, I remember, was it in the Novartis Street project where they had a basically step ramp going down in the basement for bicycles?</p> <p>JEFF ROBERTS: And we had proposed that that could be allowed essentially as a secondary access that you would still -- if you have a building with an elevator, you might provide access through an elevator that -- in an elevator meeting modern size requirements would fit a bicycle, but if you, for one reason, thought it was more convenient to have bicycles come in a different way, you could have a stairway ramp to do that.</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">78</p> <p>I think your point certainly illustrates the idea that the important thing is to really make sure that people -- that designers who are working on projects, on significant projects are really thinking about this up front, that they're thinking they're, you know, not designing a whole project and then realizing we need to stick bicycle parking somewhere, that they know this is something expected in Cambridge and needs to be integrated into their plans.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: Well, and owners, too.</p> <p>JEFF ROBERTS: Yes.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: Because I have done several projects which were all design, and the owner said, "Oh, we want to go lead certification and under lead you need 15 percent parking, but the standards are pretty weak, and they didn't want to give up parking spaces to the bicycles</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">80</p> <p>side.</p> <p>So I'm looking at it from the pedestrian on the street who is walking, looking at it from the person who has a bike, and then -- do you know what I mean?</p> <p>You can almost fasten it because I think if you don't do that, you could easily have an outcome that you didn't anticipate, but I think if you did that, I think it would -- it's a good way of looking at it and just to say "Okay. Here's a set, look at each kind've stakeholder or constituency and see is it doing what we want to do, which I still think is much more something about encouragement and convenience as opposed to mandating that something happened. You want to encourage people to use their bikes and make it convenient for them do so.</p> <p>And the mandates are only there for</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">79</p> <p>because of, you know, sometimes regulatory commitments are already made.</p> <p>So we have bicycle racks that don't meet Cambridge standard and are less convenient.</p> <p>WILLIAM TIBBS: I think one way to do this as we kind've look at the whole package is begin to just look at it from different aspects. You mentioned one which is developers who are doing large projects regardless whether they're commercial or residential. And does it do what you want to do there. And then you can look -- I think it was Tom, and I think it was the last time we talked about this. I'm not sure it was related to an example you gave or even if it were related to a real project we had. But I remember he made a comment about it. I'm not sure I would want to see all the bicycle racks near the main entrance to something. Maybe it should be on the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">81</p> <p>certain constituencies and certain types of projects in my mind.</p> <p>AHMED NUR: Hugh? I'm sorry. I had a quick question. Should we let Jeff finish? I wanted to comment, but I'm not sure -- should we let him finish before I comment because I was a little late. I apologize.</p> <p>WILLIAM TIBBS: You were close to be finished?</p> <p>JEFF ROBERTS: I'm effectively finished, and this is the last question that came up at the last -- maybe this kind've put things in sort've the broader perspective.</p> <p>I recall I think the first question that came out at the last meeting was is this enough? Is it really enough? We looked last time at what the trends are of bicycle use in the city. And they're really increasing in a very interesting</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">82</p> <p>way because clearly they can't increase exponentially, you know, forever. There will be sort of a leveling off at some point and we don't really know what that point is going to be.</p> <p>So, I think sort've of the response to that overall issue is that the regulations that are proposed are based on pretty clear city goals for the amount of trips that would be accommodated by bicycle, and that the structure of the zoning as it's proposed is meant to allow opportunities that, as over time, in ten years if we look back at the same kind of range of data and see that it's pointing in a different direction, that there would be opportunities to then adjust it in a pretty straightforward way.</p> <p>So that was the end of my presentation.</p> <p>AHMED NUR: I wanted to, along with my colleagues, say I'm also supportive of this,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">84</p> <p>It's extremely encouraging if you want to promote bicycle usage it's not just the storage, but what we really need is to attack bicycle safety on the main roads. I see many places where bicycles are treated by the city, in this case, pedestrian. They have no rights. In a way they're treated as a motorcycle and, yet, if there's a strike line there -- but when they come to a stop, for example in Inman Square, where Hampshire is, if you're headed on Cambridge Street or Hampshire Street and the light's at a stop, pedestrian cross perpendicular to the road. Where do the bikes go through? They're at the mercy of the vehicles by the fire station. They have to wait in the middle of all this stuff to take a left.</p> <p>JFK and Memorial Drive is another one. There used to be a little beeping thing where the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">83</p> <p>however, I think that William made the comment, owner occupied apartment, house versus a rental house. I think it's probably useful to reinforce the zoning for the rental because I can't see a lot of landlords saying "Oh, yeah, you can bring your bike into my basement." Normally they'll say "Stay away from the basement, I don't want any bikes, I don't want any dogs, I don't want any cats. I don't like it up front and just sort've keep the bikes away."</p> <p>So it would be nice if the rental units can be mandated to have a shed of somehow or at least allow the renters to bring their bikes into the property.</p> <p>I also think that here in Cambridge, we're an academy town and city, and I think the -- I see he usage going up. I see it all the time.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">85</p> <p>bicycles can cross diagonal. Now they have to literally get off their bike to watch the pedestrians from hitting them and they're walking 90 degrees and 90 degrees to cross just like everyone else.</p> <p>If we want to promote bicycles, we have to do it all the way. That's really all I wanted to say.</p> <p>JEFF ROBERTS: I wanted to respond just quickly to the points I meant to get around, too, about ownership versus rental. It's a complex issue, and our zoning generally doesn't make a distinction.</p> <p>If you have a housing unit whether it's owner or rental, partly acknowledging any ownership unit could become a rental unit, at any point a rental unit could become an ownership unit, so, certainly it's an issue and one that is</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">86</p> <p>a little complicated to address through zoning requirements, but it's something that we can investigate more to see if there's any possibility to look at how that could be structured.</p> <p>AHMED NUR: Oh, I forget, didn't really read it through yet, but lighting, safety. Was there any lighting requirement in the zoning when it gets dark out with the door --</p> <p>JEFF ROBERTS: We didn't include any lighting requirements. I think that's one that maybe does fall -- falls a little bit into that area that we were discussing at what point does it become too prescriptive.</p> <p>I think if -- I think we could make a general statement that lighting is -- that lit areas are preferred for certain types of parking, for short-term parking, short-term bicycle</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">88</p> <p>JEFF ROBERTS: That's also true.</p> <p>PAMELA WINTERS: Jeff, is there a rule that bicyclists have to have lights on their bicycles because that -- I have seen so many bicyclists almost getting whacked when people open up their cars doors at night. Do you know anything about that? That's probably getting off the track a little bit, isn't it?</p> <p>JEFF ROBERTS: I'm looking at the cyclists in the audience.</p> <p>AUDIENCE MEMBER: There's a required front light and a required rear reflector.</p> <p>PAMELA WINTERS: Very good. Thank you, sir.