



ORDINANCE COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE MEETING

~ MINUTES ~

Thursday, September 26, 2019

5:30 PM

Sullivan Chamber
795 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02139

I. Call to Order

Attendee Name	Present	Absent	Late	Arrived
Dennis J. Carlone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Jan Devereux	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Craig A. Kelley	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Alanna Mallon	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Marc C. McGovern	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
E. Denise Simmons	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5:50 PM
Sumbul Siddiqui	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Timothy J. Toomey	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5:50 PM
Quinton Zondervan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

The Ordinance Committee will hold a public hearing to discuss the petition by Stephen R. Karp, Trustee of Cambridgeside Galleria Associates Trust, to amend the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Cambridge by adding a Section 13.100 that creates a new PUD-8 District and to amend the Zoning Map of the City of Cambridge by adding the new PUD-8 District, which District would include the property located at 100 Cambridgeside Place (currently zoned in the Business A and PUD-4 Districts).

Minutes Acceptance: Minutes of Sep 26, 2019 5:30 PM (Committee Reports)



CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL ORDINANCE COMMITTEE

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY, CHAIR

COMMITTEE MEETING

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

SEPTEMBER 26, 2019

5:30 PM, SULLIVAN CHAMBER

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Good evening, everyone. I will call the meeting of the Ordinance Committee to order. We have a quorum, we're joined by Councillor Carlone, Councillor Malana-- [Laughter.]

I knew, I knew that was going to happen as soon as he said the wrong word in the, oh God. Councillor Mallon. We're gonna get like all sorts of variations of that name. I apologize. And now that it's a spoonerism for me, I'll probably do it all the time.

Mayor McGovern, Councillor Zondervan and Councillor Devereaux, we--the call of the meeting is--the call the meeting is the Ordinance Committee will hold a public hearing to discuss a petition by Stephen R Karp, trustee of CambridgeSide Galleria Associates Trust, to amend the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Cambridge by adding a Section 13.100 that creates a new PUD-8 District and to amend the zoning map of the City of Cambridge by adding the new PUD-8 District, which district would include the property located at 100 CambridgeSide Place, currently zoned in the Business A and PUD-4 districts.

We're going to hear from the petitioner. We will hear from City staff. We will have clarifying questions from

Councillors. We will open public comment and then we'll bring it back to the City Council for further discussion.

Before I start, before the petitioners start, do any of my peers have any questions or comments? Councillor Siddiqui can't make it, Councillor Toomey is on his way.

And with that, I will ask people in the audience to refrain from clapping, booing, sharing or whatever. If you need to display your emotions, please go outside the room and do that. Everyone wants to speak that is here, or at least listen that is here and not feel intimidated or uncomfortable due to public displays of really anything.

So on that note, the petitioners.

MR. RICHARD MCKINNON: Thank you very much, Chairman Kelley, Chairman Carlone, Members of the Ordinance Committee. My name is Richard McKinnon. I live at 1 Layton Street here in Cambridge, Mass, and I'm here as the development consultant to the petitioner.

As the Planning Board, as the Council knows, we had our Planning Board hearing last week on the--earlier this week on the refiled petition that we put in front of the City Council back in July. This is the first--the second of the two hearings that are required. The first one was at

the Planning Board Tuesday night. The second one is here, and it's on the refiled petition.

That petition really tried to capture all of the comments that we heard at the Ordinance Committee, comments that we heard at the Planning Board and in the community. And as such, the petition that's before you is substantially different than the one that we filed back in February of this past year.

The goals for tonight are really quite simple. We'd like to do a brief presentation. And what we plan to do is go over the petition, to explain to you how it has changed and to talk a little bit more about some of the planning principles that go behind it.

We're going to break the evening's presentation into two pieces. The first one will be done by our architect David Manfredi. David is going to talk about planning and design and in particular, the way that I project is rooted in planning principles from as far back as 1978, all the way through the present day.

And John Twohig has really the heavier load tonight, John is going to talk about the petition itself, the various ways that it is different from the petition that

was filed in this past February. And also, he is going to get into a discussion of the public benefits, the mitigation and focusing in some part on the affordable housing component of the petition.

So with that, I'd like to turn it over to David to begin the evening's presentation. Thanks.

MR. JOHN TWOHIG: Thank you, Richard. I'm not David. David gets the very interesting, far more entertaining, the better part of the presentation. Our thought was just because this is a petition focus, that we would spend a few minutes in advance of David going through sort of the planning and design and what informed us after meeting with the City Council and the Ordinance Committee, before meeting with planning, meeting with others, that we would spend a few minutes talking about the petition. Then, let David kind of get into planning and design.

We thought we would spend just a very brief update because I think people are aware, as Richard mentioned, we were in front of the Planning Board earlier this week, just so that everybody's on the same page with the update. I know Jeff is here tonight. I imagine--

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Could you just, I'm sorry.

You said you weren't David, but you didn't say who you actually were.

MR. JOHN TWOHIG: I'm John Twohig from New England Development, and David will be speaking afterwards. So I thought we'd do a little bit of Planning Board update, just very briefly, because you'll obviously hear from staff on that. And then talking about sort of contributions, mitigation and touching on that, and that will be our, our presentation.

The revised petition, as Richard mentioned, we did file it. It was a refiled petition in July. And we did, with the materials that we submitted to the City Council include, and this is why my part's so exciting, this chart. And we're not going to go through this chart, but you do have it in your materials.

And this was an attempt to address a lot of the issues that we heard, specifically talk about the changes that were made, and including the section references that were included in the zoning. And our goal really and what I'm going to do just in the next few minutes, in just four few minutes, is to call out probably the highlights from that revised petition. Height, density, residential trigger,

affordability, three-bedroom family dwellings, setbacks, and step-backs.

And we highlight those because they're almost universally where people, whether we met, were meeting with the abutters out in the condominium communities that surround us, whether we're meeting with Planning Board or other members, those are terms and issues that were brought up that we wanted to focus on.

So I'm just going to, as I said very briefly, hit probably those half-a-dozen topics, and then turn it over to David to walk you through some of the imagery that has resulted from the changes that we made.

Probably the first item is really, and we title this as less commercial and more housing, decreasing the commercial space. We brought the commercial space down here from about 500,000 square feet to 400,000 square feet, and increasing the housing from 125,000 square feet to 175,000 to really make a dent in something that we heard about the commitment to housing, and especially as it related to affordable housing.

While at the same time maintaining our ground level retail, maintaining our atrium, maintaining the

CambridgeSide as a gathering place. So that was probably, as we heard the issues of density and housing, this sort of demonstrates what I'd say would be the major, or a major change that we made.

The second change was really not just related to housing, but also to affordability. We heard very clearly a strong desire to have more affordable units. And also, we heard about whether you want to call them workforce units or middle-income units, to have those units and that opportunity available to people.

So it is a significant step for us, going from what would have been 20, 24 units of affordable housing up to 80, so that the total building for housing would be 50% affordable, broken down into two categories.

One your traditional inclusionary housing, the other what we termed middle-income housing, which is, you know, a higher range of affordability.

The other thing we heard, and the other factor that we're focusing on, is family units, the importance of having three-bedroom units that would be in, be in the project. That, that's something that there's a shortage of, although that was a discussion we had at the Planning

Board. But also that those units, all of the units that we would have in the three-bedroom either be inclusionary or middle income. So that's, that's another change that was a focal point of the design and the project and the commitments that we've made going forward.

The other thing that's on this slide, and I mentioned just very briefly, was the residential trigger. People were concerned that the residential portion, especially the affordability, come earlier on in the project not later. So the idea of drafting language that would talk about that we could do a commercial building, but really the desire that if you, if we did a commercial building of size, that the next building would be the residential building.

So we structured it to state that we would be the earlier of anything over the 325,000 square feet or the first issuance of a building permit for the second building. So what that really results in is the second building is going to be the residential building.

Now these are, as to the new buildings, there is a Sears proposal. We don't, I think as we've talked about in our earlier petition, we don't own the Sears building, but it would be really our second building would be a, our

second construction building would be the residential building. We can talk a little bit more about that and that becomes a little clearer as David walks you around the project.

So really, these issues of, of housing, of three-bedroom units, of when do we get the residential, were three very important pieces that became part of the puzzle in our refiled petition.

The other thing that we heard a lot about, obviously, was the issue of height. And people wanting, we had set this up, as we step back from the canal, but we had proposed 185 feet as you step back to the end of the project, which is really the Macy's and the Best Buy building for orientation. We ended up in this proposal taking 30 feet out of that, out of that band.

So again, always stepping back from the canal, but also reducing the height. And that was part of the dialogue. And one of the things I'll talk about in a minute, as it related, when I come back after David speaks, about the Planning Board was their desire to really protect the core. And we've made some changes in the zoning so that that core height, the what I call the core mall, the core

retail mix, would stay. So that was the other change that we made, you know, moving forward.

And then lastly, as far as sort of major changes was this idea of setbacks. The desire to have, as it relates to the building on, buildings on First Street, as you see the imagery of our reimagining First Street, that we would actually move the buildings back from where they are today, specifically the upper parking garage and the Best Buy building. Create a sidewalk of at least 20 feet in width, cycle track, really rethinking what First Street could be to allow, as this image shows, things that are on the sidewalk. That we could have cafes, that we could have retail, to really change that whole walling effect of First Street.

And that related to the setback, but also in working with community and others and Planning Board and comments that we made, were made, can we have areas where the buildings actually step back? So we'd have a setback at the base, but as the building went up to a certain height, we would propose at about 65 feet, the building would set back again. As it went up another series of feet, it would step back again.

