



ORDINANCE COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE MEETING

~ MINUTES ~

Tuesday, November 16, 2021

2:00 PM

Sullivan Chamber
795 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02139

I. The Ordinance Committee will meet to conduct a public hearing on the Advancing Housing Affordability (AHA) Zoning Petition by Francis Donovan, et al (Ordinance #2021-17)

Attendee Name	Present	Absent	Late	Arrived
Dennis J. Carlone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Marc C. McGovern	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Alanna Mallon	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Patricia Nolan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sumbul Siddiqui	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
E. Denise Simmons	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Jivan Sobrinho-Wheeler	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Timothy J. Toomey	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Quinton Zondervan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	



ORDINANCE COMMITTEE - NOVEMBER 16, 2021

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Dennis J. Carlone: Welcome to the Ordinance Committee. Uh, we do have a quorum present, uh, digitally. The Hearing shall come to order. I call this Meeting of the Ordinance Committee to order. The call of the Meeting is to conduct a public hearing on the advancing housing affordability, known as AHA Zoning Petition by Fritz Donovan, and others. Ordinance No. 2021-17. Pursuant to Chapter 20 of the Acts of 2021, adopted by the Massachusetts General Assembly and approved by the governor, the City is authorized to use remote participation at Meetings of the Cambridge City Council. To watch the Meeting, please tune into Channel 22 or visit the Open Meeting Portal on the City's website. Today's Meeting will be conducted in a hybrid format. Members of the public may participate remotely or physically appear in the chamber to provide Public Comment. If you would like to provide Public Comment, please go to www.cambridgema.gov/publiccommentcambridgema.gov/publiccomment to sign up. We'll, we will not allow any additional Public Comment sign up after 2:30. In approximately 30 minutes. We will take the roll call of members present with that, all of today's votes will be by roll call Mr. Clerk.

Mr. Clerk: Vice Mayor Mallon?

Alanna M. Mallon: Present and audible.

Mr. Clerk: Present. Councillor McGovern?

Marc C. McGovern: Present and audible.

Mr. Clerk: Present. Councillor Nolan?

Patricia M. Nolan: Present and audible.

Mr. Clerk: Present. Councillor Simmons?

E. Denise Simmons: Present and audible.

Mr. Clerk: Present. Councillor Sobrinho-Wheeler?

Jivan Sobrinho-Wheeler: Present and audible.

Mr. Clerk: Present. Councillor Toomey? Councillor Toomey? Absent. Councillor Zondervan?

Quinton Y. Zondervan: Present and audible.

Mr. Clerk: Present. Mayor Siddiqui? Mayor Siddiqui? Absent. Councillor Carlone?

Dennis J. Carlone: Present. Thank you.

Mr. Clerk: There, there are seven members present. Councillor Carlone, I, I just ask that we take a brief pause. There seems to be some technical issue with the audio.

Dennis J. Carlone: Thank you. We'll be on hold.

Mr. Clerk: Councillor McGovern, can you say present again?

Marc C. McGovern: Present.

Mr. Clerk: IT is here fixing the, um, audio issue. We should be back in a few moments. Councillor McGovern, I'm going to just ask you to say present one more time.

Marc C. McGovern: Present.

Mr. Clerk: I believe the audio issue is fixed. We can move forward with the Meeting.

Dennis J. Carlone: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Uh, we've also been recently joined by the Mayor Sumbul Siddiqui.

Mr. Clerk: The Mayor's been recorded as present.

Dennis J. Carlone: Thank you. Uh, this hearing is being audio and video recorded. I mentioned earlier that we have a signup list to speak presently. Twelve people have signed up. Uh, if members of the public have written comments, we ask you to email them directly to the City Clerk. The format of the hearing is as follows. The petitioners will be heard first followed by City staff, Public Comment, and then the Ordinance Committee members will comment or ask questions. At the conclusion of the hearing, we will make a recommendation based on the dialogue at the hearing, and that could include referring this Petition to the full Council with a favorable recommendation, referring to the full Council with an unfavorable recommendation or keeping it in committee. I want to thank all attendees for attending both physically and digitally, and, uh, we look forward to a good discussion. So at this point, the petitioners, uh, represented it today by Fritz Donovan and Suzanne Blier will have, uh, their time to present a Petition as submitted. Welcome.

Fritz Donovan: Thank you Council. Uh, Mr. Clerk. Um, I'm Fritz Donovan, and I'm joined by Professor Suzanne Blier, both of us, long term residents of Cambridge, both known to many of you already. We thank you all for meeting with us today to learn about the advanced housing Afford- Advancing Housing Affordability, AHA Zoning Petition. Our Petition is organized in three sections. Part 1 seeks to alleviate a significant portion of the present housing shortage by modifying single and two family Zoning to allow the creation of additional market rate and affordable units within existing structures, thereby making better use of our current housing stock with minimum environmental disruption and expense. Part 2 seeks to help address our climate change crisis by modifying onsite residential outdoor parking requirements to require rain permeable materials on new off street parking areas, thereby preserving vital nourishment for our rapidly declining tree canopy and reducing the risk of flooding. Part 3 seeks to engage large Cambridge employers in area-wide long-term planning to help themselves and all our residents deal with the impact of Cambridge's rapid growth rate on area housing, transportation, parking, and infrastructure, issues which Cambridge cannot adequately address on its own. Suzanne will begin by addressing the history of this Petition. I will then discuss Parts 1 and Part 2, and

Suzanne will conclude our presentation by addressing our Part 3 area-wide long-term planning proposal. Suzanne?

Suzanne Blier: Thank you, Fritz. Uh, can you hear me?

Dennis J. Carlone: No.

Fritz Donovan: No.

Suzanne Blier: There we go. Thank you, Fritz. Uh, and, um, City Councillors. Um, this proposal began in earnest in the summer of 2020 when the first Donovan Petition to modify single family housing was submitted. Due to circumstances of timing, we were not able to have the necessary meetings and withdrew the Petition and started in earnest in the spring of 2021 to reevaluate what we had proposed earlier, broaden the spoke and, and bring in, uh, more participants into the process. We held weekly meetings by Zoom and invited various professionals as well as members of diverse Cambridge political groups to join us. We shared agendas and meeting minutes with a wide variety of individuals, not all of whom joined in the meetings themselves. By midway through the process, we had a core group of about eight to 10 people from across the City who helped us address Citywide impacts. We also did a fair amount of reading both of local scholarly work and materials put out by groups such as the Harvard Joint Center for Housing and the Greater Boston Housing Report among others. And we brought in a number of experts before submitting the Petition in early September. The group chose to post the related documents on the Cambridge Citizens Coalition website to save the time and funds needed to create a separate Petition website. But this was truly a joint, um, uh, process. Links to the documents are shown at the upper left. Four key issues were addressed. The demand for housing in Cambridge is infinite, and we need a far reaching and, um, much more complex plan. The impact of our rich, uh, innovation-based technology on increased property values, investments and need is clear cut. The increased population and arrival of wealthier residents, employees of new bio and infotech jobs and others, plus property investment is fueling escalated long-term housing costs and resident displacement. Cambridge has the brain power and financial resources to deal successfully with this problem, but the plan must be both local and area wide. The issues around housing and property needs in Cambridge go back to our very origins and change, uh, has quite significantly changed over time and changes have been brought over time. On this slide, we can see some of the changing housing pressures, multifamily housing that originally met the needs of many emigres and workers and their larger families today are housing also an array of millennials and students. We are also seeing wealthy couples, some of whose raised children in the suburbs moving to Cambridge because of its rich cultural amenities which serve the City well for decades. As multifamily homes are being converted to single family residences and increasingly existing single family homes are being torn down or coupled with larger additions to accommodate a single family with a 20, uh, 21 sense of what their spatial needs warrant. Added to this, the increased investor capital targeting Cambridge commercial and residential properties. And we see a number of seniors as well who want to live

here, about 21% of whom are facing cost burdens, and they're an important factor also. Many, uh, of the seniors continue to enjoy their life here, aging in place, but they would also like or need to have renters younger and older to share their homes with them and or their incomes, uh, advanced by creating condos within the shells of their existing structures. The AHA Petition also addresses this. One of the things we learned from the Harvard Joint Center for Housing Seminar is that this coming decade will be especially difficult for housing. As I noted above, a large demographic of current homeowners, seniors, and baby boomers born between 1945 and 1970 will eventually be facing decreasing numbers, but in the meantime are growing. When they leave, they will free up their homes. Meanwhile, millennials who are now putting off, having families for reasons of work, housing or preference may move toward, uh, the suburbs may move toward having children or may decide to live here. It is not clear. In short, we're likely to see significant changes in the next decades. What we choose to do on housing must be sustainable for the decades and centuries ahead. In the same way that our rich legacy of Cambridge architecture has achieved this to the present. Add to this environmental concerns and the reason to smartly repurpose the housing, uh, becomes all the more important. Cambridge's very hot job market is also an issue causing problems that are in many ways a blessing. We have great universities that draw students, staff, and affiliates. These education centers and others in the area have made Cambridge an intellectual hub that spawned our rich biotech and infotech sites for innovative leaked work, sizable salaries above current residents. We're seeing as new employees move in, uh, and in this Zoning Petition, we, of course, we cannot address all of this, nor should we, instead, what the Advancing Housing Affordability Petition seeks to do is to take up several smaller pieces of the puzzle. Ones that we believe will help us today and into the future. The City can't do it on its own, and the area piece is part of this. In our recent series of meetings over the spring and summer, we took off, as I mentioned, from the additional, uh, the initial Donovan Petition and then broadened out, open to moving in all directions. Each meeting, we summarized and, uh, presented that as part of our materials that we sent on to others. Up here, you can see, uh, the Agenda for our August 1 meeting, for example, where we had broad but not universal support for the single and double family housing piece of this, but we're grappling with what we would specifically, um, want to have it entail. We also had broad support for increased density and height along Mass Avenue, and we're exploring how to address specific sections and blocks of this quarter. We were keen to add more housing to our major grocery store sites. In the end, we dropped these two ladder proposals, concluding that the City CDD itself was probably better able to provide a thoughtful way forward on this because there were so many moving parts. We had diverse perspectives on parking minimums because the impacts are felt so differently across the City. And with CDD now doing a study of parking, we also felt that this could be better left to them. But we do feel it was important to pro, uh, propose a key climate piece to the parking issues. And we did. As the issue of housing affordability came into play, thinking not only about single family and two family housing, but also the larger causes and the

impacts that are being filled, uh, felt. And in that way, uh, a more, uh, area wide approach began to be explored. Fritz.