</p> <p>STEVEN WINTER: Jeff, I do want to thank you for the way you're bringing these things forward. I want you to know that it's my perspective that we all own this together. You,</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">87</p> <p>parking, but there's also conflicts with the illumination requirements that say that -- that restrict whether you can have light trespassing into different areas.</p> <p>I think lighting -- we had a discussion on lighting, I think, several months ago, and we have -- we looked at it in the department a little bit and found it can be a -- in an urban area, it can be a very difficult issue to clearly piece out, and that it's something that is often just simply needs to be addressed on a site by site, case by case basis, talking to neighbors, figuring out, you know, where you can put a light, where you can shine a light so that it provides the needed effect while minimizing intrusion.</p> <p>AHMED NUR: I did forget people have lights on their helmets.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">89</p> <p>us, everyone here. It's not as if you're presenting something that is your idea that you want to see happen. I really do appreciate that good spirit. I think it's a dialogue and it will continue for awhile, but I'm very appreciative of the work that you have done here.</p> <p>I just had a couple comments to make. One, I don't know if we can solve this problem now, but I think we ought t book mark it in some way and that is, there's a lot of use now of these larger, heavier more industrial-type bikes that tow children or groceries or cargo of some sort, and you can't really take them upstairs even if you had a place inside to put them.</p> <p>So I think it's just something to put on the agenda to think about.</p> <p>If there's a proliferation of these more so than we see, how can we respond and how can we</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">90</p> <p>provide some kind of parking that accommodates these larger heavier bikes?</p> <p>Also, I want to make sure that we have a way to let proponents know that the city's willing to work with them on bike parking. I'm not sure how we would do that. But if it's in our zoning, that's okay and that's good, but I'm not sure that would immediately tell every developer or every proponent that the city is really able, willing, happy to go meet with these people and find ways to solve the bike parking problem. I think that's a marketing issue and something that we can address in some way.</p> <p>I really like the modification by Special Permit, equal or better. This is a built-in learning curve and I think it's just terrific. We're liable to learn an awful lot of unintended outcomes from this one and from people who -- you</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">92</p> <p>of methodology somewhere in the world with all the umbrella planning groups that we have out there that exists to project urban bicycle ridership based on like a regression theory-type of a statistical projection. There has got to be something out there that maybe can help us understand when are we gonna see that plateau and what is the demand whether it's looking at other cities or actually finding a methodology to say this has been our ridership for the past ten years, let's project it for the next ten years to see where we're going just so we're not shooting in the dark.</p> <p>And I wanted to close by saying that I think that I don't know where in the city all of the stuff is coordinated, all the bicycle issues. I know we have a terrific Bicycle Committee. I listen to their stuff when they come forward.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">91</p> <p>know, none of us know what all of us know.</p> <p>I also think there's an issue here by incentivizing this somehow. I don't quite know what that is, but if we're going to make demands on people and we're going to be making demands on people in some way, and I think that the end result is a good result and I'm all for it. I'm there. But is there a way that the city can somehow incentivize, whether it's a tax incentivize or something that incentivizes people to do this?</p> <p>You know, certainly municipalities are in pretty tough shape. But, frankly, Cambridge is doing okay right now. It could be that we're in a position to do something like that, to provide some -- even if it's just a small thing, a tax incentive, I think is a good idea.</p> <p>I think that there's got to be some kind</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">93</p> <p>They're very thoughtful. It's very good stuff.</p> <p>But the zoning is just one part of a larger rubric of stuff that -- safety on the streets, the bicycles riding on sidewalks in business districts. Apparently they're allowed to ride on sidewalks in residential districts, but not in business districts. If we're really going to have this proliferation of bicycles and we think it's good and we want to accommodate it and we want to see it happening, there has to be some coordinating factor that has all these things in mind, the public safety stuff, the zoning stuff, the streetscape stuff, the bicycle lane stuff, all of those things. I'm not sure we have that yet.</p> <p>So I'm just putting that out there for us to be thinking about.</p> <p>Can you respond to that?</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">94</p> <p>JEFF ROBERTS: The last point or all of them?</p> <p>STEVEN WINTER: Yes.</p> <p>JEFF ROBERTS: I can give a brief response of all the points, but in terms of coordination, the Community Development Department has a robust bicycle program which involves a variety of -- it deals with bicycle safety, it deals with marketing and outreach, deals with bicycle parking, not only on this side of things, the requirements and looking at what developers are providing, but also providing public bicycle racks.</p> <p>I should point out that these are not in any way intended to relieve the city of responsibilities to provide bicycle parking. I believe it's that the city approved, and I don't remember what -- I've asked what it was and now I</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">96</p> <p>PTDM is a majority component and Stephanie can comment. She's over there.</p> <p>It's a major component of the program, making sure that employers are offering incentives to encourage nonauto modes of travel to their employees.</p> <p>So, I would say if there is a coordinating effort, it's really being done at the Environmental and Transportation Division in CDD, but certainly reaches out to other departments as well Traffic and Parking and police and other areas of the departments, Public Works.</p> <p>PAMELA WINTERS: Jeff, so the other night I was down in the South End having dinner, and I forget the name of the street, but it's the one that Menton is on, M-E-N-T-O-N.</p> <p>But, anyway, driving down the street, I</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">95</p> <p>don't remember. The next three years -- \$50,000 a year for the next three years.</p> <p>AUDIENCE MEMBER: Five years.</p> <p>JEFF ROBERTS: Five years to install public bicycle racks. The Project City Smart program has been an active effort by the city on, I think, a neighborhood by neighborhood level. I believe it's going to go citywide at some point maybe. It is citywide now.</p> <p>I'm looking at some of the staff that deal with this more directly than I do. But that's a program that really puts a lot of materials into the -- it does a lot of outreach and puts a lot of materials in the hands of Cambridge residents educating them about how to bicycle in the city, where to find resources, and how to do it safely and really encourage people to do it.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">97</p> <p>noticed there was a whole bunch of bicycles that looked all the same and there were sort've like zip cars, but they were zip cars for bicycles. I was wondering if you have looked into that at all for the city?</p> <p>JEFF ROBERTS: That's call the Hubway Program. We have a Hubway Program. They were installed a couple weeks ago in -- a few weeks ago in Cambridge. They installed the first hubway systems. Yes, it's a bicycle sharing system. It's membership based. You can get a bicycle at one location and ride it to another location and park it there for free if it's within 30 minutes.</p> <p>PAMELA WINTERS: Do you know -- where are they in Cambridge, do you know offhand or not?</p> <p>JEFF ROBERTS: Where have I seen them? City Hall, Central Square. There's a lot of</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">98</p> <p>them. I think we probably have a map of them somewhere.</p> <p>PAMELA WINTERS: Great. I thought it was a great idea. Thanks.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: Well, the notion of this integrated bicycle system is, of course -- is the point you have to have all pieces for it to be effective.</p> <p>And the city, probably more than any other city in the country, is aware of that and working on that.