That is a visual issue that's lowering the density, that's actually shrinking the floor plates of what we would have and shrinking the density, but really changing how you would, you envision and how you interact with these buildings both at a higher level and certainly on, on the ground.

So in summary, those were, and there are many other changes that are listed in that petition form that we filed with you and that chart, but those were a lot of the major things. You know, height, density, affordability, family, setbacks, step-backs that we focused on.

So I wanted to have you, have you sort of hear a little bit about that, because it is the basis of a lot of the changes of the petition, before we talk about some of the, later on about sort of the public benefits and some of the mitigation, which were also included the petition.

So with that said, and with that really as a long-winded, not very exciting introduction, I'd like to turn it over to David who can sort of show okay, what does that all really mean as we start to think about the project?

David.

MR. DAVID MANFREDI: Good evening, everybody. I'm

going to go through this relatively quickly. But I want to start with just the--

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Can you introduce yourself?

MR. DAVID MANFREDI: I certainly can. David Manfredi from Elkus Manfredi Architects. I want to very briefly go back in time, and a little bit of history, but only in terms of planning. And go back to the 1978 East Cambridge Riverfront Plan, because I think it is so relevant to what we are here to talk about tonight.

And I'm going to quote from some very specific language. If you look back, pre-CambridgeSide Galleria, what you recognize is that what CambridgeSide Galleria was able to do was to contribute the real estate that created Charles Park, that completed the Canal Park, and really created the beginning of a public realm, open space network that still exists today, that still is very popular today, but offers opportunity to be expanded.

And that everything we are proposing in terms of the mix of uses, the walkability of the district, the value of open space as a community building kind of value, really is language that comes from, or ideas that come from that, that 1978 Riverfront Plan from the 2002 DCR Master Plan,

from the 2011 Riverfront Plan, and from even as recently as the '19 Envision Cambridge Plan.

So to start with what I think is the most important thing in making great urban neighborhoods, and that is a mix of uses. And the language that's in quotes is the language that comes straight out of the East Cambridge Riverfront Plan, "To require development in the area that provides expanded shopping facilities, general office space, and new housing and stress commercial uses."

CambridgeSide Galleria was able to achieve expanded shopping that was very successful for a long time. What this proposal offers is office space, new housing, and truly does stress commercial uses.

What you're looking at on the left is a rendering of Land Boulevard that you haven't seen before. It reflects what John Twohig just talked about, which is the reduced height of 155 feet on the Macy's site.

I want to point out one of the things that makes this development so difficult is that, and this is just one, one place to point it out. On this site, the Macy's site, exists today infrastructure in terms of, in terms of power, loading docks that access the entire east side of the mall.

And so in order to keep that retail operational, we actually have to retain the first two floors of the building, and then build the new building through those first two floors, so that we can service the retail, so that we can keep power in place, we can keep additional infrastructure in place.

On the right side, you're seeing First Street, which is really maybe our most important contribution to public realm. Taking a street today that is has narrow sidewalks, that is not a complete street, that does not have the appropriate bike lanes and that really has dead edges meaning it does not have edges that engage pedestrians, and to convert that in a way that I think really does fulfill that original 1978 Riverfront Plan.

And again, to quote that, "Create a fundamentally diverse and active urban focus with the canal reclamation and surrounding development." So you see what existing First Street looks like today. You all know it. And then below, what it can become.

Doubling the width of the sidewalk, creating a complete street, putting the cycle track up on the sidewalk, creating two new public spaces, pocket parks, on

either side of what is a parking garage today, that are not insubstantial. They are 40 feet wide, about 100 feet deep. The kind of scale that actually does gather people, bring people together.

We will maintain that retail core, the two levels of retail that exists today, add office and residential uses, bring the lobbies down to the streets so people coming home from work, people leaving in the morning are coming out onto the sidewalks.

The most important thing about building good urban neighborhoods is people living there, people invested in the neighborhood from the point of view of security, from the point of view of supporting all of those streetfront uses. And we will replace those blank walls that are in the upper photograph with those small stores and restaurants that really do engage pedestrians and, and bring a place alive.

Again from 1978, "Encourage development around the canal that is colorful in details and rich in open space amenities." Again, we will replace those blank walls on First Street and Thorndyke. We will replace them with small-scale shops, restaurants, lobbies for office and

living spaces, creating a much more walkable environment, and also reinvest in Canal Park.

Canal Park, when it was built back at the opening of the CambridgeSide Galleria, added important public realm. Our intent is not only to improve it, actually taking some hardscape, replacing it with greenscape, making more green tree canopy which is important to the world we live in today in terms of heat island effects. But also expand it. Expand it under Land Boulevard all the way to the Museum of Science.

And the other opportunity here which I've just hinted at is the ability, the opportunity to expand public realm. And so we think that comes in several forms. On the left is a plan that includes the reinvented Canal Park, meaning more tree cover, but also the red dots represent opportunities. Not every one, not every red dot will have public art but the opportunities to create a kind of trail of public art that will lead all the way from Charles Park, through the arcade around onto First Street, along Canal Park, under the bridge, out to the green space that exists today on the south side of the canal, and all the way to the renovated boathouse and to the Museum of Science.

And what you're looking at it, on the right, is a vision of what that river edge could be. Wide, publicly accessible, rich in detail, and with the opportunity for access on a daily basis by means of canoes and kayaks.

You all know what the existing bridge looks like on the photograph on the lower right. Walking under is not a particularly inviting experience. But there are examples around the country, around the world, about how bridges like this have been turned into the canvas for new public art. They have been re--made safe, made safe and secure. They are places where public art can come and change. It can be an everchanging, it can almost be the kind of museum space that offers an opportunity for people of all kinds to participate in public art.

And then on the upper left, the new planting on the, and the new edge on the north side of the canal, which again creates greater opportunity to access the waterfront.

And so it's all about creating places to bring people together, whether that's on the sidewalk on First Street, inside the arcade itself around Canal Park, all the way under the bridge to the, to the boathouse. Places where Cantabrigians come together, where visitors to the Museum

of Science find their way here to the water's edge. And people do get, in fact, do get to the river.

We have committed, New England Development has committed to rehabilitating the boathouse. I think everybody knows the photo on the right, the boathouse is in desperate need of repair. This will be a rehabilitation, a renovation that will allow it to be an active space, a more public space than it has ever been. And really, to be a space again that can be the launch point for access to the river through, through kayaks, through, through rowboats. through canoes. Again, our greatest natural resource on the waterfront and, and the Charles River.

So I think you, everybody knows the numbers and we can go through these in great detail. But I'll just point to the, to the chart, to the site plan at the top and the chart below it.

What we are proposing is that we are creating four building sites. I think that's really important. We're taking a kind of superblock and breaking it down into parts and creating four identifiable, mixed-use buildings, each one different. But at a scale that will reinvent for a street.

And so the Macy's parcel, you know what's existing, proposed, and what the net new is. And again, this is, as John mentioned, 155 feet tall with those two step-backs that give it scale.

The Best Buy site, again, bringing that building, reinvent that building from grade up, mixed use with retail on the ground floor, perhaps the second floor, and then the commercial uses above and the net new.

The garage, the most mixed use of all of the blocks, it will be retail on the ground floor. It will be office for three levels, and then the 175,000 square feet of, of new residential above.

And then the Sears block, again now separated by that new open space, that pocket park, with the additional two floors that will bring it to 85 feet, 86,000 square feet of net new space. And you can see the totals at the bottom, 575,000 square feet broken down by residential and, and commercial.

So I want to talk a little bit about climate and--and--and resiliency especially, and what's--what's specific, some specific points about--about heat island vulnerability.

And we all know what the risks are and the dangers are and, and those very compelling long-term prognostications about how many days a year we will have those very high temperatures compared to the historic numbers.

And the opportunity to really use our access to water and really use all of this green space as a way to combat that heat island vulnerability.

And so part of it is the building. Because the arcade itself is publicly accessible space, the interior public space connected to the exterior space, it creates a kind of oasis, a kind of relief in the midst of the city.

But all around the building, the increased sidewalk I mentioned, all of the new street trees, all of the new trees around the canal, create shade, new plantings that can have the impact of truly reducing the temperature of the ambient air around us as much as 10 degrees on those, on those overheated kinds of days.

This is the kind of thing that we've got to do across the country in terms of creating dense new urban tree canopies that not only, not only create relief, but really have a measurable quantifiable impact on our comfort.

So as you can see, improving the, our access to the

water, the tree canopy around the water, reducing that heat island effect by 8 to 10 degrees from the neighboring ambient temperatures, and improving that area below the bridge, bringing the public to the water.

And the water itself, if the tree canopy produces a 10-degree difference just being close to water, and the evaporative power of water is a 20-degree difference in terms of ambient temperature.

I want to talk a little bit specifically about sustainability. This is the last couple of, of these images. We have proposed to provide a separate storm water infiltration system. It says trench and that might bring up the wrong kinds of mental images. But it's a system in, under Land Boulevard, that can divert nearly 400,000 gallons of stormwater per day by continuing or completing the separation of the two different systems.

And we are also exploring water use reduction by two different strategies. One that will reuse collected rainwater for the simple irrigation of all of the green that we are talking about. But an even more sophisticated system that can reuse, reclaim that storm water and condensate and create clear water waste for use in the

mechanical systems of the building, and even the portable plumbing systems.

We have committed to LEED Gold core and shell for the new office buildings, with a particular emphasis on, on both energy and on water. Reduce carbon emissions, including by means of high efficiency building systems.

