



City of Cambridge

COF 2025 #134
IN CITY COUNCIL
October 27, 2025

COUNCILLOR NOLAN

Attached please find a communication from Councillor Nolan transmitting a letter regarding revocation of a curb cut application previously granted.



CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

Patricia Nolan
City Councillor

Dear all:

I am submitting this communication with the intent of suspending the relevant Council rules in order to revoke the privilege granted to the applicant for a curb cut at 177 Hancock Street. The relevant and necessary votes are enumerated below.

The application process for a curb cut requires Council approval since the City Council is the only body that takes into account the perspective of residents and neighbors and quality of life issues. In the instance of granting curb cut applications, the City Council reallocates public space and privatizes access to the curb space. A property owner who receives a curb cut can increase the value of their property significantly, and often at the expense of neighbors, who lose public access to the curb space. Any curb cut can have, and often does have, as in this instance, an impact on neighbors directly in terms of access to resident permit parking. That is why the curb cuts require some outreach to those most impacted, especially direct abutters. As the Council tries to do, the people most affected should have a voice. The City Council is the body that represents that voice.

The application process requires petitioners to submit notices, signed in favor or against the proposed curb cut, from any abutters to the front, side, rear, and across the street from the property where the curb cut is to be made. According to [CMA 2025 #259](#), “if a petitioner does not submit all abutter responses, in particular negative responses, the integrity of the process is undermined regardless of whether the applicant intentionally or unintentionally omitted any Notices. In this instance, where Notices are omitted, the City Council has a rational basis to reconsider, and possibly revoke, a prior curb cut approval as the integrity of the process is called into question and the public welfare possibly not fully considered in making the ultimate decision.” I would ask that the City Council take the below votes to indicate that the curb cut application for 177 Hancock was granted in error and due to applicant failure, and take steps to rectify it.

Vote #1

Per [CMA 2025 #259](#), the first vote necessary is to suspend Council Rules #15, which relates to the method by which the Council can reconsider votes taken. I would move that the Council suspend that rule in order to take another vote on the curb cut application for 177 Hancock Street. The vote to suspend Rule #15 will require a 2/3 majority to pass.

Vote #2

If that vote passes, I would move that the Council take steps to revoke the curb cut application granted for 177 Hancock Street, taking all relevant steps outlined in [CMA 2025 #259](#), including: publicly noticing the action and publishing adequate justification for the revocation that includes a fact-based rational basis for revocation.

The vote to take steps to revoke the curb cut application previously granted will require a simple majority to pass.

The information below outlines the basis by which the application received by the City Council was incomplete due to applicant failure.

The City's website states the following regarding applications for curb cuts: "Anyone wanting to make or change a cut in the curb of the street, such as in constructing, moving or removing a driveway must first obtain a permit from the City of Cambridge. The placement of curb cuts can have significant impacts on the safety and quality of life of the surrounding neighborhood. The City will review each permit application with due consideration to the applicant's desire for the curb cut and public welfare."

Below is a list of direct abutters who have testified to have submitted abutter responses and a notation of which letters appeared in the application document. All of the abutters listed below are direct abutters and live directly to the front, side, rear, or across the street from the property.

Abutter Letters Submitted in Approval – 3 notices submitted, all appearing in application documents

- Donna Erikson, 176 Hancock Street – abuts front of property directly across the street
- (Illegible Name), 2 Crawford Street #4 – abuts rear of property on parallel street
- David Lyon, 6 Crawford Street #11 – abuts rear of property on parallel street

Abutter Letters Submitted in Disapproval – 10 notices submitted, only 4 appearing in application documents

- Mary Reynolds, 183 Hancock Street #1 – abuts side of property to the right
- Mike Rodman, 175 Hancock Street #1 – abuts side of property to the left
- Lorraine Banyra, 175 Hancock Street #1 – abuts side of property to the left
- Laska Dittrich, 390 Broadway – abuts rear of property
- *Regis Shields, 173 Hancock Street #3 – abuts side of property to the left
- *Linda Witinski, 185 Hancock #4 – abuts side of property to the right
- *Regina Zhang, 185 Hancock – abuts side of property to the right
- *Marya Wegman, 175 Hancock Street #3 – abuts side of property to the left
- *Doug Marple, 173 Hancock Street #6 – abuts side of property to the left
- *Jane Stoleroff, 6 Crawford Street – abuts rear of property on a parallel street

* Residents have testified to submitting letters to the applicant for inclusion in the application documents, however only the first four letters were included in the application packet.

In summary, the information provided above justifies the City Council acting to revoke the curb cut application granted for 177 Hancock Street and we should take action to follow applicable legal standards. The placement of curb cuts can have significant impacts on the safety and quality of life of the surrounding neighborhood, and it is the duty of the City Council, as the grantor of applications, to review each permit application with due consideration to the applicant's desire for the curb cut and public welfare. In this case, the public welfare was undermined due to incomplete application materials.

Sincerely,
Patricia M. Nolan, City Councillor