</p> <p>My particular pet peeve is trying to get from my office in Harvard Square up Kirkland Street today.</p> <p>You used to be able to ride, go up on the sidewalk and go around Harvard Yard, across the top of the underpass at Kirkland Street. That's torn up so you can't do that.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">100</p> <p>back to Prescott, over to Cambridge, then to Sumner Road and then -- or you could go up Mass Avenue, you have to dip through the beginning of the underpass, to, I think, Everett Street, over to Oxford, come back down, and, you know, both of those are -- those trips are pretty inconvenient and also the bike lane on Mount Auburn Street is full of potholes and I really try to avoid that at all costs.</p> <p>So there's some very difficult places in the city. The difficulty is the underpass itself which is very bicycle unfriendly. But, you know, the friendly thing -- don't go on the sidewalk or don't go through the underpass anymore, we're not gonna help you out.</p> <p>And I'm not sure Harvard wants the sign saying BICYCLE THROUGH THE YARD.</p> <p>STEVEN WINTER: I know, in fact, they say</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">99</p> <p>Then a sign showed up at the underpass itself that says "NO BICYCLES THROUGH THE UNDERPASS."</p> <p>And I'll admit it's kinda scary when you do go through the underpass --</p> <p>STEVEN WINTER: It's scary in a car.</p> <p>PAMELA WINTERS: It's scary in a car, you're right.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: Right. So I tend to usually just ride my bicycle through Harvard Yard. They seem to have bagged the NO BICYCLE SIGNS at both ends of that route. Sometimes they're bagged and sometimes they aren't.</p> <p>There was policemen there yesterday, a Harvard policeman, and I thought I'd better not ride past him, so I went through the underpass.</p> <p>But the legal trip would be Mount Auburn Street to Trowbridge, up Trowbridge to Broadway,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">101</p> <p>WALK YOUR BICYCLE.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: Right. Those signs are not bagged in plastic at the two gates involved sometimes. Sometimes they aren't.</p> <p>STEVEN WINTER: I think -- Hugh, I think that was discussed as part of the construction management plan for the tunnel construction project. I wasn't involved in the final plan, but I can find out. I think that was brought up. I'm sure there's probably reasoning 'cuz I think certainly there's plans to figure out how the bicyclists transverse that area.</p> <p>I vaguely remember coming up awhile ago at staff meeting from some initial discussions about the construction management aspects of that. I'll follow up. Because that was really Public Works whose meeting and I think Jeff Perrini in my department was looking at that</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">102</p> <p>stuff.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: There may be no good solution, and we'll just have to live with it until they get done.</p> <p>STEVEN WINTER: I'll look into it.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.</p> <p>Anything -- I think what is unresolved here, I think, is exactly what you said and what Bill said, and what you said, Jeff, is "Where do you draw the line on certain things?" If you want to discuss it further maybe that's what you need to address, your thing about what are the lines that need to be thought about some more because I don't think there are very many.</p> <p>JEFF ROBERTS: It sounds like I was kinda flipping back over my notes, and it sounds like the issue with smaller residential buildings and possibly with smaller commercial uses requires a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">104</p> <p>there?</p> <p>You could say, yeah, that's fine, we have this parking spot right there. But is the ordinance, if it were adopted, going to mandate that the entire block looks that way and every block in Harvard Square looks that way. If that's the case, then, you know, maybe we just need to create a city parking lot somewhere for bikes and just say no, it's not going to be on the streets, it's going to be here, and if it's 500 feet away or 1,000 feet away, then so be it because if you're taking the T, you get out at Harvard Station and you walk wherever you have to go.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: There's a municipal lot that is covered in Harvard Square, but it's not devoted mostly to bicycles.</p> <p>JEFF ROBERTS: And part of the strategy</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">103</p> <p>little bit more thought.</p> <p>We can try to do a better job of illustrating what we -- what our approach was in the first place. And then I think maybe we can come forward with some options, maybe some alternative approaches that might seem like more in keeping with the intent and might address some of the concerns that were raised tonight, if that sounds like a good plan.</p> <p>THEODORE COHEN: The only other thing I would really be interested in is I'm really concerned about what it's going to look like and feel like in the heavy retail areas of Harvard Square and Central Square.</p> <p>We see a picture of what it looked like right in front of Curious George. What's that whole block going to look like, and, you know, what's it going to like across the street from</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">105</p> <p>to -- it incorporates the use of -- one thing just to throw in at folks on the Board, you may have noticed is seasonal corrals started being complemented, so there are certain places around the city where during summer months, the auto parking spaces are converted into a row of bicycle parking spaces, and this is the first year, I think, we've tried this and we're going to keep an eye on it, and see if that's -- certainly the seasonality of bicycle use is a whole other part of the picture.</p> <p>But I think to address your question, we can try to take a close look at how things would play out within those kind've focused areas and see what kind of quantities are we really talking about and how it would be accommodated.</p> <p>THEODORE COHEN: I actually think the corrals work well and look pretty good and I</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">106</p> <p>consider the options acceptable.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: Harvard Square now, I think every -- if you go there during the day, every parking meter and every NO PARKING sign or traffic direction sign has at least one bicycle, although you can get two bicycles, if you cooperative with the other bicyclist. Many of them have two. So that's the state-of-the-art.</p> <p>Until you have so many spaces that people don't have to do that, which would then create the other problem you're talking about.</p> <p>I also noticed the handicapped parking space sign out in front of what used to be Sages has a little tiny sign that says "DON'T HOOK A BICYCLE TO THIS SIGN OR WE'LL TAKE IT AWAY."</p> <p>ELIZABETH DEAN-CLOWER: May I address that?</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: No, I mean --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">108</p> <p>rendering those spaces useless or unsafe for the people who need them.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: It appears to me that those signs actually have been effective because I have not actually seen any bicycles chained to those.</p> <p>ELIZABETH DEAN-CLOWER: Since those have been put up a couple months ago, there are some violations, but we worked closely with other people and we also said that our disabilities commission would be part of the educational process.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: I didn't mean to say I was criticizing them. I just was noting --</p> <p>ELIZABETH DEAN-CLOWER: It's a very recent change.</p> <p>STEVEN WINTER: Hugh, I would like to</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">107</p> <p>ELIZABETH DEAN-CLOWER: Just to clarify the statement you made, not to give an opinion.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: Sure.</p> <p>ELIZABETH DEAN-CLOWER: My name is Elizabeth Dean-Clower. I'm the chair for the Cambridge Commission of Persons with Disabilities, and our commission worked closely with Sue Clippinger and her staff because the people with disabilities, the very reason that those parking spots are designated as such when bikes were locked there, because previously the ordinance allowed bikes, didn't make that exemption except those spaces, it conflicted with the ability of people either using a passenger side ramp, or someone using a walker on the passenger side, to safely exit their vehicles. And so, that's what that change reflects for specifically those spaces because it was</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">109</p> <p>make a comment, please. And that is, when I was talking about the coordination of these activities, if we allowed the bicycle policies to be driven by people who were enthusiastic bike advocates that think cars should be taken off of the road, it would be lopsided, it wouldn't work.