Fritz Donovan: On this slide, um, you'll see the, um, enormous breadth of a single, uh, and two family housing zones all in yellow. Everybody agrees that Cambridge needs more housing. The challenge is how to provide that housing economically and with minimal disruption. One golden opportunity to create a substantial number of new housing units while achieving both of those objectives is to modify current single family, A1 and A2 and two family B residential Zoning language to allow creation of additional housing within existing structures. In addition to these single and two family zones, we strongly recommend encouraging the same innovative creation of housing units in other zones Citywide as well. As you can see from this map, the A1, A2 and B zones we're speaking about in light and dark yellow areas cover a huge portion of Cambridge. We propose to allow -- next slide. We propose to allow homeowners to create new units within the shell of their existing structure with only modest changes to the rear or rear side of the existing building for access to the additional units while still keeping the street facing facades intact. If three or more units are being added within a structure, the third and subsequent units would have to be affordable under provision. Similar to Cambridge's current inclusionary Zoning regulations consistent with the Solicitor's discussion of this provision at a recent meeting, we have included an FAR enhancement relating to a new or existing auxiliary dwelling unit, ADU. Our proposed Ordinance leaves the current Zoning provisions unchanged with respect to open space and setbacks because they are consistent with their neighborhoods. And because we are deeply concerned about the loss of green, of City green spaces and trees, not only for environmental reasons, but also because in a City as dense as ours, fifth most dense in the country with population over a hundred thousand. Our close neighbors green spaces and trees are also what makes our own residences healthier. In the West Cambridge property shown on the screen, which is now up for sale, we get a sense of how the AHA, AHA might work currently owned by an African American couple who are leaving the City, it has during its recent history, also served as home to a number of Harvard Graduate School of Design affiliates. This is one of several places that we proposed for affordable housing, and it might well still serve that role as well, but it also could be transferred into two or more unit transformed into two or more units. New entrances could be added on the rear right side, where there now is an exit, which would not be visible from either the Hawthorne or Mount Auburn Street sides. Should the owner choose to add three units, either as apartments or condos, one would have to be affordable. In this way, the sustainability and beauty of this home could be maintained for generations more alternating at times between single family and multifamily use as demand and necessity require. While the AHA Petition would allow units as small as 500 square feet the size of a small one bedroom unit, it would also allow much larger units depending on the context and need. We chose to retain the current open space and setback requirements to safeguard the environment and impacts of climate change. In the light of the fact that Cambridge is so dense that one property owner's backyard or side yard is also shared visually and

environmentally with several neighbors. And landlords with relatively few units, including those who rent units in the building where they live, tend to have close relationships with their tenants and often rent at lower rates. This piece of the AHA would encourage more of that. It would not create rooming houses because of the maximum of three units with each structure. A three plus one plan involves current buildings, uh, as the, as the best, fastest, least expensive and easiest way to add units one way is to add one more unit to existing triple deckers. A modification the City could assist by creating and providing to contractors an adaptable design template for that process. If, as we understand, Cambridge has approximately 15,000 triple deckers already, adding one more unit to each would create 15,000 new housing units inexpensively, quickly and sustainably. The City could also streamline the permitting process and disseminate the adaptable design templates broadly, perhaps even retrofitting each building for energy efficiency. At the same time, the changes taking place in Cambridge are quite stunning. Here we show you what has happened over two years in one mid Cambridge home. Over the course of a two year renovation project, it has become three condos, one, two floor unit on the ground floor and below, and two additional condos above. Could the AHA have made a difference in bringing an extra rental or condo unit into this renovation? We believe so. We also believe that if, that, if the second part of this proposal for rain permeable parking areas had been in place, the large expanse of impermeable asphalt just installed on both sides of this building would now be permeable. Part 2 of the AHA, we seek to modify open yard residential parking creation to require rain permeable materials. This will be important in this era of climate change in allowing more rainwater to seep into the earth. As Cambridge gets more and more built up, that vital environmental process is increasingly more difficult to preserve. There are many different styles of pavers, some resembling brick or stone, others incorporating greenery, and they're all easy to install. And as the price, these new rain permeable pavers are competitive with impermeable paving.

Suzanne Blier: We are proposing also an area wide plan for major Cambridge employers to house 85% of their employees and affiliates in the area by the year 2040. As a model, we draw on the 1998 parking transportation demand management Ordinance, and the annual town gown reports. We're urging the City to expand the 1998 parking transportation Ordinance to include housing. This Ordinance, Ordinance includes an annual review framed to meet preset Citywide goals. In place for 20 years, the 1998 parking transportation Ordinance has had a major impact on the City's ability to add so much commercial development to our, um, to Cambridge over the past decade. The one missing piece is housing and the need to address impacts that commercial and institutional employee and affiliate expansion has brought on housing specifically. The parking transportation Ordinance now covers 30% of all Cambridge employers or employees, plus educational facilities, research and development, a hospital and 10,000 graduate and primary students. Adding housing to the 1998 parking transportation Ordinance with a goal of retaining current residents, diminishing housing costs and better reusing existing homes as a natural next step. The larger goal we propose is accountability for 85% of employees and affiliates of larger employers

by the year 2040. Is a hundred employees affiliates the right number for such a proposal, this would have to be decided. The 1998 parking transportation Ordinance uses large projects and small projects as criteria, that could work as well. We've also asked the City itself as a large employer to be included in the AHA, Housing, adding housing criteria to the 1998 parking transportation Ordinance under Article 6 links onto Article 19 of Zoning. Here, housing could be added as a possible choice for the Planning Board to consider when they request information and undertake related discussions to address shared City equity goals and would enable us to enhance equity results. In Zoning there already is the ability to address percentages. So for example, a company, if a company is 5% below the requirement or another significant amount, it could come with a penalty. One could also ask employers, uh, to sign an affidavit from ISD or CDD with their plan and a test that they have achieved it on a yearly basis. The AHA is clearly different from, but could complement linkage fees by providing core data in related outcomes. And for example, if CDD is requiring that 20% of a company's new employees live in Cambridge, for example, 4,000 employees, uh, in, in one company that would require, um, 800 units. With the AHA, we could ask where and at what rental and purchase costs would these new City units be found in the City or in the area, and what would their impacts be on current residents and housing costs more generally. As a City expands commercially and our institution staff and affiliate numbers increase, we want to be able to understand how the local housing market is impacted and what is happening to it on a year by year basis. With this and a better handle on investment impacts, we can be sure we are addressing the problems early on and not just guessing or adding to the housing problem. Cambridge has seen exponential institutional growth in recent years at our universities in the number of undergraduates, graduate students, postdocs and staff. This has significant impacts on the City. We need their help with addressing the future. With many thousand of these students, postdocs and others living in Cambridge rental units with stipends increasing, uh, as do annual costs, this reduces City housing availability and helps to raise the cost each year. If universities help us by providing more area housing, these units could go to others with larger increases if fully 85% of these students, postdocs, affiliates, and staff are addressed as well. Our extraordinary universities have helped to add housing at key moments in the City's history as shown here. Now is an important time to continue this or indeed to do it again, whether in Cambridge or in other nearby communities. Local and area housing policies would benefit from an area wide approach working remotely types of work and percentages of employees could be part of this. So two could creative, private, public shared buses or parking partnerships, the reuse of parking sites for a fee off hours, nights, weekends, summers. These are ways in which our institutions and commercial partners could help. The AHA intent, as I noted, is a specific goal and a number of employees met, um, meeting particular criteria over successive years. But in the end, we think that this would be extraordinarily helpful. We do not expect or intended an employer to create a Facebook, uh, type Bay area complex with 300 affordable units, 120 of which are geared to, to seniors, but instead to think about area-wide solutions and their impacts on Cambridge. This will be critical to

meeting our housing goals going forward. The AHA Petition also compliments the annual town gown report and would add key data to it. The possible area wide inputs, issues, and engagements already in play are considerable. These include addressing local and area unhoused. Mass cast is one of one piece of this, as we know in Cambridge and elsewhere, but also local and regional bus and subway, routing cost and frequency, as well as the effort to add safe bike lanes for a more bikeable future for some City workers, resident students and visitors. Conclusions, our challenges are many and include more and different housing demands than in the past, from millennials and students to employees with more capital to increasing number of seniors to suburban couples seeking a place to live and retire in the City to local area and national and international investors. Our plan, the AHA Petition offers three pieces of this larger whole. Part 1, modifies one and two family Zoning to add more units within existing structures, requiring an affordability piece, uh, once one reaches a certain limit, part 2 would require rain permeable materials for onsite outdoor residential parking. Part 3 seeks an area approach to our housing problems by expanding the very successful 1998 parking transportation Ordinance to include housing with a goal of addressing on an area wide basis, 85% of our employees and affiliates by the year 2040. And with the, um, parking, uh, transportation Ordinance review procedure, it'll help us to determine how well these goals are being met. Thank you.

Dennis J. Carlone: Thank you, um, for your presentation. Uh, I want to emphasize that, uh, this really is a three part, uh, proposal, um, as they've, uh, defined it. The one and two family Zoning, the rain permeability is number, two. And three is, uh, an area wide approach to planning and development. Um, we will next have community development, uh, present. I'm, I don't know who's at the other end, so I'll let community development introduce themselves. Welcome.

Iram Farooq: Thank you chair. Um, Iram Farooq, Assistant City Manager for community Development. Uh, I am joined today by, uh, from community development, our director of Zoning and development, Jeff Roberts, um, as well as from the City Solicitor's Office, we have the Solicitor, Nancy Glowa, and, um, Megan Bayer. Um, I think that is all from staff side today on the call. Um, I am actually just going to turn it over to Jeff Roberts to speak to, um, staff analysis, um, that we have done preliminarily. Uh, as you know, the, the Planning Board's hearing on this matter is scheduled for later tonight. Um, so we don't have any recommendation to bring forward from the board. Um, but I will turn it over to Jeff Roberts.

Dennis J. Carlone: Welcome, Mr. Roberts.

Iram Farooq: I am not sure if Jeff is having trouble joining. Um, so let me, um, while, if he's not able to join, I will try to do a quick summary instead, which is that staff have, uh, taken a look, um, as I noted preliminarily at the, um, at the Petition. And, um, I would say that we have several thoughts that we have put together in a memo. And my apologies that I was, um, unable to, um, I I was unable to forward the memo to the Ordinance Committee, uh, but it is posted on our website. Um, in terms of the principal, uh, considerations that we have, uh,

called out, um, I would just say that there are, um, we understand the intentions of the Petition, um, but in terms of how it is written, there are several challenges, um, and that would need to be rectified if the Council chooses to, uh, advance those ideas further. And, um, particularly calling out, uh, a section relating to the, um, the commercial and institutional overlay provisions, it would be important to define something like that. Uh, what is the extent of such an overlay? And, uh, it's not clear that, um, those kinds of provisions can be incorporated into Zoning. Uh, some of the, um, precedents that were mentioned are actually, uh, independent non-zoning ordinances, um, so would need to be dealt with separately. Uh, and also, um, I think it's important to think that what would be triggers for creating, um, for, for creating such provisions. So for instance, the PTDM Ordinance, uh, that is mentioned is something that gets triggered when people add, um, when people add additional, uh, parking. And hence that, that triggers the parking, transportation demand management Ordinance. Um, I'm actually going to stop talking and turn it back to Jeff Roberts, who is, uh, who is able to deal with his issue. It is here now.