I think the one thing that we can feel best about is that new buildings do have the kind of equipment and the kind of systems that can maintain the same square footage, the same kinds of uses, with greatly reduced energy consumption, due to the quality of systems.

Improve building envelopes. And again, the strategies have become more sophisticated. The systems are far more sophisticated.

Reduced the light, the energy used by lighting, not by reducing the lighting itself, but by using LED lighting and sophisticated lighting.

And the ultimate strategy that I think we're all striving to achieve, make these buildings Net Zero ready by use of locally sourced renewable energy from solar and wind and reduce our overall reliance on fossil fuels.

With that, we will return to John.

MR. JOHN TWOHIG: So you've heard all the interesting and fun pictures. Mine is more, a little bit back to the Planning Board update.

As I mentioned in the beginning, we were at the, um, the Planning Board on Tuesday as Rich mentioned. I know Jeff and others are here. But I just wanted to let you know a little bit of the results from that.

Their next meeting is in the end of October. There was a motion for a draft recommendation to be prepared. Certainly staff can speak to it far better than I can. Our sense is there was a positive consensus regarding sort of the planning, certainly First Street.

Building heights and the step-backs I think were, especially step-backs, well received, the mix of uses, and sort of maintaining CambridgeSide, all positive things.

There was clearly dialogue. And I, and the only reason I wanted to mention a little bit of the update was that there was a sense that the City Council really needs to focus on some of these issues.

Housing was a big discussion that we had at the Planning Board. We probably spent the most significant amount of time talking about sort of the mix of affordable

housing, whether it should be inclusionary, inclusionary versus middle, how should that break go, given the amount of housing that this project is bringing forward? That was all a discussion.

There was some discussion about three-bedroom units, three-bedroom units versus smaller units and some of the issues related to that. And then also the mitigation commitments and the details. My sense was, I think our collective sense was that some of those issues, you know, obviously the Planning Board is deferring to the wisdom of the, of the City Council on those issues. But I think more to come on that.

We did go through a lot of issues. There was a CDD memo that, that they put out. We had gone through those issues. I won't dwell on this, I think that, you know, generally we were in agreement. There's going to be some wording changes and some wording updates that we'll, I think we'll see in the, in the recommendations to clarify some things.

I think, again, we were very comfortable with the issues that were, were raised and some of the recommendations. But again, some of them are really Council

decisions in the sense of things like housing and mitigation commitments and the like.

Some of the things were clearly going to be special permit when we actually, and you know, it's always good as we think about it, there's zoning, and then there's the special permit that has to come when you have a particular building and a particular use. That will be some of the discussions.

And there was dialogue regarding some urban design and being sure that anything that we did in the future would be subject to the environmental rules and regulations that may be applicable at that time, issues like that that we focused on.

So I don't want to dwell, again, you'll probably be hearing from staff on that.

What we did think we would talk and spend just five minutes on was sort of some of the mitigation discussions. And what we're going to present to you and briefly review with you is certainly not a commitment letter per se, which has all of the details in it. But just provide you a little bit of the summary of what we imagined a commitment letter will be. And that we will be providing one to you that has

some of the details.

But these are the things that we heard. And obviously we wanted to get feedback and continue to get feedback from the Ordinance Committee about other things that may be the focal points.

So things that we heard, that half of our housing be low and middle income were important issues. That we provide opportunity for non-profit in local office space at reduced rate and term. That we provide daycare opportunities that would be, that we would actually supply the space, that we would build that space out so there'd be opportunities for reduced rates daycare. Local retail space, especially on First Street, that we would dedicate some of the space for that. And again, by providing built-out space, that would not be subject to the same rate and terms that space would be.

Community meeting space, we heard a lot about that we want a community meeting space in the project of some size, that would also include an opportunity to celebrate the history of Cambridge in this area especially, so it would have sort of a historic component to it, that we would work with the Historical Commission on that.

And then also creating community gathering space, which might include things like winter gardens, seasonal markets were all--and the desire, and again, I'm just briefly summarizing these, but they would become part of the commitment letter that would actually be incorporated into the--into the zoning.

David I think has spent some time on the boathouse. Again, that boathouse as being a place that yes, it's engagement with the water, it's building the dock. That's true but also its use and opportunity to be community gathering space.

Canal Park improvements, we showed you some of the imagery, both the day and night, and how we see the bridge could be rebuilt underneath, both as it takes you to Boston and takes you to Cambridge.

Some desire to have dollars for the tree fund, a desire to have a formal commitment, although we always have provided and will free snow emergency parking.

Cooling oasis, there was a discussion about in these-- and it's not just cooling. It's also in times of storm events, to develop an action plan, a plan with police, with fire, with the Board of Health that would say this is a

place of opportunity during certain events, whether they be, you know, heat events as we know, as we go through climate change where this would provide shelter and haven for people to have that program, and to get the word out that that program would be available.

And then also energy, to have some specificity in our commitment letter with, you know, David--David recited some of our sort of energy conservation measures. Net Zero ready, but also a commitment to solar, that we would actually include that in our, in our commitment letter.

And then finally commitment to the arts. We have been working with Lemelson MIT on programming issues. We talked a little bit in his reference to the materials, but STEAM events or generally art events that we could have in the facility.

Again, some cash contributions to support Cambridge Arts, the Charles River Program which we talked about on our earlier petition. Rich has been working closely with Cambridge Public Schools about having that as a curriculum-based program.

We didn't originally pick the third grade, I have to tell you, a little bit concerned about third grade, but we

had a dozen teachers or so out on the water and experience that, and they think that's where we should focus on.

The East Cambridge Scholarship Fund, we started, Steve did, to my left, Steve Karp. The East Cambridge Scholarship Fund, there was a request that we would renew that and commit \$1 million dollars over time to that.

To set up an advisory committee. Great that we're going to have these opportunities for local retail space, and programming of the open space. And you know we do a lot of programming there. But the desire to have people from the community on that, people from the City on that, was one of the recommendations from the Planning Board about the frequency of the meetings of that committee so there's real local input into how we run those, what that space is like, who gets that space.

And then also a First Street Promenade. The idea of, and obviously we do it in other places in Cambridge, that if we are able to achieve what we want to achieve on First Street, could we make that area from really Thorndyke down into something that could be closed and become a pedestrian mall in key--you know, Sunday afternoon, where you actually have the walkability of that area.

So all of this is sort of to come in the -- in the commitment letter.

We touch very briefly on economic benefits. There was some confusion about information that was put out. I think everybody knows CambridgeSide has been one of the largest 10 taxpayers in the city for a long, long time, average over \$4 million a year, about \$45 million in the last 10 years on a conservative basis. That will rise to a range of \$7 million to \$8 million a year based on the build out, full build out of this project, just to give you a sense.

Something we don't talk a lot about, it's not New England Development's way, it has never been but I will mention it. The in-kind and the cash donations that CambridgeSide provides, it is an important part of the sort of the engine, we've always prided ourselves to CambridgeSide being a gathering place. I have to tell you, our contributions are far more in time and in programming than it is in cash, it always has been. But that is something that's just there.

And to the extent people are interested in the job situation. One, one person described what we're trying to do is as building an airplane while it's still flying, and

sort of rebuilding it. And that's really what we're trying to do. In its most simplest essence, and this relates to the jobs, we want to keep those jobs, those tenants that active retail, that active gathering place there as we look about the edges of what can you do with Sears? I mean, Sears is closed. What can we do with Sears? What can we do with a garage that is not, you know, in demand? How can you turn that into development that makes sense?

And then really moving around to the Best Buy and the Macy's, it's sort of rebuilding those, rehabilitating those into something that as much as David recites, and quite rightfully we look and we're rooted in CambridgeSide planning and design, and we are from 1978 forward, we're also trying to root ourselves into where are we? And that's when we look at issues of sustainability, energy, where are we in 30 years? Where are we in 40 years?

And part of that is providing the jobs, providing the vibrancy that's going to bring people here not next year, not the year after, but a decade from now. So that's also part of what we're talking about.

And that's really, just in conclusion, we'll stop sort of here with our formal presentation and turn it back to

you, Chairman, but the idea of what CambridgeSide is? Six million visitors a year to CambridgeSide. So, so people realize that.

We are trying to root this proposal very much in the design goals that David went through and create a zoning framework that works by providing the benefits.

The benefits that I mentioned, when you start to total those benefits, and there'll be, as it relates especially in our commitment letter, \$16 million worth of benefits coming forward as part of this project. And that does not include taxes or jobs or other things that we do, or any payments that we may have to make under your regulations, but just what we've heard as important parts as you're looking at the rehabilitation of this project for the community.

We have been a neighbor for a long time. We value that relationship that we've always had and, you know, hope to continue that as we try to rethink what this space should, space should be for the next 30 years.

Just very quickly, next steps as we see them and we'll turn it back to the Chair. There will be a formal commitment letter that we will be filing with the Ordinance

Committee so you can sort of see the summary that I went through. We do expect the Planning Board recommendation, obviously not to be presumptive at all, but the motion that was made, we do expect that to be towards the end of the month.

And then an updated zoning draft that reflects a lot of the commentary that we've got about the zoning draft and the wording and the like.

So with that, Mr. Chair, we'll, we'll turn it back to you.

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Thank you very much. Would City staff like to come up and comment on any of this? You don't have to.

DIRECTOR JEFF ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, I'll I guess get my spiel out of the way. The, so this has been to the Planning Board now four times. So the latest, latest, this is part of the refiled petition, is the--the fourth discussion on it.