</p> <p>If we allowed policy to be driven by people who said cars are where it's at and this bicycle stuff is ridiculous, it wouldn't work.</p> <p>When I'm talking about a central coordinating piece, I'm talking about something that is -- has a sense of stewardship for the whole piece -- the whole milieu and finds room for the activities together rather than an advocacy piece that says we're just gonna put as many bikes as we can, or we're just gonna open up more parking spaces. That's really where I was going with that to try to think of a central</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">110</p> <p>stewardship maybe rather than coordinating.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: As someone who bicycled in the city for 40 of the 50 years I have lived here, I guess I'm one of the activists and I think, you know, over those 40 years we have gone from essentially no provision to part of the way. And we have to now, in the zoning, work on that piece. There are other pieces still. And there's balance of needs.</p> <p>Part of our job here in reviewing these things is to also have these discussions before the Council, so that the councilors will be aware of some of the issues and be prepared for that because ultimately it's their job to weigh all kinds of different priorities.</p> <p>Okay. Are we done?</p> <p>AHMED NUR: We're done. I just want to say one thing about the language, only bicycle</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">112</p> <p>PAMELA WINTERS: Everybody uses bikes.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: Five lane bicycle lane streets.</p> <p>THEODORE COHEN: On the other hand, in Amsterdam, the pedestrians are in terror of the bikes.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. And here the bicycles are afraid of the cars and terrorize the pedestrians sometimes. I try not to.</p> <p>Anyway, on that note, why don't we close this portion of the meeting and take a break and then we'll be back and talk about Kendall Square.</p> <p>(Short recess.)</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Let's get started again.</p> <p>Iram Farooq is going to help us with that.</p> <p>IRAM FAROOQ: Thank you so much. So on</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">111</p> <p>usage for the sheds. I would like to emphasize on that, which is motorcycles there's scooters, there's tricycles, there's this and that.</p> <p>Hugh went as far as saying pool tables. Who knows what's going to be in those sheds, and are they going to be locked, and are these locks going to be shared by tenants? There's no way to reinforce it. There's going to be a lot of those things. I understand why there's got to be a lock on these.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: Steve's comment was how are other people are doing this. But we're in front of almost everybody else.</p> <p>We can go to Boulder, Colorado maybe and part of that is topography that we have -- we have a receptive topography, and part is just the nature of our city. I was amazed when I started to go to Copenhagen or Amsterdam.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">113</p> <p>the Kendall Square topic we spent a lot of time on this. Almost the entire meeting on this last time and another meeting devoted to this, and there's been a lot of discussion, and we thought it would be useful to try to put some of the topics together, some of the discussion together, especially the broad points that impact the whole study of all of the Kendall Square area and try to get to some of that big vision that the committee had put together so that we can move to many of the specific pieces that we need to address.</p> <p>So the memo that we sent out to you earlier this morning, which people have a copy of, now looks like this (<i>indicating</i>). Nothing very exciting to look at.</p> <p>So that tries to lay out the key elements, the key big picture goals for the area.</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">114</p> <p>And I think one of the heartening things to us at the last meeting where we had both David Dixson from Goody Clancy talking about the Advisory Committee process as well Keith Shore from CBT talking about the work with the East Cambridge Planning Team and other adjacent neighborhoods, and there was a lot of consistency on the big goals.</p> <p>And the questions were more about specific numbers related to various things.</p> <p>And so we attempted here to also lay out some of that distinction, where was the commonality, where were their questions still remaining to be answered.</p> <p>So this is a lot of information. I don't think we'll be able to get through all of this tonight, but I think the two things that would be really great to try to get to is, one, to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">116</p> <p>models that we could use. What we have done for previous studies of a similar nature like Eastern Cambridge planning study and Concord-Alewife planning study, is that the committee worked for awhile on their work, they developed the recommendations which they sent to the Planning Board, and the Board reviewed it, and we sort've laid out what the goals and vision were that led to those recommendations, and recognizing that there's a lot of diverse minds at work that had put in a lot of hours into it, the Board's general notion on that was we'll accept these goals and these recommendations and then just look at those zoning pieces and then work really hard to develop with staff to develop -- to translate that into zoning language.</p> <p>And in the process there were certain refinements that almost always get made because</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">115</p> <p>determine a process to proceed forward and how we might evaluate or how we might get to a zoning petition at the end of this.</p> <p>And the second piece is to try and get agreements on these big picture five elements, so that we can say at least we agree on the goals, now we can -- we have a common framework from which to work as we go forward to look at all the details.</p> <p>So, I guess maybe is the process piece the easier one to start with, or the better one to start with as the discussion of goals might end up taking a little bit of time.</p> <p>If the Board agrees with that, we can talk a little bit about that.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Sure, let's start there.</p> <p>IRAM FAROOQ: So, essentially a couple of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">117</p> <p>once you start to write zoning, you realize that there's central issues and then that was the focus of the work of the Board. And we dealt with them as entire single pieces.</p> <p>So we came out with these almost booklets at the end of the process of the zoning petition that had four or five chapters apiece. So that's one model.</p> <p>And then another model might be the citywide model where the committee worked for a long time and actually the Board decided -- I think the committee actually forwarded little pieces to the Board, and then the Board decided to deal with individual components.</p> <p>So the backyard zoning, for instance, proceeded first, and then there were the rest, which was one package, but the article maintained the rezoning of commercial districts. All of</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">118</p> <p>that happened as a separate piece.</p> <p>So we could certainly parse these things out. Whether it's into multiple pieces or whether it's all like, you know, two pieces or three pieces, and we can even -- if we decide to take that route, we should figure out what we're gonna do first in a general sense of sequence, but then we can also agree to decide if we need to consolidate, we can do that as well. Those are the two broad approaches that we may take.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: In my mind the second approach is the one that's more appropriate here. I think we've been talking about and we have this sort've summary of a memo that sort've talks about the principles, and there's work to be done, there are questions to be answered, but it may be easier to actually get to some of those answers by looking and coming back to them.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">120</p> <p>which now has multiple owners, but under one permit where there's maybe a little -- there was a like a recommendation, can we -- in that general area, can we use the gas company property to build some housing? And their CPT identified in their report a number of peripheral sites that -- where housing might be built. There's one big owner, Met Pipe, who is not inside the Goody Clancy District, but is clearly important, and I think we talked about at some point looking at what the current zoning is, which is only ten years old, and seeing if it even needs to be updated to achieve the goals that have been established to create the opportunities.