MASSACHUSETTS CITY OF CAMBRIDGE,

PLANNING BOARD

CITY HALL ANNEX, 57 INMAN STREET, CAMBRIDGE

NOTICE OF DECISION

CASE NO: 51

PREMISES: 126-130 Gore Street

ZONING DISTRICT: Residence C-1

PETITIONER: Stu-Lin Realty

APPLICATION DATE: May 20, 1985

DATE OF HEARINGJune 18, 1985

PETITION: Twenty units of multifamily housing authorized by

special permit from the Planning Board.

DATE OF PLANNING BOARD DECISION: July 16, 1985

DATE OF FILING THE DECISION: August 14, 1985

Decision (summary): Denial of the permit request

Appeals, if any, shall be made pursuant to Section 17 of Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 40A, and shall be filed within twenty (20) days after the date of filing of the above referenced decision with the City Clerk.

Copies of the complete decision and final plans, if applicable, are on file with the office of Community Development and the City Clerk.

Authorized Representative

to the Planning Board

Case: #51

Premises: 126-130 Gore Street

Zoning District: Residence C-1

Petitioner: Stu-Lin Realty Trust

Owner: Stu-Lin Realty Trust

Application Date: May 20, 1985

Public Hearing Date: June 18 continued to July 2, 1985

Date of Decision: July 16, 1985

The Petition

A Special Permit is requested for a multi-family development totaling twenty (20) units with an FAR of 2.54 and a height of 46. Variances are requested for unit count, FAR and height.

Documents

Submitted in support of the application were the following:

- 1. Application form and dimensional sheet.
- 2. Site plans, floor plans, elevations; scale 1/8"=1; Mark Landsberg and Associates dated May 10, 1985.

Other Documents

- 1. Letter, dated June 19, 1985 to Arthur Parris from Lauren Preston, Traffic Engineer, indicating problems with the proposed parking scheme.
- 2. Letter, dated June 18, 1985, to Arthur Parris from Paul Dodds, Secretary Pro Tem of the East Cambridge Stabilization Committee indicating the Committee's opposition to the proposal as submitted.

Public Hearing

The Public hearing was held on Tuesday, June 18, 1985. Mr. Mark Landsburg, architect, presented the proposal for the petitioners. After describing the building layout Mr. Landsburg indicated that the extra units were requested in order to permit rental units at a more modest rent. He indicated that the owner would be willing to consider a 5-10 year cap on rental prices.

A number of East Cambridge people attended the hearing expressed general disapproval of the specific petition and any proposal that generally exceeded the zoning limitations prescribed by the Residence C-1 Zoning district,

Findings

After review of the application, comments made at the public hearing and discussion by the Board and the staff of the Community Development Department the Board makes the following findings.

- 1. The proposed development substantially exceeds the dimensional limitations established for the Residence C-1 zoning district; in particular the number of units of housing proposed, the total amount floor area in the structure, and its height far exceed that permitted.
- 2. While East Cambridge is a heavily built up older neighborhood, the immediate surroundings of the proposed development are in general composed of small scale wood frame residential houses in keeping with the intent of the Residence C-1 district.
- 3. While the Board has previously approved a development scheme on this site exceeding the dimensional limitations of the C-1 district, the circumstances were related to conversion of an already existing non-conforming building. In any case the number of units granted did not exceed twelve.
- 4. No compelling reason was presented at the public hearing to justify the variances requested. Indeed the site is well suited to multi-family and townhouse development consistent with the limitations imposed by the zoning district.

Planning Board Decision

Based on the findings noted above the Board <u>DENIES</u> the request for a Multi-family Special Permit and also <u>DENIES</u> the requests for variation in the requiements of the Residence C-1 district which would customarily require a variance. The decision was made by five members of the Board with Paul Dietrich, John Woolsey, Carolyn Meith, Alfred Cohn and Arthur Parris voting to deny the permit.

For the Planning Board

Athur Carris

Arthur Parris

Chairman

the C Secti be fi	by of this decision shall be filed with the Office of city Clerk. Appeals if any shall be made pursuant to on 17, Chapter 40A, Massachusetts General Laws and shall led within twenty (20) days after the date of such filen the Office of the City Clerk.
by (ffice of the City Clerk on Sugar Tyle 5
in th	e decision have likewise been filed with the City Clerk ch date.