It's also the fourth CDD report that's been put out on this, and so we have done a lot of work on this proposal and we've had a lot of productive discussions with the petitioner in the meantime. This team has engaged with us

throughout the process and they've responded even to the latest CDD report that we made with commitments to resolve the issues that--that we identified there, which are largely in the realm of details.

So shifting to the Planning Board hearing on Tuesday night, it was a robust discussion that went on for approximately four hours, so I'll just cut to the conclusion.

Which was that the Planning Board asked staff to draft a recommendation. And the recommendation would be generally supporting the proposal with the consensus among the Planning Board being that they were comfortable with the overall plan in terms of the heights and other development standards that were being proposed.

But the Board Members wanted to emphasize some key issues in their report that would be considered further by the--that they would recommend be considered further by the City Council.

And there were two main categories of--of issues. One is housing. There was a general consensus among the Board Members that this proposal should have as much residential use as can be supported. And the Planning Board members

appreciated the increase in, in residential that's, that's come with this revised proposal. But many members felt they didn't have enough information to know if this was the most residential that could be achieved. So that was something they wanted to explore further.

They also appreciate the commitment to affordable housing, and particularly to middle-income units, but wanted to continue to have a continued exploration of some of the detailed questions that were raised.

So the other category, generally speaking, was public benefits. And the Planning Board, again, appreciated having the chance to see the petitioner's overview of the commitments that would be made as part of this proposal. But they thought that those commitments needed to be looked at in more detail in order to make an assessment of whether the benefits of the project would outweigh its effects on the community.

So that's a brief summary, but I can answer any questions.

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Thank you very much. Do any of the Council Members have clarifying questions? Councillor Carlone. These are clarifying questions, I'm

sure no one needs to be reminded.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE: I'd like to ask for a clarification. So now can I say what I want? Last Tuesday, we talked about the figures, the 575,000 square feet. I believe it is, yes, 575,000 square feet.

But in fact, the garage numbers are not in that. And prior to 2000, any garage built did not qualify as FAR, that's why you had garages everywhere in the city above grade. And after 2000 it did count as FAR, and if you knock down a garage that was built after 2000, you have the right to build that amount of space back.

So in fact that is additional density, not massing, but Another 240,000 of commercial which, as I understand it, raises this, what you're asking for in the special permits to 815,000 and not 575,000. Is that correct?

MR. JOHN TWOHIG: I think there's, there's a couple of issues and I'm going to let David--I think your number, and David can speak to the number. And Councillor, I know you're not necessarily going to agree with it but the building, that building exists there.

How we treated it, whether you call it garage replacement space or whatever it is, and whether that

proposal is, you know, our net new space is as David, and I'm going to turn it back to David in a minute, is that space. There is a 250,000 square foot garage there that, that exists.

So how we tried to treat it was to acknowledge the existence of it as--as--as space and massing that was there. But David, why don't you, why don't you speak to that? And Steve, comment as well.

MR. STEPHEN KARP: Yes just in--

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Can you speak into the microphone, please?

MR. STEPHEN KARP: I'm Stephen Karp, New England Development. Just a clarification that the, that the use of that particular building is the housing, is in that building, and that's 175,000 square feet of the building, of the replacement building, as you call it.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE: Thank you, I got that number earlier from our meetings. But 17--same question. Actually I was asking Mr. Roberts. Tell me how the 170-- how, tell me how the parking garage is treated in the zoning and what is needed for it to be converted to actual space, new construction?

DIRECTOR JEFF ROBERTS: Through you, Mr. Chair, I think your assessment, Councillor Carlone, was--was correct overall. And in our zoning ordinance at large the park--above-grade parking at the time this--this was developed was not counted as part of gross floor area. And there was a zoning amendment made around 2000 which said that any new above-grade parking would be counted as gross floor area.

So that was a--it was a point that we acknowledged in the memo that was important to clarify what the intention was, and I think that was--was clarified at the Planning Board's hearing. I think the Planning Board and remained comfortable with the, the overall sort of volume of development as it was proposed.

Again, there--there was a lot of discussion about the relative mix of residential to commercial use. But, but I think the Board was, you know, was able to clarify and acknowledge that that, that if it were treated the way current zoning treats parking garages, that the demolition and replacement of that with a new building would count as a new gross floor area.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE: So indeed, that needs a special permit to use that 175,000 square feet of parking

as commercial?

DIRECTOR JEFF ROBERTS: So my understanding under current zoning, the current PUD-4 zoning for this site is that the existing garage is not part of the gross floor area allotment. So if they were going to demolish it and rebuild it, it would require either a change to the zoning as is being proposed now, or would require some other kind of reallocation of space in order to remain within the--

The limitation under current zoning is effectively the existing gross floor area. So if, if the garage were demolished and replaced it would require a reallocation of some space that's--that's existing on the site.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE: So the answer to that is yes, it's--it's 175,000 as stated, plus the 575,000 I believe it is? It's more than 575,000 which we're constantly seeing in the--in the presentation, that needs to be approved.

DIRECTOR JEFF ROBERTS: Well, I think the--the numbers are the numbers that were--were presented in this presentation. It would be the existing, so the existing gross floor area under current zoning wouldn't include the garage but what's being proposed in this petition is the

575,000 square feet of new gross floor area, plus the replacement of the garage. So that's separate.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE: And that's more than 575. That's 575 plus 175.

DIRECTOR JEFF ROBERTS: The garage, the replacement of the volume of the garage is in addition to the 575,000.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE: Okay, so once again, that's over eight, over 800,000 square feet is the real project that they're asking for in the square footage proposal, not the 575,000.

DIRECTOR JEFF ROBERTS: It's the 575,000 plus the garage.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE: Exactly, okay.

DIRECTOR JEFF ROBERTS: The additional for the garage.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE: And that adds up, if it's 575 and, sorry, 175, that's 800,000, over 800, correct? Or is it 750,000?

DIRECTOR JEFF ROBERTS: That's approximately correct.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE: Yeah. And the existing, existing legal size of the Galleria is?

DIRECTOR JEFF ROBERTS: I believe we talked about that at the Planning Board hearing. I could turn it back over to

David if--if he has a more specific estimate.

MR. DAVID MANFREDI: I think the Galleria itself is 600,000 square feet

COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE: Total? Not including the garage, just re--

MR. DAVID MANFREDI: Just the Galleria itself, that's right.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE: 600,000. So this is in essence more than a double, Mr. Roberts, more than a doubling of the FAR that's being requested, assuming those numbers are correct. 750,000 new, 600,000 existing. It's obviously more than a doubling.

VICE MAYOR JAN DEVEREUX: Mr. Chair, or whoever's controlling the slides, if you go back to that slide that it's on, I'm not sure what page number it is. You see the little, there's a table of numbers that might make this conversation somewhat--that, that was it. Wait, go back. There.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE: I'm asking because it is not clear and has never been clear.

VICE MAYOR JAN DEVEREUX: That's the one.

MR. DAVID MANFREDI: The--the, I think the right way

to think about the 575,000 that is the difference between what exists on the site today and what would exist on the site if everything was accepted.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE: I understand, but we're talking about zoning. And zoning is specific in numbers. Please.

ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER IRAM FAROOQ: Through you, Mr. Chair. I guess one of the things though, as the Board, the Planning Board talked about it, they saw it in two different ways.

So one is looking at the physical form of the building and the increment in that sense is the 575,000. And the other way is to think about the impacts of new development when you think of additional commercial or residential. And in that case, you would think about the 700 and--

COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE: I think it's great to bring in how we feel about things because that, as an urban designer I do that. But we're talking about zoning, and zoning is numbers. And I want it to be clear what is on the table.

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: So, so Councillor, I think you've made it clear. It's too--maybe you could restate it

and then we can move on. I think you've made your point.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE: What are they proposing to build according to zoning? By the definition of zoning it's more than 575,000.

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Okay.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE: And I think that should be clear in everything we write, or frankly, the zoning will be challenged if it's not clear. If they intend it to mean the 175,000 garage plus the 575,000 outlined.

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Okay.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE: That's question number one.

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Okay. Question number two?

COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE: Just bear with me for a moment. So the height proposed of 155 feet is approximately three times the existing height. Is that correct? 55 versus 175.

DIRECTOR JEFF ROBERTS: The, well again, I'd defer to get an accurate read on the existing height of the building. The current zoning allows a height limit of 85 feet.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE: Correct. Okay, a

double. Thank you.

Something was said which I think was a little misleading. Wasn't Canal Park built five years before the shopping complex? It was alluded to in a way like they were built together. The City built the park. I'm not going to ask if that's correct. I know that's true. But that's, that's a question.

And I will stop there for now with questions. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Thank you, Councillor Carlone. Anyone else have clarifying questions? Councillor Toomey.

COUNCILLOR TIMOTHY J. TOOMEY JR.: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Through you, it's my understanding that New England Development does not own the Sears Roebuck building. And that is correct?

MR. JOHN TWOHIG: That's correct.

COUNCILLOR TIMOTHY J. TOOMEY JR.: But you, I assume you're working with the owner to increase the height on that, on that site? And to be quite, quite honest, I think that's I mean it's clarification but I've always felt, felt that that should stay at the same level, the Sears Roebuck.

But is that the correct sentence I just said, that you are working with the current owner?

MR. JOHN TWOHIG: That's correct. It's owned by a company called Northwood Anchor Line. we do not own it, never did. Actually Sears has owned it--

COUNCILLOR TIMOTHY J. TOOMEY JR.: Owned by who?

MR. JOHN TWOHIG: Northwood Anchor Line.

COUNCILLOR TIMOTHY J. TOOMEY JR.: Northwood.