</p> <p>So there's like a multiple small piece thing, but there are three big pieces, and they have, in my view, they need to be done in cooperation.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">119</p> <p>I mean, I don't think -- we don't want to substitute our judgment for the committee process or for the East Cambridge process, but we want to try to mediate so that there's a consensus and that's mostly going to be a staff function and we're sort've sitting and advising the staff.</p> <p>The ownership in the Kendall Square area is unusual in that MIT owns a lot of property. Boston Properties controls a lot of property, most of which is built out.</p> <p>And the Department of Transportation owns a lot of property and we're in our planning hoping that that might change. And we're trying to develop a very clear vision of what the change could be, so that will help the process to facilitate the change.</p> <p>And then there are a number of other owners of, let's say, Cambridge Research Park,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">121</p> <p>I would want to see the PUD that covers the MIT properties to be submitted jointly by MIT and the Planning Board and with the support of the people who are sitting out here facing us saying, yes, you have done your property, you heard us, and so that there would be one plan. We might not be a hundred percent there, but we could try to get as close as we could to a hundred percent agreement consensus.</p> <p>And with the Boston Properties, I think it has to be a face-to-face talks with them. Maybe not this in room, but in this process, there probably would have to be some talks.</p> <p>IRAM FAROOQ: So all of those entities except for -- well, not the smaller individuals, but MIT, Boston Properties and the CRA were all represented on the committee and have been part of the whole discussion throughout.</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">122</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: Right. But I think, you know, it's different being one of a 20-person committee. And somebody came out of the woodwork that I was unaware of. I got a letter here from the American Red Cross who owns an important building, I hadn't noticed that Red Cross on it until I looked this morning when I was driving past. And they want to make sure that their particular concerns are involved when we're discussing their next-door neighbor.</p> <p>So that's why I think we should -- also, I think timing -- MIT wants to go, DOT doesn't want to go, and Boston Properties is not anxious to build the housing that we think they ought to build.</p> <p>So the time scale for each one of those discussions may be different.</p> <p>IRAM FAROOQ: So, Hugh, are you</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">124</p> <p>discussion by -- and the city responded by saying "We need to look at this and we have."</p> <p>What does the Board think of this?</p> <p>WILLIAM TIBBS: Well, I think the big elephant in the room is the amount of housing and where it is. If you compare the Goody Clancy study to the CBT study that really is the big difference. They have more in, and even if we just look at the recent letter we got from the East Cambridge Planning Group, they're saying the same thing. So I think that somehow we have to kinda sort that out. And when you -- I think for me, it's helpful to -- for me, I understand some of the guiding principles here, and there is some similarity actually between the CBT report and whatever in terms of some of the guiding principles, it's some of those details of what is included and where your opportunities are.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">123</p> <p>envisioning that each of these would be separate petitions that would then go forward?</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: That would be my thought. That we can't get them all on the same plan scale. And -- I mean, I think there's a principles report gets issued, and I'm not quite sure how -- they're not really adopted, they're simply issued and then we forward it to the Council saying, "Hey, look at this." A couple of the councilors have undoubtedly been involved in the process and there's room for discussion.</p> <p>That's sort've the way I would see the biggest picture. Exactly -- I think -- so we want to work, making sure the principles are clear, and we may want to start having more detail to try to get the MIT piece going or continuing. After all, they kinda two years ago, they were the ones who really started the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">125</p> <p>Obviously the CBT expanded beyond the area, that is, the Goody Clancy area. So I think that's something we need to do, and I think looking at it, the concept of breaking it up into the PUD is, quite frankly, I'm not quite sure if I would -- how I feel about that. But I think we need look at it in a way you have suggested it at least so I can just sort've make sure it feels that way.</p> <p>The concern I have about the fact that so many of the key players who are on the committee is that you probably are going to get a compromise based on those key players' concerns so it doesn't surprise me that the CBT study kinda has, say, a lower housing threshold for the MIT side because that's kinda what MIT probably would like.</p> <p>So I just want to make sure that even</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">126</p> <p>though we have this committee and it's great and we're doing it, that we, still as a city, look at what we think really needs to happen there, and if that means we need to say to MIT, "Hey, you've got to get more housing on your site even if it's your own. They have their own grad students come here and say "Hey, we need more graduate housing. So I just want to make sure that the process doesn't just an assume that.</p> <p>But I think one way to do it, is, to within the context that you have laid out, is begin to look at each of those parcels and say "How would they change based on what you have initially thought about them?"</p> <p>It's clear in my mind that MIT when it needs more housing units, how does that work within the context. And then in my mind there are still things about how the street scapee,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">128</p> <p>idea doesn't work unless we have stakeholders and owners that we can work with.</p> <p>So I'm all for looking at this in smaller pieces so we can see it. But I just want to make sure that in doing that we're going to come back to the whole and see there's a whole mix that doesn't make sense or do we have to make changes to the whole based on the realities of what's practical and what can be and can't be done.</p> <p>I think that's one of the reasons I think why MIT is not ready, they're still asking those questions themselves. And they have a new administration there which I'm sure is probably thinking about these maybe in a slightly different way than they did before, and they're probably trying to sort that out.</p> <p>So, yeah, that's where I am. But I think, as I said, the elephant in the room is</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">127</p> <p>open spacey kinda that diagram that I talked about the first time I saw it, is that practical and it's working.</p> <p>The reality is when you look at any of things, when we looked at East Cambridge and we looked at citywide, you really had to look at what can be practically done based on the ownership patterns, based on what zoning can and can't control, and I think we need to get to that nitty-gritty, too, just to sort've say "Okay, look at the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority site, and there's -- we need to talk about that." What can and can't we do there. Look at the MIT site. It's clear that the Department of Transportation site has a lot of potential, but we have very little control over it.</p> <p>So I think that's the thing I'm trying to get -- I mean, we have a grand idea, but a grand</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">129</p> <p>housing. And the difference between how housing was treated in the two plans is something I think we just have to sort've come to some conclusion about, and where it is and who has the capacity to give it to us and how do we do that.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: So I'm resisting the temptation to talk about substance.</p> <p>I didn't mention one piece, which is the -- which is in this memorandum and we talked about it before, which is a study of the public realm, how do you -- what can you do in the public realm to partially achieve the open space goals.</p> <p>And that's something, I guess, that's about to start.