Jeff Roberts: Thank you so much, Iram. Thank you to the, uh, committee. And on my apologies, I'm, uh, had some stuff scheduled at home and as, as I feared things started happening at exactly the, uh, wrong time. So, um, I apologize, thanks to Iram for, I think covering most of what, uh, I was planning to say. Um, I will, I'll try to sort of go through all of it, just, um, just to make sure I covered everything. So first, the, uh, Planning Board has not yet reviewed. Uh, this Petition, the hearing is going to be tonight. Um, we did, uh, provide a memo, as we always do, to primarily to help guide the Planning Board. And, and I understand that, um, uh, some, some members of the committee may have read it. Um, one caveat is that, um, for this particular Petition, um, as our, our primary, um, way of, uh, understanding this was to, um, just to review the, the text of it. We haven't really had the opportunity to discuss this with the petitioners. Um, there are some parts of it that are somewhat unclear. So we tried to, uh, make some of our best assumptions about what was intended as, as the outcome of the Petition. Um, but we, um, uh, it, it's, it's important for us just to note that, uh, for a Zoning Petition to, to have a real, um, hearing a real sort of worthwhile hearing, uh, it's crucial that, um, it lays out clearly what the proposed requirements would be and how they would apply. Um, so that's just one, just the one thing to note. Um, I'd note that some parts of this Petition seem related to ongoing discussions that have been had around changing the Zoning to eliminate districts that are limited only to single family or two family residences. Um, that's been discussed in, in the context of some Zoning petitions and some past City Council hearings. Um, this Petition seems to suggest a, a restrained approach to doing that, which would be, uh, permit the conversion of existing single family or two family residences to contain three or four units, um, with limited exterior alterations. And the Petition suggests, uh, an affordability requirement, uh, for developments of three units or more. And again, it's, it's somewhat unclear exactly what the full range of, um, situations is, where that, uh, kind of requirement would apply. Um, some of the potential issues with this approach have been discussed at, at past hearings. Um, first of all, simply allowing a conversion to three or four family

residences without amending some of the dimensional standards. Most importantly, the lot area for dwelling unit limitations wouldn't allow new units to be created without still needing variances. Um, parking requirements are also something that come into play when new units are created, even without exterior alterations. Um, and that would require either adding parking spaces onto, um, the site or seeking relief from the board of Zoning of people. And it also, um, it might affect other dimensional relief in cases where it's not practical to create new units without some exterior alterations being involved. Um, and finally, the affordability requirements, as we've discussed in some prior hearings, would pose, um, some legal questions as well as practical concerns if the intended types of conversions wouldn't be economically viable. So other parts of the Petition, um, are not directly related to the, the issue of single family and two family Zoning. Um, the part that would require, uh, permeable paving for parking areas, um, is conceptually in line with, with many of the City's environmental goals. Um, it might still pose some practical difficulties. Some paving materials can often have a kind of a spectrum of, of permeability. Um, permeability can also be affected over time as, as vehicles drive over it, um, and sit on top of it. It's not always easy to make a clear delineation between permeable and not permeable, and that's something that's come up in the past, um, and something that we would, would want to think about a little bit more. Um, and then the final part of the Petition, uh, is one that I don't have much to say about because, um, it's somewhat unclear how it fits within, um, the framework of Zoning um, it describes an overlay district, but there isn't a description or a map, um, or something that describes what base districts it would apply in. Um, it also applies requirements based on employment characteristics of the owner or tenant of land. Um, that's not something that is generally regulated by Zoning. And then finally, there's no clear, um, land use regulations or development standards that are proposed. And that's, that's really what, um, Zoning is intend to do. So that's a part of the Petition that, um, I think would require some more thought. It's a more clarification before we would be able to give it a, a, a really, um, reasonable review as a Zoning proposal. So those are just as a summary of just what, what some of what we came up with in, in our review of this Petition. Happy to answer any questions.

Dennis J. Carlone: Uh, so that concludes, uh, community development's presentation on the subject, Mr. Roberts? Other than addressing questions, I mean.

Jeff Roberts: Yes.

Dennis J. Carlone: Okay. Did you, um, Ms. Farooq, did you want the Solicitor to step in at this time or only in answering questions?

Iram Farooq: I, uh, Mr. Chair, I don't believe that the Solicitor has a presentation.

Dennis J. Carlone: Okay.

Iram Farooq: But, uh, their representatives are here to address questions.

Dennis J. Carlone: Okay. Thank you very much. Um, so I will ask my fellow, uh, no, actually we're going to go to Public Comment and then we'll get to questions and comments by the City Council. Um, so at the present time, we have 14 people signed up. Uh, each speaker will have three minutes, correct?

Mr. Clerk: Three.

Dennis J. Carlone: Three minutes to speak. Uh, when we are near, uh, the end of the time, I will say 10 seconds, just, uh, to make sure that you're aware of it. The first speaker is Daniel Hidalgo, followed by James Zall. Daniel, you're up first. Welcome.

Daniel Hidalgo: Great. Thank you. My name is Daniel Hidalgo. I'm, uh, a resident at 79 Norfolk Street. Uh, and I'm, I'm wanting to comment, uh, in opposition to, to this Petition, mostly because it would be ineffectual in really, uh, solving the, uh, the housing crisis that Cambridge faces, and also would introduce, I think, uh, real administrative challenges, challenges to implementing particularly the, the third section on, um, on, uh, the, the planning requirements, uh, on the part of employers. So on the, on first, on the, on the family Zoning, single family Zoning, um, changes. While I, I'm, I wholeheartedly agree that we should end single family Zoning, uh, in, in Cambridge. I think we should do so in a way that actually removes the effects of single family, uh, restrictive single family Zoning, which has led to the, you know, uh, or one of the factors that has contributed to the housing crisis, uh, in Cambridge. And essentially not allowing for alterations in the, the, you know, except for minor alterations to the overall structure. Well, I think will really result in very few, um, additional, uh, units, partly for some of the reasons that, uh, Jeff Roberts just mentioned, that the, these, these houses would still be out of compliance with other Zoning requirements. And then, but we also saw, have a sort of similar experience with the, uh, 2016 ADU reform, which I think has, is similar in, in, in principle. And as of 2021 has less led to less than 20, uh, uh, additional units. And so I think for actually creating new housing, we, we have to allow for a greater variety of structures and really, uh, allow for the undoing of, of single family Zoning. Not only just in in name, but it's also in, its in, in its effects. And then, uh, the, the, my other main, uh, main comment is on the, uh, the overlay proposed work, which would require, uh, you know, employers to submit these, uh, housing infrastructure and transportation plans. And here, I really just think that, uh, it's a responsibility of the government to, um, to be providing the plans and structure for this and not, uh, uh, not, not the employers. You know, an employer of size 100 does not have the expertise and wherewithal to implement or, or provide sophisticated plans for, uh, for, uh, all their employers. And I think also very importantly for CDD to spend every single year, uh, monitoring compliance and, uh, and the quality of these plans, it would just be a, an incredible, um, you know, a lot of work for, for CDD when they're, I think they're probably already overburdened with their existing responsibilities. So, and, uh, I just think it's be, um, very difficult for the go, for the City to be able to manage this in any kind of effect- effective way. Uh, thank you very much for your time.

Dennis J. Carlone: Thank you, Daniel. The next speaker is James Zall, followed by Christopher Schmidt. Welcome, James.

James Zall: Thank you. I'm James, a 203 Pemberton Street. Um, I've spoken here many times in support of amending our Zoning laws to allow a much needed increase in multi-family housing in Cambridge. And I'm glad that a majority of the Council supports that goal. The Donovan proposal, though, takes such a limited and miserly approach to alleviating our housing shortage, that it seems unlikely to ever achieve its stated purpose. This proposal aims to allow conversion of existing one or two family structures into three or four family buildings while leaving intact decades of dimensional restrictions that were designed to prevent that from happening. It would apparently affect only renovated structures and would've no relief for new developments. It imagines that voluntary unsubsidized efforts by generous homeowners are an adequate response to the major shortfall of housing in Cambridge. Similarly, this Petition attempts to privatize our response to the housing crisis by maintaining our restrictive Zoning laws and simply transferring responsibility on to selected employers in Cambridge just by mandating that it be so. There are no requirements or prohibitions here, there is no plan here as even the planning would be privatized. Large employers would be expected to produce more housing while the City's own Zoning laws restrict their ability to do so. Just waiting till that train goes by. I would love to see the Council address our serious and growing housing shortage, but there's very little in this Petition that would help Cambridge accomplish that goal. Thank you.

Dennis J. Carlone: Thank you, James. Christopher Schmidt is next, followed by Robert Camacho. Welcome, Christopher.

Christopher Schmidt: Thank you. Christopher Schmidt, 17 Laurel Street. Uh, thank you for the opportunity to speak today. Um, I just wanted to, uh, people before me spoke on many of the things that I was actually going to say, so I don't need to repeat them. Um, I, I do think that it's worth noting that, um, you know, there's a, a sense that demand in Cambridge is infinite. Uh, demand in Cambridge isn't infinite. We actually have seen, uh, over the course of the pandemic that, um, supply and demand applies here just like it does anywhere else. And, and, uh, even with a relatively modest shrinking of demand, uh, we saw the response in supply, uh, housing got more affordable and accessible to a broader range of incomes and people temporarily, uh, as, as demand relative to supply shrunk. Um, we can move that direction, that needle in the other direction as well, so long as we are willing, uh, and, and able to make more change. Um, our existing rich architecture, while lovely, uh, should not be the thing that blocks us from making change to protect people's lives, uh, the, the, um, you know, CDD described this Petition as restrained, and I think it is restrained. And I think that that's, uh, very much the intent of the Petition. I, I understand, but I, I would encourage the Council, um, to not take a restrained approach to fighting our housing crisis because I, I don't think that that matches, um, the scope of the problems that we had. Um, I'll also just note, as someone who has spent a bunch of time looking at Zoning, uh, language, um, this Petition doesn't actually allow for creation of

pretty much any new housing. Uh, taking into account the existing ADU rules, which yes, require special permit, but, um, you know, are, are still somewhat effective in creating new housing, uh, as well as the existing lot size for dwelling unit. Um, this would legalize only the creation Citywide of approximately 170 units, um, only in places where they would be required to be affordable. Uh, and, and frankly, if we're seeing 20 ADU Citywide in cases where, um, much less restrictive restrictions apply, um, it is really, really difficult to see how this could do anything. Uh, this would create no new housing. Um, I, I think that, uh, uh, uh, the chair mentioned three different sections of this, uh, Petition. Um, so I think we would create no new housing. Uh, uh, everything that is written, uh, in, in that first section, I think would be completely ineffective. And that's not that just the other rules will prevent any of this from being built. Um, rainwater, uh, I think is really important. Uh, improving our climate resiliency is really important. In fact, it's so important we have an entire task force devoted to it, and a climate resiliency Zoning effort that is ongoing. I think that if there's a question there, um, this could be, you know, that, that element could be raised to the climate resiliency effort. Um, I think that they've done a good job in considering many different elements of that. And, and I don't think that there's a need to take this from this Petition. Uh, I think they've considered a lot of those elements already. Um, and then as far as coming up with plans for where housing should go, uh, in a City that bans, uh, new housing from being created, um, in 85% of its residential land, uh, the idea that we would somehow put that responsibility on employers, I think is a misfit. So, um, I, I would encourage you to, to simply pass this on with a negative recommendation, uh, or at least follow along with the Planning Board's recommendations here. Thank you.