MR. JOHN TWOHIG: It's a partnership that's primarily Northwood, which is an investment company. That's been owned by Sears. Sears sold that to them. We have worked with them to create an atrium that would come through the Sears building to open up all of First Street and to open out onto Thorndyke Way.

There is a request that they be allowed to come up to 85 feet, which would involve putting two floors on top of the existing building. The first floor would remain retail and restaurant which we would actually program on behalf of them. So that's, that's been the dialogue that we have had with them.

COUNCILLOR TIMOTHY J. TOOMEY JR.: Thank you. Just that is a concern of mine. The other clarification, quick

clarification, on the front for retail like on First Street. I know you mentioned local. What is your definition of local? Is that going to be existing Cambridge businesses? I'm just curious to make sure that in fact it is local. So I'm just curious what your definition of local is.

MR. JOHN TWOHIG: It certainly could be. When people usually use that term, they say, you know, a lot of malls have national retailers, you know, with hundreds of units across the country. The thought is to, whether it be a local store or a very small chain. That, I mean, that's a desire to have people, and it's sort of thought of as a local and also sometimes incubator. We actually work on that now.

But what we heard is, people would like us to do a specific program to provide partially built space at reduced rate and terms. Because that's the biggest thing when you have local retailers, their ability to be able to commit to a longer-term space and rental. So to be able to give them a reduced rental rate and reduced term. That's what we've been asked.

But the thought is we want people from the area,

whether they're from Cambridge or its environs, that sort of depends on what kind of demand.

But the other reason to create the advisory committee was to help promote that opportunity. And, you know, oftentimes the best way to promote that opportunity is to have local people say, I know of, or I have connections to. Steve, if you want to speak to that, that retail piece.

MR. STEPHEN KARP: Just as a clarification, I can give just as a clarification, to give you an idea. We're, we are at the present time, we're redoing all of Logan Airport, all the retail, and we're bringing in all, as many local tenants as we can and the big names that you recognize, and it's been well promoted in the, in the press. So we're trying to stay away from a lot of those national chains that you typically see inside the mall.

And particularly restaurants where local restaurants add vitality to a community, so that's our intention to do that. And we'll work with a lot of the people that are in the neighborhood groups to talk about who would be available, that would be interested in coming into the new project.

COUNCILLOR TIMOTHY J. TOOMEY JR.: Thank you. So

you're shying away from national chains coming in along First Street?

MR. STEPHEN KARP: Along First Street, yes.

COUNCILLOR TIMOTHY J. TOOMEY JR.: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Other there questions? Mr. Mayor.

MAYOR MARC C. MCGOVERN: I just kind of wanted to, will there be an opportunity to share with them some thoughts on, can I ask some questions, not questions, but comments about the retail space, but we'll have that opportunity later?

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: We'll have that after public comment.

MAYOR MARC C. MCGOVERN: Thank you.

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Other questions before we move to--Vice Mayor.

VICE MAYOR JAN DEVEREUX: Yeah. So the presentation refers to commercial and office. It doesn't mention lab. Is there, what's the--what's the thought of how much actual general office there would be, as opposed to lab?

MR. JOHN TWOHIG: There isn't actually a breakdown. We

don't, you know, as we get into the special permit process and we actually have a user to bring forward. It's sort of the, the difficulty when you're sort of in that zoning process people say, "Well, could you put the building here? Could you--what kind of use are you going to have here?" We really don't know. It's going to be subject to at the time we bring it forward what the demands are, what the status of the economy is.

Everybody knows there's a very vibrant lab demand. That's true. There's also a very vibrant office demand. We have one of the lowest occupancy rates in the country here. And interestingly enough, they're very similar economic models because lab requires more tenant improvement monies, pay slightly higher rent, but office requires less.

It's a very, we don't, we really don't know what the what the future would be.

VICE MAYOR JAN DEVEREUX: And, and the housing would not be in a building that had any other use except some retail on the ground floor. Is that correct?

MR. STEPHEN KARP: No, there'd be--there'd be some office in the building, if you look the breakdown of the square footage within the building. And, but that would not

be lab space. That would definitely be just straight office space and retail on the first floor. It's possible we could have retail on two floors in that building.

VICE MAYOR JAN DEVEREUX: Okay. And, and I think in one place it referred to that the LEED Gold being applying to the general office. So if--if they were a lab, would it be the LEED, something term like shell, form and shell? I don't know, it wasn't-- core and shell.

MR. DAVID MANFREDI: Yes. The requirements for core shell LEED gold, would apply core shell lab or core shell office.

VICE MAYOR JAN DEVEREUX: It would apply, so either one, okay. Are there any actual numbers about parking spaces? I mean, I know there are various parking ratios that are, were a topic of discussion, but is there any estimate of how many parking spaces will remain and--?

MR. STEPHEN KARP: Yeah, there's a total of about 2,500 spaces right now of which 800 are above grade, so that will leave about 1,700 spaces that continue to be in operation.

Obviously, if we, if we build the, if the first building isn't the garage building, the garage building

will still be up so there'll be, continue to be 2,500 spaces. When that building comes down, there's 1,700 spaces below grade.

And we've done obviously a study to make sure what, when everything is built out, that's an adequate amount of spaces. And so we, you know, when we come back with the plans on each individual building, when we get the details of it, we can get more specific about the breakdown of it.

VICE MAYOR JAN DEVEREUX: But you're not building any more spaces, so.

MR. STEPHEN KARP: We're not building any more spaces, no.

VICE MAYOR JAN DEVEREUX: Then the 1,700 remaining, you'll basically back out the parking ratios by figuring out how those are?

MR. STEPHEN KARP: That's correct. Yeah.

MR. JOHN TWOHIG: Unusually, we did spend some time with the transportation department, a zoning provision, proposal, you don't often bring forward to your traffic and parking numbers, but they wanted to be careful to be, you know, not that parking has been an issue here in the City of Cambridge of recent date, but it has been. Sorry.

VICE MAYOR JAN DEVEREUX: Too soon.

MR. JOHN TWOHIG: Too soon, it is too soon. But in that 1,700 remaining, if you apply the parking ratios which Cambridge is comfortable , 0.9, for example, for office, the retail numbers. When, and one good piece of news is we have 20 years of data every day, every hour, on how many people park and it's an amazing straight line down over the last 20 years as far as demand for parking.

But it also informs us based on the ratios and the demands how many spaces we need, and that number came in about 1,250 to 1,300 parking spaces out of the 1,700.

But there's also desire, we do have a commercial parking permit that the staff, and this was going to be part of the recommendation, that going forward we work with Transportation and Parking and Planning to determine that they were comfortable with the ratios that we have. These are the recommended ones that we put into the zoning from staff, but also work on sort of what should be the future.

But that 1700 spaces was, people were comfortable, that that's going to be more than sufficient for--for our needs going forward.

VICE MAYOR JAN DEVEREUX: And so you mentioned that

there was some traffic data preliminary. Where--where is that?

MR. JOHN TWOHIG: We provided a memo to staff. It wasn't--

VICE MAYOR JAN DEVEREUX: It wasn't part of the Planning Bard stuff?

MR. JOHN TWOHIG: It wasn't part of it, no, not at all. Well, although they did report in our last petition, and again, Jeff can speak to it, that they were comfortable with our parking numbers and understood where traffic -- traffic and a full transportation study really is informed by bringing a building forward. You have to have a full, both a local and state and meet the quality traffic study when you know what the actual uses are and everything that's currently in the queue.

That isn't done at a zoning level because it's just, there's no basis for it. But we did go through, at a high level, a discussion with--with City staff on that, but wasn't part of the--besides the report originally in the petition, there was not a study in that sense. It wouldn't be done until we did a special permit.

VICE MAYOR JAN DEVEREUX: Yeah, I know, except that

we're being asked to essentially double the amount of usable or used GFA. Take, if you include, if you--

MR. STEPHEN KARP: So I think that's still a question.

VICE MAYOR JAN DEVEREUX: I know, okay, okay. It's still a question. So I mean, I guess I'm, I guess I'm just trying to clarify how we would ever see any of the traffic data to get a sense of--

MR. JOHN TWOHIG: If it would be helpful, we could take the traffic memo that was, that we provided to staff and reviewed and supply it to the Ordinance Committee so you can see whether--

You know, and again, it was done at a high level, assuming all of this space was built, if it was built out today what, and I think projected forward, what would that be? And we can provide that information. Happy to do that.

VICE MAYOR JAN DEVEREUX: Okay, thanks. I think that was my last question, last clarifying question. Thank you.

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Thank you very much. Councillor Mallon, I was very careful in that one.

COUNCILLOR ALANNA M. MALLON: Good job. So my clarifying question is, I know there was a lot of discussion about housing at the Planning Board and the

percentage of housing, and I'm not surprised since it's a conversation we've been having a lot lately.

There was some talk about the residential trigger, and how it may not have been as effectively written as it could have been. And I'm wondering if Jeff Roberts from CDD can talk to us about what the concerns were around the residential trigger, and how we can mitigate that moving forward to make everyone feel more comfortable with that.

DIRECTOR JEFF ROBERTS: Certainly. Through you, Mr. Chair, the--the discussion was really, it was about the parts really about the concept of the trigger as it's been called. And as we've described it, and as it's been applied in other mixed-use phased developments such as this, it, it sets an overall expectation for how the non-residential and residential phases will proceed in relation to one another without being too prescriptive.

Because the whole intention is that PUD zoning is all based on the premise that everything needs Planning Board approval, including the phasing. So the zoning sets, it sets an overall threshold, but then the master plan for all the, all the buildings and the uses within those buildings would have to be laid out with the phasing and the timing

of each that would say, you know, we're going to do this building, and then we're going to do that building and then that building.