</p> <p>IRAM FAROOQ: Yes. There's an RFP that Stuart and Taha and Jeff are working together. There will be a purview that kicks off the</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">130</p> <p>process, but that's in the works. Hopefully this fall that will begin.</p> <p>What diagrams you see right now for the public space should be thought of as examples and the starting point. And I think what you see in the Goody Clancy plan, what you see in the CBT plan and what you saw from the MIT plan will all three be treated as ways to achieve that same end because the goal for all three of them really was the driving principle was the same interconnected network of streets and public spaces that serve a whole host of functions and programs and this will take that to the next level.</p> <p>Maybe in our thinking we have to figure out how we reference, not just the plans that exists, but the plans that will be created in the future as well.</p> <p>WILLIAM TIBBS: I think to get to that</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">132</p> <p>mentioned in the memo that it's a little hard to compare because of the different study areas and because we had numbers aggregated for the entire areas. And just today, the CBT was kind enough to send us more detail, a spreadsheet where things actually fall, and we have obviously for our stuff. So we can start to look at what that looks like and how they compare. The big difference, though, when you look at those studies side by side, actually almost all the sites within the study area that we looked at are the same except for one south of Main.</p> <p>Then they have a lot of housing sites that they were able to identify just at the edge the study area that create some nice transitions to the neighborhoods.</p> <p>I suspect that a lot of the additional density comes from there. But that's something</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">131</p> <p>point is what do we control? Obviously we can control the public quorum, the city can do that. And there are only relatively few big players that can make big statements as to how they control some of the other stuff.</p> <p>You did do an ownership, obviously, in the course of this study because I would be interested in just literally seeing the ownership pattern there. We know Alexandria has some stuff. I would just be interested in seeing that as a piece of the plan as a bit of information to help me sort this stuff out.</p> <p>IRAM FAROOQ: We can get the ownership map.</p> <p>If I might address two of the questions that were raised. One is the question of housing.</p> <p>So far, we actually -- I think I</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">133</p> <p>that will become clearer when we do the comparative analysis and we obviously will --</p> <p>WILLIAM TIBBS: But just for clarity, though, are you saying that I misread it when I said they both had a different housing capacity with the MIT sites?</p> <p>IRAM FAROOQ: If you look at the memo that I sent right before the graphics on Page 5 at the top, you will see that the land area that both looked at, is actually quite different.</p> <p>And so, a lot of the housing sites that CBT identified, which is on Page 6, the blue are the office lab and the yellow are residential sites. You'll notice that there are a fair number housing sites outside of the Biney Street curve. And those are --</p> <p>WILLIAM TIBBS: No. But, again, my question is not about what's outside the Biney</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">134</p> <p>Street curve. The MIT site itself. Were their assumptions fairly similar or were they different?</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: There's one difference which the CBT plan says the MIT press building is replaced by a housing tower and that's a part that everybody now says, no, that's not the right thing to do there.</p> <p>I mean, it's...</p> <p>WILLIAM TIBBS: Is that just because of there versus -- there's a difference between where to place it and whether or not it should be there, I mean, in terms of quantity or in terms of amount of housing on the site.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: I think what I heard was, no, we shouldn't tear down that building to build a housing tower.</p> <p>WILLIAM TIBBS: And I guess what I'm</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">136</p> <p>commercial expansion, which is another goal...</p> <p>WILLIAM TIBBS: Again, I don't want to -- again, we don't have to sort this out because you said you will sort it out. But you're saying basically that if you in a sense -- basically you're saying it's hard compare to both numbers because they have different areas and I understand that and that's true.</p> <p>I just want to know comparatively in terms of where the opportunities are, for instance, as I look at that, unless I'm misreading it, I don't see too much yellow on the MIT side of Main Street, and I think in the CBT plan I saw some yellow. Now, whether or not it was this building versus that building that's not the case, but that's a site that MIT controls and can deal with, and they're saying basically they're putting most of their -- they think that</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">135</p> <p>saying is should MIT commit to a certain amount of housing regardless of where they put it and how they arrange it on their site. I'm not saying what the number was.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: That was the conclusion from CBT. I mean, I think the -- if you can take the CBT study, they basically are saying, you got to take advantage of ever possible housing opportunity to get enough housing to effect the quality of life in the district. And that's -- that's what -- is that CBT or is that the planning team's view? I mean, they're the same view. I don't know which is the chicken or which is the egg. I expect it's probably comes from you people in East Cambridge saying "We understand how this stuff works," and so, there was a big priority to try to identify as much as possible, but still the reasonable amount of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">137</p> <p>their housing should be on the other side of Main Street along with where One Broadway is, and I would say that that to me is the kind of elephant that we need to just understand as to how much and where it should be, and where it begins to effect what we're trying to accomplish. And I don't have an answer for that now. I just want to make sure -- and one way to do that is to just begin to -- as you're comparing it in a way, which you said you're doing, you're looking at the two plans, one is bigger than the other just trying to look -- you can almost look at parcel by parcel. If you look at your PUD area, you can say in the PUD plans that were identified by Goody Clancy, here's the differences regardless what is outside those areas or not. But I would say also that we should look for opportunities outside there too.</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">138</p> <p>But I just want to make sure there's a way to compare it and it sounds like you said you were trying to do that anyway.</p> <p>IRAM FAROOQ: We haven't had a chance to delve into it yet. But our goal is try to get as close to a clear comparison for you.</p> <p>But that evaluation can happen in the format that Hugh described as well. But we could be looking at the MIT PUD and then having that discussion with MIT. I think that's fair.</p> <p>There are some big questions that maybe smart to think in more of a district way. There were a set of ADLs that we put forth earlier are things like the idea of a Kendall Square -- I'm sorry.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: I just wanted to give the opportunity to the rest of the Board members to weigh in on the process.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">140</p> <p>last meeting they would be for office, nonlab, smaller, whereas we in the Kendall Square study, we came up for 250 for nonresidential with floor plan limitations.</p> <p>So that's a question that I think the Board -- that's something the Board should talk about.</p> <p>Those other sorts of questions maybe are worth thinking about more broadly than on a district by district way, I don't -- or being really careful to recognize with the first consideration that this will have districtwide implications just for the sake of equity.</p> <p>PAMELA WINTERS: Thank you.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: The way I see addressing that is start with MIT. They have a particular goal for the amount of commercial development and we see -- and now, they're developing an open</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">139</p> <p>Questions?</p> <p>STEVEN WINTER: Nothing yet.</p> <p>THEODORE COHEN: I have nothing. I think the debate is what is going on. And it's interesting and I'm content to let it go on.