Dennis J. Carlone: Thank you, Christopher. The next speaker is Robert Camacho, followed by Allan Sadun. Robert, welcome.

Robert Camacho: Thank you. Hello. Can anyone hear me?

Dennis J. Carlone: We can. We can hear you.

Robert Camacho: Okay. Thank you. I urge you all to vote favorably on the advance, Advancing Housing Affordability Petition. It allows more units to be created within already existing same single and two family homes. This would increase available housing while preserving building facades and preserve longtime neighborhoods throughout the City. We already have the fifth most dense population nationwide when considering City size and current population. Doesn't it make sense to preserve housing we already have while expanding those housing capabilities instead of destroying existing neighborhoods? Part 2 requires residential onsite parking to be a permeable material. I don't think anybody is arguing against permeable material here. Part 3 calls on major employers to individually and together provide an area plan to cover 85% of their employees and affiliates by the year 2040. And, you know, housing as much as people ignore this fact housing is not a Cambridge only problem. It is a Boston area wide problem. Let's not forget what is now, now happening next door in Boston, where longtime residents tired of seeing livable and beloved neighborhoods torn down in

the name of building and development, have elected a new Mayor who's opposed to the destruction of existing already viable neighborhoods all in the name of modernization and for the sole benefit of the real estate developers. Does it solve, does this Petition solve all the housing problems in Boston in Cambridge? Of course it doesn't, but it's a start and it's a reasonable start to take advantage of what we already have. But apparently people are not satisfied with what we already have, nor are they interested in improving what we already have, but instead want to go great guns and destroy everything we already have, all in the name of affordable housing. Well, that doesn't work in reality. And the reality is that what's going on in Cambridge today is the start of destroying the current City we have so that real estate developers can benefit. This Petition doesn't start like that. It's a small part. It won't do a whole lot, but it at least it is a start of some sort, which is reasonable and measured and totally doable. Thank you.

Dennis J. Carlone: Thank you, Robert. The next speaker is Allan Sadun, followed by David Halperin. Welcome, Allan.

Allan Sadun: Hi. Thank you, Mr. Chair and thank you members of the City Council. My name's Allan Sadun. I live at 24 Union Street. It's hard for me to comment directly on the details of the Petition because if CDD has repeatedly indicated. The Petition is frustratingly vague and sloppy and confusing and carefree with the facts in the way that it's written. And insofar as I could comment on the details, I think previous commenters have done a good job of pointing out the practical and legal issues. But it seems to me that this Petition is best understood as an idea rather than as an actual proposal. And that idea is something that Mr. Donovan said to achieve minimal disruption. In the petitioner's eyes, we achieve minimal disruption by not allowing any alterations of street facing facades. In the petitioner's eyes we achieve minimal disruption by telling employers to go build housing somewhere else, rather than empowering Cambridge to build the housing we need right here. But the fact of the matter is, is that that's not a strategy for minimal disruption. That's a strategy for maximal disruption. When we review, when we refuse to provide for Cambridge housing needs. The people of the Cambridge are the ones whose lives are disrupted as they're displaced by rising rents and prices as they lose their friends and family to other cities and towns. It in fact, this, this approach doesn't even preserve the buildings of Cambridge. We are seeing gut renovations all over town as our naturally affordable occurring housing, uh, sorry, naturally occurring. Affordable housing is being lost to unmet demand and rising rents and prices where, you know, the status quo of Zoning is currently causing a whole lot of, of disruption. And that's why I would say, yeah, I'm, no, we're not satisfied with what we already have. We need to do something bigger. We need to, you know, actually seriously reform our Zoning and address our, the legacy of exclusion that has underpinned so much of our Zoning. You know, I, I want to thank the petitioners for putting in the amount of time and effort that they have in earnestly trying to think about how to address what they see as the challenges facing Cambridge. But frankly, this Petition is a distraction from the really important work that the Council and CDD need to be doing, um, on ending single family Zoning on

climate resiliency, you know, on planning with major employers. It would just take a lot of work to make this Petition something that's worth working with. And I think that work would be much better spent in engaging with the City on, on your own pro, pro proceedings. So, um, I hope you'll dispose of this position quickly. Thank you.

Dennis J. Carlone: Thank you, Allan, for your comments. David Halperin is next, followed by Philip Wellons. Welcome, David.

David Halperin: Hi, this is David Halperin at one 15 Auburn Street. Um, thank you all for your time. Uh, I want to speak against this Petition echoing a lot of things that the previous speakers has said. Um, single family Zoning has racist and classist origins. And while it's laudable to try to get rid of that, this does so in the most minimal possible way. Um, and it would, uh, pro- produce almost no units for reasons that ha have been discussed earlier. Um, and rather than trying to have minimal disruption, we are a progressive City and progress requires change. And we are a City of innovation, and I like old buildings. Um, but, um, do we really want to put the facades of old buildings above material provision for future residents of our City? Is that the right set of values that, uh, that we want to have in our Zoning code? And I, I think the answer to that is no. Um, it's true that Cambridge can't solve the housing crisis all on its own, but, um, does that mean that we should have a minimal solution or that we should take bold action? Um, um, it, Cambridge also won't, uh, you know, completely solve poverty in its City in in the near future, I don't think. But I, I don't think we should trim our sales in response to that. Um, we should, uh, we should, we should, we should be bolder in the face, uh, of big challenges. Uh, and I, I also want to echo the parts about, um, how putting the planning and housing employ, housing, uh, employees on employers doesn't make sense. Um, it's true that housing affordability, um, has been impacted by the amount of commercial development in Cambridge being unbalanced with the amount of residential development. Um, but, uh, what we need to do to, uh, increase housing production is, uh, liberalized the Zoning to allow that housing to be built. There's no reason to get, uh, employers involved and CDD and the Planning Board and the City Council and so forth, um, can make a plan that will, uh, take all these things to into account and balance them. Uh, thank you for your time.

Dennis J. Carlone: Thank you, David. The next speaker is Philip Wellons, followed by Marilee Meyer. Philip, welcome. You have three minutes.

Philip Wellons: I, I think you can hear me now. Is that right?

Dennis J. Carlone: Correct. Thank you.

Philip Wellons: Okay. So I'm Phil Wellons. I live at 651 Green Street. I support the AHA, the Advancing Housing Affordability Petition. I agree with Robert Camacho and I have issues with the various other speakers, but I, I'm, I want to co- continue to lay out just how innovative this, uh, proposal actually is. There were, there were really three cre, uh, key issues in our housing crisis. One is, how do you increase housing unit supply, including affordable, using existing stock to

slow climate change? The answer is to modify single and two families Zoning. There are other ways too, but this is a, a critical way and steps need to be taken immediately. Many groups benefit from our doing this. There are people who need, uh, new units or want to, or need to avoid being displaced. The seniors, uh, who remain in their homes with rental income developers, uh, benefit the City will benefit as a stock of housing rises and residents generally will benefit. Second key issue is how to address, how to use Zoning to address climate change. You don't see a whole lot of that. Here you see the opposite. But the answer is piece, step by step. In this case, start out with permeable materials. And the third issue is how to address a housing crisis with global causes. A, a regionwide plan for large institutions and firms, uh, to find solutions across our metropolitan area is needed and will be useful, uh, and not just for Cambridge. And everybody benefits. The AHA takes a different approach to our housing shortages from earlier petitions. I'd like to just emphasize that difference. The scope, uh, it's incremental. It doesn't go for massive change. It's go, it's to scale. It, uh, uh, tries to slow reverse the decline of our tree canopy. Um, it distributes the pain of meeting new housing needs among various City groups. The two, the single and two family homeowners, their neighbors, large employers and developers. The AHA tackles, um, the housing problem where problems where they appear such as neighboring cities, uh, and with the influx of high tech jobs, people, and money. Uh, the AHA will nudge in, in my view, uh, other cities and large employers to put their heads together with us. We may get real improvements. We, I hope, expect that we'll get real improvements in regional housing as well as transportation, water management, power supply, and all of these will help Cambridge solve the problem. So please try the con, try this new approach, support the AHA Petition. Thank you.

Dennis J. Carlone: Thank you, Philip, for your comments. Marilee Meyer is next, followed by Elizabeth Gombosi. Mari- Marilee, welcome.

Marilee Meyer: Hi, Marilee Meyer, 10 Dana Street. And I, I too am supporting the, uh, Donovan Petition as another tool in the City's housing toolbox. This Petition takes advantage of the underutilized space in significant vintage homes and will compliment the often heavy handed new construction, usually lacking, um, binding design review. Um, and, um, dismissing an idea wholesale is almost arrogant. Anything brought forward will entail all departments to, to qualify, uh, details in legislation. Um, the, um, this plan has several benefits. Um, it does allow for subdivisions of, um, of single and two family houses. It helps keep s um, seniors aging in place and share larger homes. Units are sprinkled around, which can contribute to diversity in neighborhoods, depending on the neighbor. Um, the number of units and affordable, uh, components can apply if the City wants to contribute to mortgages of first time home buyers. Here is an opportunity and also can legitimize all those illegal apartments lacking code compliance. Seniors are the largest growing demographic, um, remaining in their homes or returning to suburbs. And we have an opportunity here to, to help, um, a number of different, um, populations and, uh, permeable, um, material. Yes, absolutely in parking. And, um, speaking of parking, nobody mentions, um, wintertime and

snow in relation to, um, um, a hardship for a lot of people. So parking in general needs to be re-looked at. And, um, most students and businesses tend to be trans, um, transient and demand, um, of, uh, accommodations. And I don't think it is unreasonable to ask schools to step up and, and try a little bit harder. And family needs larger units, so, which can be found in older houses. These and smaller units can be adapted in present homes more cheaply and more readily than the current expensive, new projects. Please give this Petition as, um, uh, same favorable, favorable consideration as the larger, uh, Zoning amendments to plug the whole for the more balanced development in keeping Cambridge identity. We are not talking about all or nothing. And, um, to dismiss an effort to, to plug the holes in, in finding other opportunities, I think is really an, an amazingly arrogant thing to do. Um, it's, you're you big towers and you're, I I'm just, I'm, I am the cleed. All right. Thank you very much.

Dennis J. Carlone: Thank you, Marilee. The next speaker is Elizabeth Gombosi, followed by Heather Hoffman. Elizabeth, you have three minutes.