The, the, I think the overall expectation that's attempting to, that this--this current version of opticians is attempting to articulate is that there would--would be something like one commercial building built. And then, there would need to be the residential phase commencing.

I think the Planning Board members did have some concern about whether the--the zoning language was being articulated clearly enough to make sure that that would be the case.

I think part of it does go back to this conversation about the development would be kind of a blended mix of development rights that are available under the existing zoning, and then the net new development that's coming out of the proposed zoning. And the trigger was, is based on the net new.

And so there's a question of well, if, you know, you kind of have to factor. If you're looking at the overall phasing of the project, you then kind of have to factor out what's allowed under existing zoning and you might end up

with something where it could, you know, it could seem like it would get pushed off even further than--than it's expected to.

So I think there's a willingness to work with that language to make sure that it--it does what it's intended to do. Which again, is to have a, to have a -- to allow a commercial phase to go first but then to make sure that the residential phase would come right after that first commercial phase.

And that's fairly typical with--with other mixed use developments that have been permitted. I think the theory is that maybe they could speak to this more, is that, you know the commercial, getting the commercial development off the ground is important for the economics of the project. But requiring the residential sort of in the middle means that there's still a strong enough incentive to do the residential, because there's still then more commercial that can be unlocked after it.

MR. JOHN TWOHIG: Mr. Chair, could I, through you, could I clarify that?

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Sure.

MR. JOHN TWOHIG: There was a concern raised that the

language wasn't clear. What Jeff said is absolutely correct. Our thought was we have, it put it simplistic terms, you have the upper garage building, you have the Best Buy building and the Macy's. Those are our three buildings. Sears, you have to sort of put it aside.

We were trying to, in the language, clarify that the Sears which is staying as a building, we have three buildings. We could build one new commercial building, but then of our three buildings, the next building would have to be the residential building.

And we're going to clarify the words so that's clear. Because what people didn't want to have is that we would leave the residential building to the end, and then therefore that might not happen.

So the goal was that there would be some incentive, because, you know, you have the issue of you have one more commercial building. And with the degree of affordability, we have some challenges on the residential building. So be sure though that that residential building is going to happen as our second new building. And we have no problem. That's, we will clarify to be sure that's, that's accurate.

COUNCILLOR ALANNA M. MALLON: Okay, thank you, Mr.

Chair. And through you, I, you know, I think, yes, of course, we want to make sure that those residential units happen. But I also don't want to wait 8 to 10 years to see those residential units, particularly the ones we need for our most vulnerable residents looking for safe, affordable housing.

So I'm just assuming that before you go back to the Planning Board, the petitioners will work with CDD to have that language more clearly articulated around the residential trigger. Is that correct?

MR. JOHN TWOHIG: Through you, Mr. Chair. Correct.

COUNCILLOR ALANNA M. MALLON: Okay. Thank you.

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Other -- Councillor Zondervan.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And through you, I have a question about the heights. I, I see them very prominently marked on this slide as minus 30 feet. And I understand why it's done that way. But what I would like to know is what is currently allowed and what are you proposing to add?

DIRECTOR JEFF ROBERTS: Through you, Mr. Chair, what's currently allowed under current zoning is 85 feet is the

height limit. And this proposes sort of a range of escalating heights above the 85-foot height limit, up to a maximum of 155.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Thanks. And what, what are the building heights now for Macy's, Best Buy and the garage?

DIRECTOR JEFF ROBERTS: Again, I believe they're three-storey retail buildings, and I think they're approximately 60 feet. We might, I might need to turn to-- I'm getting nods from that side. I think that's accurate.

MR. JOHN TWOHIG: They range from 58 feet to 92 in those three buildings. The upper garage happens to be 92 feet.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: The garage is 92 and the other two are 60?

MR. JOHN TWOHIG: Yeah, 58.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: 58, okay. Thanks. And then I had some questions about the energy and Net Zero ready proposal. Is it, it still seems a bit vague. So are you planning to put more specifics in the, in the commitment letter? I mean, for example, it references wind, but are you proposing a wind turbine on site? Because

otherwise, I don't quite understand that reference.

MR. JOHN TWOHIG: Through you, Mr. Chair, in the commitment letter we're going to lay out the specifics of things that we can commit to. Some of the things we may not be able to commit to, but we'll agree that we're going to try to build into the program. And so we'll put the details of that in the commitment letter so you can see that.

Because I know it was important that not only do we say we're going to have these sustainable goals, but we actually achieve and are obligated to achieve some of them, so.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Thanks. And when, when do we get the commitment letter?

MR. JOHN TWOHIG: Our goal is to have that to you in the next 10 days.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Great. And then there's a lot of concern in the community as you know about the Eversource substation, and adding additional load onto the grid. So could you speak to what that looks like for your proposal?

MR. JOHN TWOHIG: Bob Diller is here from Tetra Tech who is site civil and our environmental. And he's, I'll try

to give you the short answer. And we certainly know and appreciate, and we've met with Eversource many times over the past several months and know the discussions that are going on related to the substation otherwise.

We are somewhat of a different animal than the traditional project that's sort of building new. We're a customer since 1990. We traditionally, and I'll just kind of give you the--the sort of gross numbers. There's been 27 million kilowatt per hour demand. We, that will change over time and is changing as Sears has closed and as other anchors may close.

But we have a plan that allows us, knowing that we had a traditional base, as that base comes down, as with the Sears closing and therefore energy demand going down, we expect unfortunately Macy's also to be closing as that demand goes down, that as we come back up with a different type of use as the demand, and retail's a very high user. Residential, for example, is a much lower user.

We're also changing the peaks a great deal, because if you look at retail, retail is you turn the switch on when the lights come on in the morning, they go out at night. You know, the peaks are very similar.

By bringing in mixed use, whether that be office retail, residential, it is a different system. And also by bringing in technology and systems and initiatives that certainly didn't exist in 1990, whether that be how the facade is built. We've also talked to Eversource about bringing in battery storage to be able to deal with some peaks, that we feel that over a period of time, recognizing this isn't a project that gets built right away and actually can't because we have to, again, keep it open and keep it loaded and keep the facility there, that we can actually start at a certain historical level. Drop down as we will, and then come back up. And you know, either stay at the level that was our historical energy demand, or even beat it if we can, by some of the initiatives.

So that, that's sort of our plan and program going forward. And we've spent a lot of time and--and certainly, we can get, Bob could get into greater detail. But that's, that's been our discussion.

Yeah. And traditionally, you know, I know, again, related to Eversource, the whole issue about, you know, are we in the zone pocket? We're actually out of it. But I mean, I'll sort of stop there because I don't want to get

too far over my skis. But just having spent a lot of time over many months focused with them.

We also have, we did something that is not in your zoning, and we proposed it in the zoning for the PUD-8 that as part of any special permit, we would have to, as you make, and you have language in your existing zoning that speaks to demonstrating water and other availability. We added, we added electric. I mean, and to be able to demonstrate that that utility that's not in your existing zone.

And I know you had a meeting earlier today that talked about that. But adding that before we could go forward with a special permit for any building, we'd have to make a demonstration. We actually had put that in, in the draft we filed in July, recognizing the concern and the issues that were in the community.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Thank you.

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: See, no other clari--
Councillor Carlone.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE: Just you show, or the City shows your drawing for the site and the different height zones. I noticed the height zones for the two major

office buildings along CambridgeSide place are actually bigger, I think, than what the model shows. And I understand flexibility. Maybe I'm reading it wrong.

But according to this drawing, it's about 125 feet, where the existing height of your retail complex will stay as is, and then the office building comes up. But the model seems much bigger than that. So this is just flexibility, this diagram?

We could talk about that another time. My other question--

MR. JOHN TWOHIG: Yeah, I'm not sure what--

COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE: My other question-- well, it's different. And I want to make sure the model is accurate. How big is the site? It's not on these drawings nor in the report.

MR. JOHN TWOHIG: I know Bob is here who did the survey. I want to say it's eight and a half acres. Eight and a half acres, plus or minus.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Seeing no more clarifying questions, we will go to public comment. Each member of the

public who wants to speak will have three minutes to do. We don't have a timer so we will use a low-tech method.

At two minutes and 45 seconds, I will put my coffee cup up in front of me and you know you have 15 seconds to wind up.

Please stop at three minutes, we have a lot of speakers, and we're an hour-and-a-half into the meeting. So if you go over and other people go over it winds up being somewhat disrespectful of everyone's time. So we will stop you as politely as possible at three minutes.

As I said earlier, we want everyone to feel welcome here. And as incredible as it may seem, zoning actually gets a lot of people very passionate. So when someone says something that you really agree with it, that's great. Please keep your emotions to yourself. If you really disagree with it, please keep your emotions to yourself. And if you want to display your emotion, I ask that you leave the room.

And on that note, when you come up, please introduce yourself, say where you live. If you have written comments, there should be a basket someplace out there for you to put them in.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Russell Cushman, 100 CambridgeSide, spoke in support of the petition. The Charles River Boat Company has operated the boats at the Lechmere Canal under contract from the City of Cambridge and works closely with CambridgeSide Galleria daily, enabling his business success and growth. Mr. Cushman indicates 50 seasonal jobs and 10 full-time jobs would not be possible without the assistance of CambridgeSide management. He stressed the importance that this project serve the local community as well as tourists from Boston and international markets. Mr. Cushman complimented the community generosity of the CambridgeSide team and their work with non-profit and community groups.