</p> <p>PAMELA WINTERS: Did you want to say something? I just have a quick question. I read so many papers today and I can't find it right now, but I think I read somewhere that CBT wanted their housing to be lower, and the Goody Clancy wanted -- no, the other way around.</p> <p>IRAM FAROOQ: No, they were both proposing 300 feet for housing, so both agree on the residential height. The difference is in the commercial height.</p> <p>PAMELA WINTERS: Okay.</p> <p>IRAM FAROOQ: CBT has a lower height for commercial, 150 feet, but they did say at the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">141</p> <p>space plan and that will then define somewhat better the sites.</p> <p>So then the question is: "Well, what's the height if you achieve that commercial goal, and what's the balance between achieving the commercial goal and the height?"</p> <p>And it depends where the site is because one of their sites is not on Main Street, but is, in fact, half a block back. That might change our thinking on that particular site. It might be -- because I think the -- you know, a lot of that discussion is what the streets will be like. It's less what the skyline is going to be like. It's more like what is it going to be like when you're on the ground on the street.</p> <p>THEODORE COHEN: I mean, I said I didn't -- I was just happy to listen. But I think it's very hard to view either process in</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">142</p> <p>the abstract without a combination of the two because, you know, for example, if we were to deal with MIT first, and I agree with Bill that housing is a major issue. And so what MIT suggests in the way of housing has to be factored into everything.</p> <p>But if we're just looking at them, you know, what does their idea say for Main Street because we had two different proposals, one, you know, opens up Main Street to traffic and one does not.</p> <p>And if they come down and say "Well, this is what we really want to do and this is our proposal," and it's premised on it either being opened or closed, then that changes, you know, the perspective of, say, the study that has the opposite.</p> <p>And, you know, dealing with any one thing</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">144</p> <p>actually implies looking at it as a cluster of focal points, shall we say, and the Goody Clancy really has the Kendall Square -- you know, the center of Kendall Square is the focal point, so to speak.</p> <p>So I think that understanding -- unless I'm oversimplifying it but they're really emphasizing the importance of really trying to getting the focal hubs where the place kinda pulls together and almost breaking it up into not necessarily the PUDs, you know, focal areas and I think that that's another difference between them which a global difference.</p> <p>So I think just understanding those and really discussing which is better, is it better have to Main Street opened or closed, is it better to have these things or what opportunities you have for that and stuff.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">143</p> <p>certainly has implications on how we're going to deal with everything else, and on the other hand, it's such a large project, that trying to deal with everything simultaneously, also seems very difficult if not impossible.</p> <p>So, you know, I realize it's very tough thing to handle. Yes, it's how you're going to see things from the street, but the height is going to impact on four plates and how things are going to be aligned within the district and different areas.</p> <p>I'm interested in the pros and cons of each, but it's part, you know, from my perspective right now to see it going all one way or the other way because I think they have to be intertwined somehow.</p> <p>WILLIAM TIBBS: I think another area that's similar to that is that the CBT plan</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">145</p> <p>And I think one of the reasons for that is because they did look at a broader area and they had Area Four in their committee.</p> <p>So of course you would have a cluster up at the other Kendall Square -- I call it one Kendall Square -- and that kind've cluster up there and what is happening.</p> <p>But I think that is the reality of what is there. And if you overly focus on one area you could actually have it where the other areas kind've feel a little either blighted or neglected or whatever.</p> <p>THEODORE COHEN: From what I understand of the earlier plan, MIT certainly saw their Main Street area as a focal point for them.</p> <p>So if that becomes a focal point in view of another focal point 500 feet away...</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: To me, that was the most</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">146</p> <p>revealing parts of the CBT study was this idea that there were multiple points and that led you -- that had to do with pathways that you wanted to create, and it had to do with recognizing other efforts, you know. At the end of the broad canal, there's a focal point.</p> <p>The center of Cambridge Research Park is a focal point. Alexandria is going to be building some focal points at, I think, Second Street.</p> <p>The open space study will hopefully bring more clarity to that question.</p> <p>I read this notebook that we were given, and one piece I pulled out of that notebook was, in a traffic analysis, the only intersection that is in trouble in the plan is the intersection between third and Main and Broadway.</p> <p>And so, you probably can't make it wide</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">148</p> <p>because those circuits are mostly cut.</p> <p>That was a particular problem with Harvard Square at that time, a lot of excess traffic generated by this parking hunt.</p> <p>So, in looking at that space, there's the traffic car piece, the pedestrian piece, the visual piece, the symbolic piece that has to come together. And to some extent, it also affects the MIT housing piece.</p> <p>Each plan showed you a structure on the seascape and the Goody Clancy is colored blue, and I'm not quite sure what was programmed in for the CBT thing, but to me it's an obvious place to put a significant amount of housing above the ground floor which should be adding to the retail business.</p> <p>Anyway ...</p> <p>As a personal goal, to try to actually</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">147</p> <p>open because that's gonna make it worse. It's got to work.</p> <p>And so, that's going to constrain how you let cars move. It doesn't necessarily constrain what it looks like. And it may not force you to make pedestrians do things you don't want to do. But it's going to definitely -- we're gonna have to put some restrictions on what cars can do in order for that intersection to work properly.</p> <p>But we have a square in the city called Harvard Square where in 1967 and then when the T was built, we cut off most of the things cars could do and it survives, but it's visually intact, but you can't drive to places that you used to be able to drive.</p> <p>Well, you know -- and part was also to keep people from circulating around looking for parking spaces which has been really effective</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">149</p> <p>not go much beyond 10:00 tonight because my brain is dead.</p> <p>PAMELA WINTERS: All of ours is.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: And so -- Ahmed?</p> <p>AHMED NUR: Yeah. Hugh, I just need a clarification.</p> <p>The opening statement indicated that the players need a separate petitioner versus collectively sitting around the table. And, I mean, I wanted to hear from the staff's point of view. What is the benefit? Which one is more -- like, just generally, how do you get things done? I thought if we brought everybody together, all the players and say "Here is what we're working with, this is the amount of space you have, open space is the amount of residential you have, this is the percentage of this concerned area that you say you own in this, you know, and let them speak</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">150</p> <p>as opposed to separating one another.</p> <p>But I wanted to first give you -- what is your idea behind it. You said this is how I see it which means you wanted to have separate...</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: In separate discussions with each area.</p> <p>AHMED NUR: Yeah.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: I think it's just a reality of the reality of the ability of the different owners to make decisions, because the DOT is not going to make decisions. We're gonna have to try to put a real strong case for the best use of their parcel and try to get that to happen.</p> <p>AHMED NUR: Yep.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: And on that site, the big question in that site is really the balance between housing, open space and commercial</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">152</p> <p>and that it would then go into some sort of private hands or municipal hands.