Elizabeth Gombosi: Elizabeth Gombosi, 42 Irving Street. I speak today to urge you to support the AHA Zoning Petition. The AHA Donovan Petition currently before you is part of a much larger whole to address the housing infrastructure, transportation, and climate concerns we face as a City, it will take the enormous brainpower available here, as well as the goodwill and positive efforts of the entire City government and its citizens to tackle the past. In our planning, it is critical that we think holistically and remember that quality of life must remain foremost in providing solutions. We owe it to all our citizens. Allowing additional units in one and two family structures will provide benefits to the owners and to the renders both. It will retain critical green spaces and will maintain and reuse existing structures, which is the ultimate environmentally sound practice. Though the focus here is on A1, A2 and B zones, I feel we should encourage the same innovation Citywide. Given the climate crisis and the increasing amount of parking on what were front lawns, it seems requiring all outdoor parking surfaces to be permeable is a simple and responsible step to take. In fact, one wonders why all City projects are not held to this standard. It is long overdue to ask our institutions and large employers to partner in finding regional solutions to housing, transportation, and infrastructure issues for their employees and students. The City cannot alone be responsible, although it should bear a responsibility for its employees. Proposed timeline gives ample time to work on imaginative and innovative collective solutions, including encouraging assistance for home ownership. Clearly, much more than what this Petition proposes needs to be done. But every solution that moves us forward must be embraced, and I urge you to support this Petition and its goals. Thank you.

Dennis J. Carlone: Thank you, Elizabeth. Uh, Heather Hoffman is next, followed by Carol O'Hare. Welcome, Heather.

Heather Hoffman: Hello, Heather Hoffman, 213 Hurley Street. I have to say that I have so enjoyed listening to all of the people who, just a few short months ago were telling us that adding one unit here, one unit there throughout the City,

would for, and aiming those at people making at least a hundred thousand dollars a year, was the thing we needed to solve our housing problems. It's funny how time changes people's minds. Now, it, as others have said, this isn't going to solve everything, but reusing what we have is environmentally responsible. And I can tell you those materials, especially the, the older houses, tend to be a whole lot better than the materials we can get now. So instead of taking all of the sturdy old wood and tossing it in a landfill, let's find ways to use it and reuse it, because that is the kind of thing that our ancestors did. And they were not people who threw stuff away. So, of course, this will benefit from real criticism, from people who are looking for ways to solve our problems, at least to start solving them, because nobody is so smart as to submit something perfect right at the beginning. So if people can get away from deciding that something that they didn't propose could not possibly be any good, and instead look for how we can work together and, and start on dealing with the problems that we have, the quicker we might actually make a dent. I mean, the notion that all we have to do is build and build and build. Well, I live in East Cambridge. How many millions of square feet of housing have we built? And yet it does not seem to have cured anything. Why? Because as someone pointed out, we build even more commercial. Our City Policy is to make it worse. How about we start by doing this little bit to make it better? Thank you.

Dennis J. Carlone: Thank you, Heather. The next speaker is Carol O'Hare, followed by John Pitkin. Welcome, Carol.

Carol O'Hare: Hi, can you hear me?

Dennis J. Carlone: Yes, we can. Please proceed.

Carol O'Hare: I have resided in a former single family residence, now a three family since 1969. First as a tenant in one of the three apartments, and later as an owner, there have been no significant exterior changes to the building since it was constructed around 1900. As a landlord, and I ventured to guess that other landlords in housing like mine, I have charged well below market rents. I expect that would be applicable to others who live in close, close proximity to their own tenants. I support parts 1 and 2 of the Donovan Petition in spirit, though they may need revisions to work smoothly. And, uh, with the current Zoning Ordinance, for example, definitional consistency. Why oppose this? It's absurd to oppose this. It's just, um, obstreperous and kind of nasty. Why not allow one and two family residents to have more units with minimal exterior modifications? Why not require rain permeable surfaces for parking in other areas? The City has already been installing such material around our street trees. I certainly support the in spirit and the goals of part 3, but I don't know enough to take a position about the effectiveness, ramifications, consequences, downs or downsides. And I, uh, am concerned like Jeff Roberts, uh, that it really is beyond the scope of Zoning. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Dennis J. Carlone: Thank you, Carol, for your comments. John Pitkin is next, and is the last person I believe on our list. Um...

John Pitkin: Can you hear me?

Dennis J. Carlone: Yes, John, please proceed.

John Pitkin: Thank you. Um, I would like to associate myself with the support of Robert Camacho, Philip Wellons, and other speakers who have spoken in favor of this Petition. I support, particularly support the first provision because it, it, uh, it supports sustainability and, and the adaptive use of existing residential capital and, and materials as, as, as, as it been noted. It makes a, makes a ton of sense in a time of climate change when we have, when, when resource depletion is a growing issue, uh, also support the Perus surfaces for parking areas. Of course that makes sense in, in this time of climate change. I specifically want to applaud the, the petitioners for the, the thought they put into the third Petition. Even though it, it does, it's not entirely clear how it fits into Zoning, but it makes a huge amount of sense to consider the relationship between parking and transportation demand management and where people are going to live. I don't even understand how you can come up with a sensible parking, transportation and demand management plan for a company if you don't know where your employees, employees are going to live. How are you going to predict who is going to ride on bikes or, uh, uh, single occupants if you vehicles or, or transit? If you don't, if, if there doesn't, also, with some kind of an idea of planning, let's at least have that disclosed. Now, I don't know that that belongs in Zoning, but a holistic approach to transportation and employee residences is absolutely essential. We should have been doing this years ago, and we might not be in the mess we're in now with our transportation system and trying to fix everything by building bike lanes and, and reducing, um, and creating more congestion for cars, which it may actually be making our affordable housing situation worse. We've got to start looking at these things together. Is this the way to do it? I'm not sure if it is. Let's, let's make it work. If not, it's still a terrific idea that I think really should be studied more and made to work as soon as possible. We've got to pay attention to the relationship between where people work and where they live. It's getting more complicated in the wake of, of, uh, pandemic restrictions and remote working. We don't know how it's going to change. And working with the employers to figuring out what these, what these needs are is going to be critical. So let's not, uh, mothball this part of the, the Petition without thinking about the, the, the problem that it attempts to address. Address. So I, again, I could commend the entire Petition. I encourage you to not to lose sight of three, even if it doesn't fit very well with Zoning. Thank you very much.

Dennis J. Carlone: Thank you, John, for your comment. Um, committee members, uh, that completes our list, but we do have, uh, an additional person who is physically here and would like to present his thoughts on the matter. I move, um, to suspend the rules to allow that person to speak. Mr. Clerk

Mr. Clerk: On that motion. Councillor, I'm sorry. Vice Mayor Mallon?

Alanna M. Mallon: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Councillor McGovern?

Marc C. McGovern: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Councillor Nolan?

Patricia M. Nolan: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Councillor Simmons?

E. Denise Simmons: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Councillor Sobrinho-Wheeler?

Dennis J. Carlone: Councillor Sobrinho-Wheeler had to leave for an appointment.

Mr. Clerk: Absent. Councillor Toomey. Absent. Councillor Zondervan?

Quinton Y. Zondervan: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Was that a yes or a no?

Quinton Y. Zondervan: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Mayor Siddiqui?

Sumbul Siddiqui: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Councillor Carlone?

Dennis J. Carlone: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Motion passes. Eight, uh, seven in favor, two absent.

Dennis J. Carlone: Hi, Mr. Barrett. We welcome your thoughts.

Patrick Barrett: Uh, thank you, uh, Mr. Chair and Councillors. Um, I, I, I'll keep it brief. Um, I think there's a lot of merit to what Suzanne and her group has put together. I've worked with them many times over the years. Um, I think if you're looking for a guidepost, I'd always looked at Carol O'Hare, uh, uh, in terms of validity and whether it's Zoning or not. And the third section is clearly not Zoning. Um, however, that doesn't mean it any less important to talk about. Um, however, I think one thing I'd like to point out is, have anyone noticed how we sort of twist ourselves in knots when it comes to trying to put housing in the neighborhoods that are already existing in Cambridge? I understand the reason why we're doing it. I understand the reason why we try to increase the density in these neighborhoods. And I, I think to some degree, there's some good ideas in there, but it's very difficult from a practical standpoint. It's in, it's, you know, you're talking about upgrading electrical, you're talking about upgrading plumbing, you're talking about ripping up the very streets to allow for some of these uses. And although I do agree with Heather Hoffman that some of these buildings are built very well, a lot of them also have not been taken care of very well over the years and require an extensive amount of work up to the point where I think you almost spend more money per square foot to develop inside of some of these places than you would if you built brand new. Um, however, we are focusing on the wrong places in my mind, with these petitions to build. And we

should be looking at places like Central Square. We should be looking at places like Alewife and looking places like the corridors in the City where are either predominantly a neighborhood business district or BB business district. And quite frankly, they are ripe. They are ready, they are soft sites ready for development along infrastructure, along transit, whether it be the missing middle or the Donovan Petition. And I salute Fritz for, for putting his name on this one. Again, he is a trooper. But, you know, I think between those two petitions, there's a lot of good, and there's a lot of things we should take from it. But, you know, and we don't want to let perfect be the enemy of, of progress, but I think at some point in time, we have to look at how much money we've spent on studies and examinations of areas of development and say, is it, can we finally pull the trigger on some of this stuff? Can we finally move forward? Um, this Petition merits at least a good discussion. There's some good points and there's some points that I'm, I'm not going to get into in the weeds on it, but I urge this committee to think how difficult it's going to be to actually produce the housing that we say we want in these areas and focus more on the places where we know we can actually do it. Thank you.

Dennis J. Carlone: Thank you. So that concludes, uh, the section on Public Comment. There were many good comments. And I move, uh, no, I need a motion to, uh, end Public Comment.

Sumbul Siddiqui: So moved.

Dennis J. Carlone: Thank you, Mr. Clerk.

Mr. Clerk: On that motion. Vice Mayor Mallon?

Alanna M. Mallon: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Councillor McGovern?

Marc C. McGovern: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Councillor Nolan?

Patricia M. Nolan: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Councillor Simmons?

E. Denise Simmons: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Councillor Sobrina-Wheeler? Absent. Councillor Toomey? Absent. Councillor Zondervan?

Quinton Y. Zondervan: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Mayor Siddiqui?

Sumbul Siddiqui: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Councillor Carlone?

Dennis J. Carlone: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Motion passes. Seven in favor, two Absent.

Dennis J. Carlone: So now we'll open up, uh, to the Ordinance Committee, uh, questions or comments. Let's try if there are any clarifying questions that are very direct to further understand what is before. I do want to say that when I first saw this, uh, Petition, I also thought it was really three sections. And although the last section, a number of people have said, and I believe it is not Zoning, it is still an Ordinance, uh, discussion about how to approach planning and looking at development. Um, so I believe that these are really three parts, and we could go with two of them. We could go with three of them. Um, but that's the way to approach this. Now, I also want to say, I don't see whose hands are up, so the Clerk will notify me of who's speaking first.