Sharon Zimmer, 99 Bishop Allen, Executive Director of Cambridge Camping Association, spoke in support of the petition. Ms. Zimmerman's organization has benefited from Steve Karp's generosity and commitment to the community, and stated that New England Development cares deeply about Cambridge, while being committed to equality and access. Ms. Zimmerman highlighted the many charitable contributions New England Development has made in the City of Cambridge, and asked the Committee support the petition so that New

England Development can continue to invest in the community.

Jeff Martin, 10 Holworth, President of Carpenters 138, spoke in support of the petition and stressed the need for the mall to be renovated, stressing the redevelopment will create jobs in the City of Cambridge.

David Boris, 9 Hollis Street, representing Pile Drivers Local 56 of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters, spoke in support of the petition, stating there is a need to readjust and repurpose the property in question to maximize its potential for both the developer and the City of Cambridge. Mr. Boris complimented New England Development on being a good corporate citizen, and highlighted the jobs to be created by this project.

Michael Burns, 1157 Adams Street, Dorchester MA, representing Sheet Metal Workers Local 17, spoke in full support of the petition.

Leroy Ward, 8 Marvin Place, spoke in support of the petition.

Tom Joyce, 270 Third Street, spoke in support of the petition and was grateful to see heights have been reduced, and cautioned against any creep in the building heights in

East Cambridge going forward.

Cilia Moran Cruz, 14 Chestnut Park, Malrose, MA, spoke in support of the petition, indicating she felt safe at the Galleria, commended the charitable contributions of the developer, and appreciated the inclusion of affordable units.

Pamela Putnam, 4 Canal Park, spoke in opposition to the petition, expressing concerns about traffic congestion and the long-term infrastructure impacts resulting from size and amount of units proposed, and was opposed to the height of the project.

Steve Bennett, 29 Cogswell Avenue, spoke in support of the petition, and his appreciation for the relationship between the Arts Council and CambridgeSide, as well as the commitment to involving local artists in the project.

Anderson Lima, 566 Windsor Street, spoke in support of the petition and indicated the Galleria Mall was outdated and in need of a facelift.

James Williamson, 100 Jackson Place, spoke about issues taking public transportation to the Galleria and the importance of considering public transportation in the proposal, as well as traffic impacts. He encouraged the

council to be skeptical about promises from the petitioner, and stressed the importance of accurate data when making policy decisions.

Marlene Lundberg, 4 Canal Park, stated that there was not enough financial information to make a decision on this petition. She asked the council to require pro forma, audited financial statements from the petitioner to evaluate whether the petitioner's claim of financial need to justify the increased height is valid.

Saundra Vrejan, 4 Canal Park, spoke in opposition to the petition, citing serious concerns over the traffic in the neighborhood. Ms. Vrejan feels that drastically varying the current zoning regulations and the resulting density will change the character of the area.

Ilan Levy, 148 Spring Street, spoke about negotiating actively to extract as much as possible from the petitioner for public benefits, as good corporate citizenship does not equate to benefits. He stated as a representative of ECPT, ECPT has discussed but not come to a decision on this petition until the Eversource situation is resolved. Mr. Levy also requested energy be incorporated into the zoning, and to be careful not to enshrine contract zoning.

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: I'll take a moment here. We're supposed to have our meetings end after two hours. We're bumping up against that two-hour limit. I'd entertain a motion to--

MAYOR MARC C. MCGOVERN: Move to extend.

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Okay, we'll move to extend. Is there --

MAYOR MARC C. MCGOVERN: How many speakers?

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: We have roughly 10 speakers signed up yet to speak and whoever wishes to speak after that, so probably another 20 minutes or so of public comment.

MAYOR MARC C. MCGOVERN: And then more discussion. Okay.

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: And then more discussion. Okay. The motion has been moved and approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Stephanie Couch, 10 Rogers Street, spoke in favor of the petition. Ms. Couch emphasized that CambridgeSide Galleria improved the walkability of the neighborhood, provided access to essential items. Ms. Couch mentioned the public benefits of incorporating the arts, incubating local

businesses, and serving as a community gathering space, and appreciated the community benefit commitments being proposed.

Cynthia Livingston, 10 Rogers Street, generally spoke in support of the petition while highlighting concerns with the 10-year timeframe of the project, the height variance, traffic and parking, and questioned the necessity of increased density. Ms. Livingston was in favor of the inclusion of affordable housing and stressed the needs of the community must be prioritized.

Lee Farris, 269 Norfolk Street, spoke in opposition to the petition. She opposed any upzoning until the Eversource siting issue is resolved, speaking for the Cambridge Residents Alliance. She stressed the need for housing at all income levels in Eastern Cambridge, and encouraged Council to stay with 50% middle income, and requested affordable family-sized units be incorporated.

Xavier Vivar, 14 Chestnut Park, spoke in support of the petition, citing the enjoyment residents will derive from the project.

Tristine Thong, 287 Broadway, read a letter in support of the petition, highlighting CambridgeSide as a great

neighbor, and expressed appreciation that the proposal includes 80 units of affordable housing.

John Rafferty, 4 Canal Park, spoke in opposition to the petition, stressing that zoning changes are consequential. Mr. Rafferty indicated the height and volume changes need to be handled with sensitivity, indicating much can be achieved within the current zoning. Mr. Rafferty acknowledged New England Development as a good corporate citizen, but finds the changes too insensitive to the community needs.

Anika Watler, 224 Norfolk Street, spoke in support of the petition, highlighting the Galleria as a community gathering spot.

Pauline Phillip-Borde, from Fall River, spoke in support of the petition, highlighting the affordable housing component.

Chris Matthews, 26 Sixth Street, spoke in support of the project, and the transformation it would bring to the neighborhood. He referred to the East Cambridge Planning team's letter with respect to public benefits, and indicated that renovating the Department of Conservation and Recreation DCR boathouse as part of the mitigation

package is not responsive to neighborhood wishes, and that the money instead go to a community benefit that is needed in East Cambridge.

David Ellis, 6 Canal Park, stated that there are several attractive things in the proposal but is concerned about the character of the neighborhood and increased traffic, and questioned the need for increased height, and encouraged Council to review pro forma.

Matthew Connelly, 13 Cornelius Way, asked the Council not to approve any upzoning petitions until the issues with the proposed Eversource substation on Fulkerson Street is resolved.

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Thank you very much. Is there anyone else who has not spoken who would like to speak? Seeing none, I'll entertain the motion to close public comment. Public comment is closed. Councillor Carlone, did you--oh, okay.

I want to take the temperature of my peers. We've been sitting here for close to two-and-a-half hours. We can continue to talk. We can take a brief recess and talk. We can take a longer recess and meet at a different time and talk. Thoughts?

COUNCILLOR E. DENIS SIMMONS: Thank you. Because it is 7:55 I wouldn't ask us to adjourn. I think that'd be a disservice to the presenters.

I might recommend that we recess. But I only say that if the meeting, the next meeting was going to be relatively soon so we could pick up the conversation, starting maybe earlier.

I always appreciate the fact that we meet at 5:30 so that the public can come and participate. I also know that it's very hard to be thoughtful after several hours. So one recommend- one recommendment [sic] would be, but again, it's up to a vote of my colleagues, is to recess and then come back earlier in the day and continue the discussion when we're all fresh and -- well, not fresh, but. There's a good word but I can't think of it.

So that's my, that's my recommendation. Refreshed. Thank you. That's why I sit beside her. And refreshed. So that's my recommendation.

But again, I don't want to -- the other thing is, as someone in public comment says don't vote this tonight. And I think it might be helpful if you just discuss what the next steps are or would be, because it's not my

understanding we'd be voting to approve this this evening, although I'm sure the petitioners might like it, only after being four times up to bat.

But it'd be important for people to understand where we are in the process just so that they're not misinformed or suffering some angst because they think we're going to, this is going to be finished this evening.

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I yield the floor.

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Anyone else? Councillor Zondervan.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I do support the idea of recess and the continuation.

I also would like to discuss the idea of an independent analysis of the pro forma. I don't know if we want to do a motion tonight. I suppose if we're recessing it won't get to the manager until after that continuation, so, so maybe we can do it next time. But I just wanted to put that out there as something that I do want to consider.

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Councillor, Councillor Mallon.

COUNCILLOR ALANNA M. MALLON: Just a point of order.

When is the Planning Board planning to adjourn their hearing until, and meet about this again?

DIRECTOR JEFF ROBERTS: Mr. Chair, the Planning Board set, announced the date of October 29th to resume this and at that point, they would review a draft recommendation report. And it could be then, if it's voted on, it could be conveyed to Council fairly quickly I think after that.

COUNCILLOR ALANNA M. MALLON: Thank you. And can somebody just confirm the date of the petition expiration on this petition? What is it? Oh, Christmas, right. Wonderful. Okay. Thank you.

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Anyone else? Councillor Toomey.

COUNCILLOR TIMOTHY J. TOOMEY JR.: If we're moving, if we're going to recess and keep it in committee and the Chair will schedule another committee hearing.

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Okay, I'm happy to do that. I suggest that, so right now we have -- sorry.

COUNCILLOR TIMOTHY J. TOOMEY JR.: If I could continue, I would hope that the proponents have listened to comments that people have made and will come back and show us some further refinement of what you're proposing. So

maybe we have a further discussion with the refinements, I guess.

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Okay. Madam Vice Mayor.

VICE MAYOR JAN DEVEREUX: I was going to suggest that when we come back, because there have been questions both by us and the Planning Board and I think it's just confusing enough that they make more of an effort to take the figures that we're looking at, that table of numbers of what's existing, what's proposed, what's net new, building by building, and add totals at the bottom.