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: I think people are more encouraged than they have been for quite awhile that this could happen. And that's why it's serious that we have a clear plan on the table for what is going on that they can react to, but they're not going to negotiate with us this fall.</p> <p>And there are some significant differences in the land use and perhaps more importantly in the kind of -- I don't know whether the design issues -- there are significant design differences in the two sample plans.</p> <p>Probably the design differences are not terribly important because they're not going to follow either design. But the land use is probably more important than trying to make a</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">151</p> <p>development. And by implication the DOT use, which is apt to be a new building for their uses because their present building apparently is out of date. So that would be a blue building even though it's owned by the government.</p> <p>So, that's the big discussion there, what do we really want to achieve on that parcel given that the owner won't talk to us in a meaningful way because -- and, you know, so that one is probably not going to be something we can do by Christmas.</p> <p>THEODORE COHEN: Can I just ask: Is the property remaining within DOT and their building something on it, something that is likely to occur?</p> <p>I mean, I thought from the last meeting the discussion was that the tenor of the times now was for it to be divested by the government</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">153</p> <p>really good case for them to provide open space.</p> <p>That to me, is the hardest thing, I would think, to convince the Department of Transportation even though they have been providing open space for 25 years marvelously, although it's not very accessible or usable, at least it's there.</p> <p>IRAM FAROOQ: There's a movie night planned for the open space that they're working with Kendall Square Association, so they're starting to open up a little bit more and be part of the neighborhood.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: Right. We have to romance them. And another feature is that the Board of the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority and has some well-known and well respected people on it.</p> <p>And so that's -- and what their role is in portions of the site that they at one point</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">154</p> <p>had a lot of control over. Legally what are their arrangements with Boston Properties that might allow them, we don't know and apparently they don't know at this point because those are the questions they're asking now themselves.</p> <p>What role could they play? DOT, I know -- I had many conversations with Joe Tulimieri about efforts he took over the last ten or 15 years to try to bring that land into the fold, and so, how that's all going to play out -- I will say for the record, I was standing next to the chairman of the Redevelopment Authority in the checkout line at the public library, Kathy Born, and we then talked for awhile and she said, "Yeah, it might be a good idea for the Planning Board and CRE Board to meet together and talk about this."</p> <p>Does that answer your question?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">156</p> <p>Research Park, the names change around here so much, I lose track of them sometimes, but that area is more or less kinda developed and we kinda know where it is.</p> <p>When you look at it from that perspective, there's -- the opportunities are finite, I guess, in terms of what you can and can't do.</p> <p>And to MIT's credit they basically put on the table and said, "Hey, we would have like to have, you know, a lot more development space for research and development, and we're willing to parlay that with a little bit of housing and some other stuff. But the other stuff we kinda -- you know, we are not quite sure how all that fits into all this.</p> <p>So I think looking at them in this -- I guess for me, we quickly have to get to a point</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">155</p> <p>AHMED NUR: Yes, it does. Thank you.</p> <p>WILLIAM TIBBS: I mean, that gets back to -- basically, Hugh, the areas are kind've around large stakeholder players and each area has very unique realities to them that regardless of, you know, how we -- and the success of what we -- the division is based on the likelihood of some of those realities, and so, I think obviously the MIT wouldn't really comes to you because they're -- they're -- one, they were the ones that kind've triggered all of us to think about this in the first place because they have a grand idea of what they thought they could do with things that were relatively within in their controls.</p> <p>When you talk about the Redevelopment Authority and even what we used to call Cambridge</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">157</p> <p>and I think we did, when we did -- some of you weren't here, but when we did the citywide rezoning in East Cambridge rezoning, we did quickly get to the point as to what was practicable based on just who the stakeholders were, who the owners were and what control the city had and what areas and stuff like that.</p> <p>So I think that looking at smaller parcels or looking at the PUDs themselves and answering some of those questions, how does it fit to the larger framework, however you define it and who controls what and how do we -- what are the triggers and catalyst for making sure certain things happen.</p> <p>IRAM FAROOQ: I'm thinking there are some big questions that you have raised that may need to get answered, the broad ones, before we can delve into the specific PUD.</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

<p style="text-align: right;">158</p> <p>Like Bill pointed out ownership map. We talked about comparing the housing that's permitted, and bringing just maybe a little more next level detail on what's going to happen with the open space plan and how will that fit into this picture. Maybe go beyond one step what is in the memo. We could bring all the diagrams, bring a little more on the process that we see that's forthcoming, and how that process might fit into the consideration here.</p> <p>In fact, who knows, the broad component of that might be done before we get to adopting the MIT PUDs. And then we can delve into MIT the next time. Although we did talk to MIT and they said they would be willing to come and start the conversation at the next meeting. So we can start to maybe have both conversations. It may not take very long, and when you look at housing,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">160</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>CERTIFICATE</u></p> <p>Commonwealth of Massachusetts Norfolk, ss.</p> <p>I, Jill Kourafas, a Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby certify:</p> <p>That the hearing herein before set forth is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.</p> <p>IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 25th day of August 2012.</p> <p>_____</p> <p>Jill Kourafas Certified Shorthand Reporter License No. 14903 Notary Public My Commission expires: February 2, 2017</p> <p>THE FOREGOING CERTIFICATION OF THIS TRANSCRIPT DOES NOT APPLY TO ANY REPRODUCTION OF THE SAME IN ANY RESPECT UNLESS UNDER THE DIRECT CONTROL AND/OR DIRECTION OF THE CERTIFYING REPORTER.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">159</p> <p>you may want to have that conversation with MIT right away.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: I think we can try for the next several meetings to work both tracks. Try to bring the big picture things to a resolution, and then start off. So one ramps up, the other ramps down.</p> <p>IRAM FAROOQ: Perfect. So I won't try to get agreements on the big goals.</p> <p>PAMELA WINTERS: We're tired.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: I think we may have done what we can do tonight.</p> <p>IRAM FAROOQ: Thank you so much.</p> <p>HUGH RUSSELL: So I guess we're adjourned.</p> <p>(The meeting adjourned at 10:06 p.m.)</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">161</p>

**Planning Board for the City of Cambridge
General Hearing - August 21, 2012**

CAMBRIDGE PLANNING BOARD - August 21, 2012

ERRATA SHEET

INSTRUCTIONS: After reading the transcript, note any change or correction and the reason therefor on this sheet.

PAGE LINE

___	___	CHANGE: _____
		REASON: _____
___	___	CHANGE: _____
		REASON: _____
___	___	CHANGE: _____
		REASON: _____
___	___	CHANGE: _____
		REASON: _____
___	___	CHANGE: _____
		REASON: _____
___	___	CHANGE: _____
		REASON: _____
___	___	CHANGE: _____
		REASON: _____
___	___	CHANGE: _____
		REASON: _____