Mr. Clerk: No hands.

Dennis J. Carlone: No hands. Well, I guess that concludes, I'm sorry, Patty. Patty. All right. The first speaker is Patty Nolan. Councillor, you have the floor.

Patricia M. Nolan: Thank you, uh, to the petitioners to chair, Carlone and the Clerk, and all the comments. Um, I, I do have a couple of, um, I, they might be in the category of clarifying questions, and then I have some other thoughts and questions. And this is through you to either the petitioners or CDD. Often when we get a Petition, we have had, there has been a back and forth in meetings with, uh, CDD. So many, many of the comments and questions have been about the clarity of the writing of this. So were there meetings to go over some of the concerns, particularly around the clarity of the definitions, uh, with the petitioners and CDD? So that, um, and, and if, if not, then it seems to me from my tenure that that's a, a normal part of the process. So I'm curious as to what happened with that kind of, uh, development of a process.

Dennis J. Carlone: Ms. Blier.

Suzanne Blier: Thank you. Um, for Part 1, uh, that was, uh, a piece of the proposal that was largely in the original Donovan Petition. And we had the expert help of Patrick Barrett, but we also conferred with, uh, Jeff Roberts on that. And, uh, so that is not, um, so we, we didn't come back on that. And then, uh, we did consult with, um, well, Barrett was part of our working group for a long period of time, and then we consulted with another attorney as well. But of course, the, the issue of language is something that we would welcome, um, re-engaging with CDD around and with the Solicitor to make sure that the language is exactly right.

Dennis J. Carlone: Councillor.

Patricia M. Nolan: Yeah. It seems that that would've been particularly because if you met with Mr. Roberts, he said himself that there were a number of questions he had about the definitions in the language. So it sounds like those meetings need to happen in order to ensure that if this moves forward, that we would all understand, um, how it is that, that it is being defined. It, and you just, I just heard you say you're open to all those discussions in a number of areas. I think that's pretty important for us to understand how it is that it can be defined in such a way

that, um, that those questions can be put to rest. Um, and then the other, uh, more of a clarifying question, then I can come back, I can yield and come back to some other, uh, questions. What, could someone answer how this particular Petition differs from the ADU and how it, there are some questions about whether this would do anything more than the ADU. The way I read it, it actually does have the potential to add units in a way that the ADU Petition, uh, or- Ordinance doesn't. But if someone from CDD could explain how it is that they see this different, and if that's something we should, uh, take into consideration and be thinking about, since the ADU is, uh, I understand not created as many units as had been expected.

Dennis J. Carlone: Community development.

Jeff Roberts: Hi, this is Jeff Roberts. I can, uh, try to answer that question. So, Cambridge has a, um, accessory apartments Ordinance, which allows for, um, certain, under certain limited circumstances, buildings that are single family or two family can add what's often referred to as an as an ADU or an accessory dwelling unit by special permit from the BCA. Um, this is a little bit different because it, uh, this petition's a little bit different because it, it says that a, a single family, for example, could be converted into a three family if you, if you ask me, there's sometimes a little bit of ambiguity as to what makes something an accessory dwelling unit versus just a regular dwelling unit. But, but sort of putting that aside, I think the, the issue in either case comes down to how the Zoning limits the number of units that can be put on a lot. And the accessory apartment Ordinance says that the accessory apartment doesn't count as a unit when you are calculating the number of units that are allowed on that, uh, particular piece of land. So, um, this particular Ordinance, while it, it on the face of it, would allow single family to be converted to three family, it doesn't say anything about the limitation on the number of units that could be allowed on a lot. So that, that's part of what makes it difficult to, to fully assess what, what kind of impact it would have.

Patricia M. Nolan: Okay. Um, thank you. I'm not sure that, I clearer on on the differences, but it does sound like this is at least different in, in, in terms of what it would allow. But we can talk later about some of the ramifications of it. I'm happy to have my colleague speak, uh, Chair Carlone and then come back. I have a few other questions that I'd like to, to ask.

Dennis J. Carlone: Uh, we're going to post, uh, put a hold on the meeting for a minute. We have a visitor hold on. So we are going to proceed. Uh, the Clerk had to step out for a moment to deal with, uh, another person. I'm sorry, Councillor Nolan, did you want to stop there or were there?

Patricia M. Nolan: Well, uh, I, I'm happy to have, uh, my colleague go and then we can go around again because I have some other questions.

Dennis J. Carlone: Thank you. So, on the list I have the next speaker is the Vice Mayor. Vice Mayor Mallon, you have the floor.

Alanna M. Mallon: Oh, thank you Chair Carlone. And thank you to, uh, the petitioners and CDD for the presentation. Um, I, I guess I have a, I have a lot of thoughts. I know we're asking clarifying questions at this point, but I feel like this Petition has more questions than answers. Um, you know, it, it tries to do a, a lot of different things. As you mentioned, there's three distinct buckets. The last one isn't necessarily Zoning. One, it's, you know, I think a lofty goal that we all share around ending single family only Zoning. Um, but as is called out, um, by CDD, there's no dimensional requirements that were addressed in the pet- Petition. Um, CDD says, uh, more importantly, as discussed at the previous Planning Board and City Council hearings on this topic, allowing a conversion from single family or two family used to a multifamily would not necessarily enable the addition of dwelling units because most are constrained by the restrictive minimum, minimum watt area for dwelling requirements in res A, um, one and two and B districts. So that's the first thing that, you know, we ran into this with the, the MMH, where, you know, we really understood that you can't just say, we want to eliminate single family only Zoning and not, uh, really address those dimensional requirements. So that's the first thing. I think, you know, somebody mentioned in, in Public Comment that the affordability guidelines are a voluntary unsubsidized affordability piece, but they're also really not clear in the Petition as CDD points out. There is no section 5.16, the final footnote seems to waive affordability. And there's another section which allows for a waiver, uh, from the, um, the Planning Board with a special permit. So there's a lot of really a lack of clarity around the affordability housing piece. I think, you know, we've talked about the afford the permeable parking requirement, which, um, I'm assuming is being covered, uh, with Councillor Nolan's climate, uh, change working group. Uh, if if that's not the case, then um, perhaps should be because it's, uh, you know, it's something that we should be looking at in terms of, of our climate change goals. And then, you know, the last piece around requiring housing to be built by employers. I, I guess I, I have some real questions around, particularly with the petitioners where, um, we would be asking for this housing to be built. There has been a tremendous pushback on building any housing for whether it's market rate or affordable, whether it's along the corridors as, as Mr. Barrett, uh, suggested in Public Comment. Uh, there's been a tremendous pushback. So I'm just curious, you know, I have some questions around where those would be built if we were have the staff, uh, and the, the ability to regulate that. I think we're, where I'm sensing that there is consensus and agreement, um, from the City Council, from the Donovan Petition, and from the folks that put forward the, the missing middle Zoning Petition is that there's a desire to end single family only Zoning and create those additional housing and address housing affordability at the same time, creating additional units of existing housing, uh, with existing housing stock might be part of that conversation and those recommendations. But I'll note that the, the house on Hawthorne Street that we were looking at is now on sale for, uh, almost \$6 million. So it, it's not clear to me how we would, um, address affordability in that particular, uh, example that was brought forward, uh, with one or two additional units. So during, I guess this is really my question. During the MMH conversation, the last meeting that we had, uh, and the Planning Board,

both, both bodies agreed that there should be a broader conversation. Um, and that this should be a priority that we talk about what single family only, only Zoning, what it amounts to here, how, how do we address it. Um, and the Planning Board does expressed a desire to have a broader conversation within their own body, which I'm sure actually will come up tonight when they, um, debate this topic as well. I feel like I would be a, a big proponent of figuring out a way how to have that conversation, how to allow them to have that conversation at the beginning of the year, both bringing forward some of the things that we brought forward with this Petition, the Donovan Petition, but also the missing middle Petition. And that allowed them to have that conversation with CDD and bring forward some models and ideas and concepts for the City Council to discuss, um, at Ordinance. I think, you know, that might be the best way for us to, to really thread this needle with the desire that I think I'm hearing today and the desire that I heard this summer, um, with the missing middle Petition. So, you know, I would move it, we would keep this in committee until the Planning Board is meeting, you know, the meeting tonight. We have not heard from them. We have the CDD demo, which was very helpful and instructive. Um, and then try to figure out a way to direct this Planning Board and CDD to have that broad conversation, uh, amongst themselves, uh, at the beginning of the year to address single family only Zoning and provide options and, and models to the City Council to move forward with. So, um, I think there's, there's definitely things in this Petition that we could think about as part of that broader conversation as well as the missing middle Petition, um, because it is clear that we want to have this conversation. And so my, my advice, my, where I'm heading is to leave this in committee, uh, while the Planning Board has that conversation, but plan that broader, uh, larger thinking conversation, uh, for the beginning of the year. So, uh, I'll yield back at this time because I know I've seen a bunch of other hands and you've, you've allowed me to, to talk for a long time. So thank you Chair, Chair Carlone. Um, I'll yield back.

Dennis J. Carlone: Thank you, Vice Mayor. Uh, I have no doubt that this will be left in committee for the reasons you cited. In fact, I think all Zoning should go at least two meetings, like, uh, many of the Planning Board meetings. Um, I, you asked the number of questions. I stopped counting, uh, after a while because I couldn't remember them all. But one that came forward was about part 1 and, um, about affordability, um, and about out why not have square feet per unit. And my reading on this is that this is the exception to square feet of lot per unit, that if it's within the confines of an existing house, that Zoning does not apply. That's how I read it. So now I'll ask the petitioners if I read that correctly, and if not, what is their perspective on that and affordability.

Suzanne Blier: So let, let me take up a piece of that and I want to thank Councillor Mallon for those terrific, terrific questions. One of the things that we looked at is how financially viable is this. And we asked a developer, um, that question specifically. And for a roughly 700 square foot unit, uh, how much would it cost to, to create a new unit within the shell of the existing structure? It would cost anywhere from 175 to 200,000, and that could be done, uh, with a second mortgage. And, uh, then the person could add, if they could use that to

sell, uh, a condo and use those funds to live for the rest of their lives, if these are seniors or, um, they could, if you're thinking about, um, the average area income of roughly a hundred thousand, uh, one could easily see, uh, you know, if they're using a quarter of their income, that that would be paid off within let's say eight or so years. So I think it, it is a viable financial solution both to the owners of these homes, uh, and would benefit whether it's other seniors wanting to move here as rental units or condos, or as younger people wishing their fir- first step in the door. Uh, in terms of, uh, moving up and, and retaining a position within Cambridge, we know that if homeowners generally pay less, uh, in their mortgages than those who are renting. And this would, uh, certainly help within that. Um, I, I'd also say that, that I do think there'll be many more, um, takers of this in part because, uh, we know that in, um, uh, parts of West Cambridge and elsewhere, there are an awful lot of "illegal apartments" for graduate students and others. I mean, as we were doing canvassing, we saw, you know, eight, nine, uh, names, uh, as we were going in an entryway. And we know that as our population is aging and more and more individuals want to continue to live here, the opportunity for them to have more people living within the shells of their existing structure, um, will be taken seriously.