Make a table, or some sort of drawing that sort of shows where the square footage is. Because it's confusing when there's in this thing it says parcel up garage, I think that means the garage that's above ground.

If they can, if they can do a better job of explaining how, how the -- where the density is. And then I, and then I would like to see the, because all of the--the affordable housing percentage, the 30 percentage is being expressed as a percent of this net new square footage. And I would like to see the amount, the balance, the commercial and housing and retail balance broken out as a percent of the entire PUD-8.

Because I feel like we're starting kind of over on an entirely new PUD, and so I just, I want to see sort of like what are we, what are we really doing in terms of the balance of commercial, housing and retail?

So if they could create that, a table that is not in teeny tiny print and that's a little clearer, I think we'd all have a better sense of what we're talking about.

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: And Councillor Carlone.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would ask the City to prepare a chart that outlines the actual square footages as we discussed earlier. That indeed the garage is part of the new construction. Just because the way our zoning is written, it's considered that.

And including the height variation like they normally do in any up zoning, where they talk about existing conditions and talk about proposed, so that it's a clear series of numbers, and that becomes what we discuss.

It builds on what the Vice Mayor said, but it's asking the City to prepare it as part of their analysis.

I mean, we heard the discussion tonight, there's an interpretation on the garage that's night and day from what the zoning says. And since that's what we're talking about,

we need your interpretation on that. I would also say--

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Can I--can I just interject for a second?

COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE: Please.

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Councillor Toomey has a motion on the floor to recess. I would ask that you withdraw it right now and we'll come back.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE: I apologize.

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: I apologize for interrupting.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE: So I didn't even hear that one, but that's the sear. I apologize. I think, I think the other thing and we talked about this with, I talked about this with the petitioner. I personally believe the architect has done a good job in trying to humanize this density, but the density is way over the top.

And as many people have said, we needed a financial analysis of what really is necessary. And my sense is it was almost driven from the parking garage numbers out. What could we build? I'm sure that's not the only thing.

But my point is, who's going to decide that? And in the past the Planning Board, Community Development about 25

years ago, I don't remember the project, hired a financial person to analyze it. It was a local person and one of the public speakers suggested someone not from around, not from here.

You know, we, a number of us have had discussions on having the right professionals help us understand things. This, this is the whole thrust. And it might indeed show that the petitioner is right. But I don't know. I don't think anybody else knows except the petitioners' team. And we need that separately analyzed. That to me is absolutely key or we're playing in the dark. Thank you.

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Thank you. Anyone else? Mr. Mayor.

MAYOR MARC C. MCGOVERN: Excuse me. I have a number of comments but most of them, I think, can wait. But I did want to follow up on, I had a similar question to Lee Farris' question around the three bedrooms. I do think that it's important that we maximize family-size units.

But I also know that we, the housing, it's looked at as square footage, not percentages. And so the more three bedrooms we add, which are obviously larger units, it may mean fewer units we get. And so if you can maybe parse some

of that out a little bit and give us some options, or some things to look at. That if we added this many three-bedrooms, it might not be 80 units, it might be 70 units at that point, just so we have some idea of what we're talking about. Because it's not, you're only talking about a certain amount of space. And so the larger units will take up more of that space. I just want to have a better idea of that.

But I certainly support the three-bedroom units. Those are the ones that we have the hardest time finding for families.

And then also the, you know, I think the breakdown 25% inclusionary, 25% middle. You know, we could play with that a little bit. But I do want to make sure that middle is included as well. So those are just my two cents for now. Thank you.

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Anyone else?

COUNCILLOR E. DENIS SIMMONS: Mr. Chair?

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Yes.

COUNCILLOR E. DENIS SIMMONS: My last recommendation, because I know we're spelling this out on the floor, and you're the Chair but this is just a suggestion. Just so

that the Clerk and, and you and the rest of us can have a more accurate idea of what Councillors need, it would be helpful, I know what I will do is send it to you and to the clerk by mail. By email, excuse me, and by a certain date.

So if you set a meeting up say five or six days from now, you'd say within 48 hours, would you please forward this on to the petitioners so that they can come prepared.

And I know we're already, we're putting it out and the clerk is, is writing it down. But I always find it helpful working with a petitioner around any subject matter is when we provide the information in advance, it gives them a better attempt to be able to put their answers in writing.

Again, this is the fourth time up the bat. There's another presentation, there's more questions relative to it. If we could just put it in a way that's a little bit more organized, it might be helpful in terms of getting the information back that we are requesting. So that would be my request from you, Mr. Chair.

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Okay. Anyone else? So, on that, one of the challenges of governance is we can't talk to each other. So the Ordinance Committee has a quorum of three, which means that other than for scheduling purposes,

we can't talk to more than one other Ordinance Committee member.

So my suggestion is with the Clerk's acquiescence, that if you have questions that you want to be answered at the next meeting, you send them to the Clerk, who will then send them to the proponent and they will be entered as part of the record for our continued meeting.

If you send them directly to me and Councillors Zondervan sends them directly to me and so forth that--

COUNCILLOR E. DENIS SIMMONS: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair, that was my intention, If you--

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: I just want to be able to --

COUNCILLOR E. DENIS SIMMONS: Absolutely would not want to bend or break the procedure or protocol or the law. Thank you.

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Okay. Councillor Zondervan.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to get clarification. If we wanted to do a pro forma analysis --

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: That was, that was going to be my next point.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Okay. And then do we

have a sense of when we would have a continuation roughly,

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: I don't at the drop of my hat I don't. I'd like to do it sooner rather than later but getting all of us between now and Election Day, even during the day, may be something of a challenge, but we'll do our best. I think the pro forma --

COUNCILLOR ALANNA M. MALLON: Mr. Chair, can I just--

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Yes.

COUNCILLOR ALANNA M. MALLON: That's why I asked the question about the Planning Board meeting. I think it would probably behoove us to have our next meeting after that meeting, because they asked a number of questions that I would have raised tonight, but I think they are going to be answering those questions on the 29th.

So having, just to reiterate, after the election is probably great. But also, more importantly, after the Planning Board meeting meets again on this particular topic.

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Okay. That sounds reasonable. The pro forma part isn't something that's going to be solved with emails to the Clerk. So I think this raises one of the challenges we have as a Council. We don't

have direct access to that sort of expertise, as Councillor Carlone was mentioning.

So we could put in an order. Arguably, it may be faster if, well actually it probably wouldn't, because we don't have a meeting on Monday. But we could put it in an order now or we can just put it in an order at our next Council meeting, asking that the City Manager provide the financing for an independent, pro forma review of this project. And it may or may not go forward.

And even if it went forward, I don't know that the city has a house doctor or the ability to move forward with that sort of contractual support quickly. So I guess at the risk of putting City staff on the spot, Ms. Farooq, do you have any idea if that's the sort of analysis that one could get reasonably easily?

ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER IRAM FAROOQ: Mr. Chairman, we do not currently have, as far as I know, somebody on staff who could -- I mean somebody on house doctor who would be able to do this work. But I will consult with the City Manager and other folks to see what we might be able to figure out that might help it within, within a reasonable timeframe.

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Councillor Zondervan.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Well, it sounds like probably the fastest way to proceed would be to do it at the regular Council meeting, because we're not going to meet until way after that in this Committee, so.

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Right. Well, we could pass an order now but it would have the same effect, so a regular Council meeting is perfectly fine.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: If we pass it now, that doesn't take it straight to the Council though.

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Well actually since, interesting point, since we are recessing the meeting rather than adjourning it, we will not have the Committee report in front of us at the next meeting, so you're absolutely correct.

COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN: Okay, thank you.

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: All right. Anything else? So no -- so again, just to reiterate, we're not trying to shut anyone out of public discussion but we've been here for going on three hours. So next time we meet, we want to start with fresh minds. I'm sure if you want to email the

council or pigeonhole us, we will be receptive, and thank you for your patience.

The meeting is recessed.

**The Cambridge City Council Ordinance Committee
adjourned at approximately 8:08 p.m.**

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, **Susan Ireland**, a transcriber for Datagain, do hereby certify: That said proceedings were listened to and transcribed by me and were prepared using standard electronic transcription equipment under my direction and supervision; and I hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the proceedings is a full, true, and accurate transcript to the best of my ability.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name this 11th day of January 2023.



Signature of Transcriber

1. A revised Petition Has been received from Stephen R. Karp, Trustee of Cambridge Side Galeria Associates trust to amend the Cambridge Zoning Ordinance by adding a new Section 13.100 to Article 13.00 of the Zoning Ordinance and to amend the Zoning Map to add a new PUD-8 District overlay that certain area (which includes parcels and portions of ways and streets) labeled as "PUD-8 district".

RESULT:	NO ACTION TAKEN	Next: 12/4/2019 5:30 PM
----------------	------------------------	--------------------------------

2. A communication was received from Stephen R. Karp, Trustee of Cambridge Side Galeria Associates trust, regarding a presentation to the Ordinance Committee on September 26, 2019 on the revised Petition to amend the Cambridge Zoning Ordinance by adding a new Section 13.100 to Article 13.00
3. A communication was received from Marlene Lundberg, 4 Canal Park, regarding the Cambridgeside Zoning Petition.

RESULT:	NO ACTION TAKEN
----------------	------------------------

4. A communication was received from the Community Development Department regarding the CambridgeSide Galleria Associates Trust Zoning Petition

RESULT:	NO ACTION TAKEN
----------------	------------------------

Minutes Acceptance: Minutes of Sep 26, 2019 5:30 PM (Committee Reports)