Dennis J. Carlone: Any other comments that come to mind on the Vice Mayor's comments? You don't have to answer all of them. I'm just giving you the opportunity to respond.

Suzanne Blier: I, I would, um, I would add two things. One, um, our, one of our concerns about the missing middle Petition was that Cambridge is such a huge target for investors. We were really worried that we would get local, national, international investors as they are now, but buying up more of these properties, tearing them down, and, uh, leaving them vacant. I mean, that was the other thing that really struck me during the canvassing season, was how many vacant homes that we're seeing. And we're trying to preclude that in a thoughtful way. And on the, uh, affordability requirement, I would say, um, you know, draw on the guidelines of the AHO, and, and use that in this context, uh, as well. That seems to me a very good solution. And within the Petition, we also have the possibility for special permit, so that if there is a case that really makes sense, um, where one wants to make a larger addition to a structure as now, uh, that can certainly be achieved. And, um, but we wanted the sort of apriori, um, framing of this to be as a means to, uh, provide a financially viable, um, econ- ecologically sustainable way to make better use of our existing buildings.

Dennis J. Carlone: Okay. Thank you. We're going to move on, uh, in the loop. Um, Councillor McGovern and Councillor Zondervan have questions or, or comments? Councillor McGovern co-Chair McGovern, you're up.

Marc C. McGovern: Uh, thank you. Um, I saw the Vice Mayor put her hand up for a minute. I didn't know if she had a follow up to what I...

Dennis J. Carlone: I, I'm sorry, Vice Mayor. I did, I don't see the hands.

Marc C. McGovern: Oh, it's down now, but it was up a minute ago. I wanted to yield back to her if she had a follow up question based on what the petitioner had said. I don't know.

Alanna M. Mallon: Uh, thank you, Councillor. Governor, my only my follow up was to say to the petitioner in response that I understand the affordability requirements, but the CDD memo outlines quite clearly that it is not clear in the Petition of what those requirements were and what situations that they would, um, be applicable for. That's all. Thank you for allowing me to speak.

Dennis J. Carlone: Councillor McGovern.

Marc C. McGovern: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Um, thank you to, to the petitioners and, and CDD for, uh, the presentations. I think I, I'm in line with, um, what the Vice Mayor, uh, how the Vice Mayor feels in terms of, certainly in terms of this needing more time. Um, you know, and also, you know, I do think that there's, we are, we've all stated our support for ending, uh, exclusionary Zoning and single family only Zoning. Um, but it does, you know, the devil is in the details, right? You can, obviously, changing the Zoning to allow things to happen is required. Um, but that doesn't necessarily mean that it'll, it will lead to, uh, what you hope it will lead to. So getting into the specifics of, um, how it will actually be allowed and what incentives or what, you know, uh, you know, changes we would have to make to, um, not just change the Zoning and say it's okay to do, but actually encourage it to be done and help and, and help actually get units. And I'm not sure where, um, that we're there yet. Um, I was too, I too was going to bring up the Hawthorne Street example because it sometimes helps me to think of as an example and kind of walk it through. Um, you know, that at home is on the market right now, um, as the Vice Mayor said for, you know, \$5.8 million. So let's say it sells for six. Um, it is in a zone D, which, um, it can build, uh, it could be two units based on its lot size. No, no more than that without, without a variance. Um, it could do an A DU now, uh, which would create two, which would make it two units. Um, but let's say, you know, it, it sells and somebody pays \$6 million for it, and they can only divide it into two units. Let's say they want to live in one of them. It's not an investment property, but they actually want to live in one of those units. That second unit is never going to be affordable with a \$6 million investment. Right? And so, you know, again, I do think we, you know, we have to figure out, um, you know, how that would actually work. I don't, I don't think that's the best example. I think as Ms. Blier in, in her response to the Vice Mayor actually had a, you know, a better sort of take on someone who already owns a house, you know, they're already paying it off and they want to subdivide it into for a second income. I mean, that I think probably could happen in some instances, but I don't think the, I would, for what it's worth, I would think you, you should, you maybe want to think of changing your example. I don't think Hawthorne Street actually makes your, makes the case. Um, in terms of, um, I guess a question I have, and maybe this is for the Solicitor. I don't, I I don't know. Um, you know, again, and it goes something that, that Councillor Nolan had talked about. Um, you know, many of these, these, these homes can already do ADUs, which would be a second income, would add a second unit, and they're not

doing that. And in the affordability piece, if someone were to become, Mr. Donovan had said, if someone were to take a, a, make a single family or add another unit, so it becomes a three instead of a two, that the bonus would for that 25% affordable unit would be, um, you know, adding another, another unit. And, and we, um, incomplete sort of similar to the ADU, but if the, but how is, if they're already allowed to do that, add that other unit, how is that legally? How is that, how is that considered a, um, you know, a bonus in, in terms of like we do with inclusionary, with, with heightened density? Um, if they can already do it, it's not, we're not giving them something extra, um, because they can do it anyway. Is that, does that make sense? Madam Solicitor?

Dennis J. Carlone: Ms. Glowa?

Marilee Meyer: I, uh, through you, Mr. Chair, um, Solicitor Glowa is not, um, attending, but I'm here as representative from the law department today. Um, you know, I think, uh, Councillor McGovern that we would have to look into the nuances of that question, but I, uh, I see your point that there wouldn't be a benefit if there already being able to do something that's allowed as of right. Um, there may be some ways so that it, it differs in the accessory dwelling unit that would be allowed as of right in some way that it would offer a benefit. But, um, I think that is questionable and something we would have to look at more carefully.

Marc C. McGovern: Thank you.

Dennis J. Carlone: If I could just add in, I, I agree, and I think it might be one or the other, and that can be added, um, in this for clarity. Uh, also with a special permit, you can add additional units. Um, so there would be the possibility of putting a, an addition on the back, but you'd have to get it approved, I assume, through the Planning Board. But, um, that's always a possibility. I'll stop, Mr. Councillor, please continue.

Marc C. McGovern: Yeah, thank you. Uh, just two, two things on the, the, I guess the third bucket, if we're thinking of it in terms of buckets, um, you know, I, I do, I concur with the Vice Mayor in terms of, you know, if we're a, if we're going to be asking companies to build housing, um, or supply housing for 85% or some percentage of their employees, I don't know how we do this. This petition's not going to get there. So I don't know how we do that without building more housing. And I think it's, you know, it does bring up this larger question where any time we talk about building new housing, it's met with extreme opposition. Um, and so I hope for the petitioners, some of whom are often opposing, um, the building of new housing, that if that's going to happen, that we, um, do more to allow and encourage, uh, housing to be built, uh, particularly along corridors where we all, you know, think for various reasons, that's, that's where it should be. I, I, I just, you know, I, I don't know how those things are going to fit together. Um, but I do have a question for the petitioners, and maybe I'm just not understanding. So there's, there's a difference, I think, between an employer and a property owner, right? So, MIT is building, you know, MIT builds a, an office building in Kendall Square, MIT is the property owner. They own the property, they're renting the commercial space. I am a, I'm starting a company, a tech

company, and I have a hundred employees, and I want to rent a floor or two floors, um, in that building. So you're saying that I, as the president of this company, would then have to go out and try to find or build 85 units of housing to, for my 85 employees, assuming they're, they're not married or whatever. Um, I mean, how, I don't even unders I don't even know how that would, how that would happen. So now saying to, um, and we we're doing this with a couple projects in Kendall Square, Councillor Carlone and I have met with some folks down in, what is it, one Kendall Councillor? Um, and, and Councillor Sobrinho-Wheeler brought this up where you're, you know, you want to build this new commercial building that's going to bring people in. We want you to build housing, but they're the property owners. They're not necessarily the employers who are going to be occupying those buildings. So just some clarity, are you talking about the owner of the property is supposed to supply a certain amount of housing, or are you expecting some, you know, company that is just renting space to go out and try to do that?

Dennis J. Carlone: Ms. Meyer. Ms. Blier.

Suzanne Blier: Uh, thank you. Thank you. Uh, thank you Councillor McGovern. Uh, and let me answer that in, uh, by turning to one of your first points, and then I will go through the points that you raised. Uh, one of the things that you had said early on was that we just, we may not know what This's going to lead to. And so we want to have more clarity on that. And I think that is one of the reasons why the third part is important, because we would be bringing the large employers to the table as they are doing now with, uh, um, 1998 parking transportation Ordinance, with basically a, a summary of where their employees would be living and whether it's in Cambridge or elsewhere, including that as part of the analytic in the same way that we're currently doing with them for transportation, uh, and for parking. And in the same way, to some extent, we're also doing that with the town and gallery port. We're simply asking that, um, housing be a piece of this so that we can know on a year by year basis going forward how that ultimately would work. No one is expecting, uh, employers to build this housing, uh, unless this is something that they are inclined to do. And I would hope I, I know that, uh, my own university and others have a key moments stepped up and really been, um, extraordinary, uh, contributors to the housing, uh, in our City and elsewhere. And this may well be one of those moments where we could encourage them to do that, either on their own Cambridge properties or elsewhere. On the issue of the Hawthorne Street property, uh, I know it well because it's, it's, uh, close to where I live, and it is one of those structures I did point out to CDD as, you know, some, a place that would be great for affordable housing. Um, in part it's got a, um, a parking area beside it that, that might be built, and it's so close to transportation, et cetera. And so that was one of the main reasons I used it. And who knows, um, whether this couple, you know, had they had the possibility of more, um, income in the way of dividing it into condos or official residences, um, whether that might have encouraged them to stay at this juncture. Uh, 5.6 million is beyond the budgets of many people, most people, uh, so I doubt that the City would, would find this as a, as a viable place to do this. But I do think, um, that

looking at how we can subdivide our existing structures really makes sense as one of the many pieces, both for the environment and as our community is aging, and thinking about ways in which we can encourage them to stay here. And if something along the lines of the area wide approach comes into play, we would have the data, uh, necessary also so that we could, um, keep in play what each of our employers is doing. As I said, when CDD decides that 20% of one's employees have to live in Cambridge, and it's a company of 4,000, that's 800 units that have to come from somewhere. So, knowing how this is going to be done, and if, uh, we need to sort of rethink some of these policies, I think would be, be important, and to have all of the criteria in play.

Dennis J. Carlone: Co-chair.

Marc C. McGovern: Thank you. Um, let, I'll finish up now, Mr. Chair. Thank you. Um, you know, I think, I mean, I think you're right, Ms., Ms. Blier in that, you know, at, at \$6 million, you know, that that particular example wouldn't work, and now it wouldn't work if it can only be divided into two or three units. Now, if that could be, if that could have been divided into several more units, maybe it could work. But that wouldn't be allowed necessarily under this because it would probably require, you know, changing, you know, much of, much of the building. So, I, I, I, I agree with the Vice Mayor. I think this is, these are all part of a larger conversation. Um, you know, I, I worry about, you know, we just passed last night, the, the, uh, L wife, uh, you know, quad. Um, I do, I am concerned about, um, putting too much on CD's plate, um, uh, and how we do that. We, we, we keep, we add a lot faster than we take off, um, these lists. Um, and a lot of it comes from residents who do this tremendous amount of work and give a tremendous amount of their time volunteering tremendous amounts of their time to bring things forward. Um, because some things aren't moving ahead, but yet the more we bring forward, the further behind we get. So, so I, I, I think that, um, you know, I, I don't know how we can better support CDD, um, in, in getting through these things more, more, uh, more quickly. They, they, they're working, uh, I think as hard as they can possibly work. Um, and so, um, you know, if there is some way to bring some of these ideas, whether it's some of the stuff from the MMH and, and some of the stuff from this Petition, um, together into a broader conversation to sort of figure out how it's not enough to say, let's end single family Zoning. We could do that with a stroke of a pen, but that's just words unless we figure out how to actually to have it turn into something. And that's where the devil's in the details. So, um, you know, I, I, I certainly think that, uh, you know, thank you for the time you spent. Um, I think this has got a long way to go. Um, and I think if we can incorporate it into some other conversations to really, you know, come up with something, um, you know, that, that, that leads us to where we want to get to, I think that would be better. So, uh, I will yield, uh, Mr. Chair, thank you for the time.

Dennis J. Carlone: Thank you. I, I do want to add that in my, uh, eight years of being in the Ordinance Committee, parts 1 and 2 are the simplest Zoning petitions I've seen. And any, uh, changes would be relatively simple as well. No citizen Petition is ready for the review of experts in Zoning. Um, in fact, many

professionally prepared petitions get altered pretty dramatically as well in the process. So the next speaker is Councillor Zondervan. Uh, you have the floor Councillor. And just note that, uh, or maybe we should extend the meeting now.

Mr. Clerk: Yes.

Dennis J. Carlone: Uh, before Councillor Zondervan gets on, I move that we extend the meeting till 4:15, 15 additional minutes.

Mr. Clerk: On, on that motion. Vice Mayor Mallon?

Alanna M. Mallon: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Councillor McGovern?

Marc C. McGovern: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Councillor Nolan?

Patricia M. Nolan: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Councillor Simmons? Councillor Simmons? Absent. Councillor Sobrinho-Wheeler? Absent. Councillor Toomey? Absent. Councillor Zondervan?

Quinton Y. Zondervan: No.

Mr. Clerk: No. Mayor Siddiqui?

Sumbul Siddiqui: No. I have to leave at 4. I'm sorry.

Mr. Clerk: No. Councillor Carlone?

Dennis J. Carlone: Uh, yes.

Mr. Clerk: Motion passes. Four in favor. Three absent, two against.

Dennis J. Carlone: Uh, Councillor Zondervan, if, if we said no, you would only have five minutes and even less than that. So I'm doing this for you. Council Zondervan, you have the floor.

Quinton Y. Zondervan: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I really appreciate that. I, I do have to leave it for as well, which is why I voted know. Um, I, I largely agree with my colleagues in, in their comments. Um, I, I think we all agree that we want to eliminate single family voting. It's, it's super important that we get that right and the details, particularly around the affordability piece. Um, so I, I too, thank the petitioners for bringing this forward, but I think we need to have a, a much broader and more detailed conversation on that general topic. Um, on the permeability, of course, I completely agree. In fact, I have a permeable parking spot at my house, um, and I'm putting forward a, uh, Zoning Petition to eliminate parking minimums with Councillor Sobrinho-Wheeler. And, um, I've added language in there as well to, to require permeable parking for, um, any parking spaces that are created. So, um, I think we can, we can address that fairly easily as well. Um, and then I, I agree on the, on the third piece, it, it clearly does not belong in Zoning, but it's an important conversation to have, um, around holding

these large employers accountable for the impact they have on our City. I think that a 2040 deadline is, is a, a little too far in the future for me. Um, but again, I, I think we, we just need to have a, a broader conversation about how exactly we address that, um, that issue in, uh, in our City going forward. So I'm in favor of keeping this in committee, and I look forward to hearing the Planning Boards, uh, thoughts and, and further the discussion. Thank you.

Dennis J. Carlone: Thank you, Councillor. Very succinct. Uh, Mayor, if you're still on, did you wish to speak briefly? I know you have to go to another meeting.

Sumbul Siddiqui: Yeah, sure. Thank you. Um, Mr. Chair, I only wanted to add, um, echo and underscore the points around, you know, we keep talking about this broader conversation. I think, you know, whether the CDD wants a motion from us, um, a Policy Order where we, we, we kind of can have that broader conversation is important. The last time we discussed this in August, late August, um, you know, there's these slides that have these important questions. You know, what aspects of development are most important to control and why? You know, there, there's, do these districts reflect the City's current goals? Should there be fewer or more resident district types? There are all these questions that CDD is asking us, and, you know, we, I think I'm not in a place to be able to answer those questions. I think, as the Vice Mayor said, if we can respond to some concepts, um, I think that would be the most, I think, fruitful conversation. Um, so, you know, I think we can talk offline about how do we get that in writing, that we want to have a next conversation because something needs to move forward to actually make it happen. Um, and sometimes they just, some, you know, that doesn't happen. And I don't, I think CDD has been talking about these concepts, but there's been no work on them. I think because they're looking for some direction for us, we're looking for direction for them. Um, so I'll, I'll, I'll just end there. That next steps, um, let's kind of figure out what we actually need to implement the next steps. Um, but that's all I had. Thank you.

Dennis J. Carlone: Uh...

Patricia M. Nolan: Chair, Chair Carlone, I have a point of information. If, if we're go about to lose Quin, uh, Councillor Zondervan and Mayor Siddiqui. Is that the quorum? And therefore we should vote right now to keep this in committee or what?

Dennis J. Carlone: No, I believe we'll still have a forum is four.

Mr. Clerk: Uh, two things through you, Mr. Chair. So, uh, first the quorum is five. Um, and, um, you don't need to vote to keep things in committee.

Patricia M. Nolan: Okay. Thank you. Because we'll lose a quorum at four, it looks like. So I just wanted to make that point. Thank you.

Dennis J. Carlone: What I'm wondering is, since people have brought up, uh, missing Middle, and we've discussed the AHA today Petition, perhaps we want to ask community development to objectively compare the two. You don't want that Councillor?

Patricia M. Nolan: Uh, I would just say we want, as the Vice Mayor said, we want, uh, not just those two petitions, but to bring forward the concepts in many of the petitions, including the fact that the Council itself asked for the single and two family only zone. So I wouldn't limit it to just to, to those, that's all.

Dennis J. Carlone: That, that's what I'm talking about since those are the two petitions that have been presented this year. And then we can evaluate if something else should be included or not included, since that seems to be the focus of many people's comments today, what do we really want? Uh, and, um, I was trying to get to it faster and ideally done by December, so we can talk about it more. Um, but if that's not an interest of the committee, that's fine with me too. We'll just drag it on again. Vice Mayor has a comment.

Alanna M. Mallon: I believe Ms. Farooq has her hand up, and...

Dennis J. Carlone: Thank you. I don't see it. I appreciate it. Ms. Farooq.

Iram Farooq: Thank you, Vice Mayor. Um, thank you, Chair. Um, I was just going to suggest that perhaps the committee could do what the Vice Mayor had originally suggested, which was to direct us to work with the Planning Board to come up with some viable concepts to accomplish the goals of, um, of eliminating single and two family zone Zoning, uh, and or single and two family only Zoning, uh, in a way that, uh, addresses the various, um, various other impediments that come along with that. And we can then, um, realistically, that discussion with Planning Board looking at their Agenda is not actually going to happen until January. So once we have that discussion, we can bring the concepts back to the Council, or to Ordinance Committee where, wherever desired. And then, um, and then this can proceed further.

Dennis J. Carlone: Um, I so move that the Council recommends that, and hopefully it'll be brought up tonight in the meeting. Since, I must say that when the MMH came up, uh, the Council suggest, uh, the Planning Board suggested that, and that was months ago. Uh, so I'm hoping this time it actually happens.

Mr. Clerk: Mr. Chair, I ask you restate the motion.

Dennis J. Carlone: Uh, I've been asked to restate the motion, uh, as the Vice Mayor propose that we move to ask the Planning Board to develop a proposal that reuses single and two family homes, uh, by increasing units, um, and addressing multiple issues and alternatives within that. Please suggest the different motion, both my committee as well as, uh, com- community development, if that is not sufficient.

Alanna M. Mallon: Oh, Councillor Carlone.

Dennis J. Carlone: Please, Vice Mayor.

Alanna M. Mallon: Thank you. Um, I, I think you're right on the money. I, what I would suggest is that we leave it a little bit more broad for the Planning Board to discuss concepts in models to present to the City Council to eliminate single family only Zoning for discussion and possible adoption or something. I, because

I think we, you know, we've got a couple of petitions here, there are other ideas out there. I would love for them to, you know, have that broader conversation within themselves with CDD and then present us with, here are some options that the City Council could consider.

Dennis J. Carlone: Okay. I, I just want to add, I agree. That's how we concluded the last Zoning Petition. And, um, and even the Planning Board said that that's what they should do. So, uh, let's hope this time it actually happens. Mr. Clerk, did you gather the Vice Mayor's wording?

Mr. Clerk: Uh, I may not have it exactly as it was stated, so I'm just going to read this back. Um, that the City Council hereby request that the Planning Board discuss concepts and principles to eliminate single family Zoning in the City of Cambridge. Is that, is that correct or am I, I'm not sure if I...

Dennis J. Carlone: I, I, I would further state, which I think the Vice Mayor alluded to, to further enhance City goals, or what are we aiming for?

Patricia M. Nolan: I also, I, I think it's single family and two family only zones. And it is to, for the Planning Board to work with CDD.

Dennis J. Carlone: I also, I, I think it's single family and two family only zones. And it is to, for the Planning Board to work with CDD.

Patricia M. Nolan: Chair Carlone, should I do that again? I had had my hand up, but I, I...

Dennis J. Carlone: I don't see that. Just no, I don't see that. Uh, no, we heard you.

Patricia M. Nolan: Okay, thank you.

Dennis J. Carlone: So What I currently have is City Council here. I request that the Planning Board work with community development to develop concepts and principles to eliminate single family and two family only zones in the City of Cambridge.

Alanna M. Mallon: Uh, Chair Carlone.

Dennis J. Carlone: Please.

Alanna M. Mallon: Uh, do we need to be explicit that we expect them to, to have time and space in their meeting to have this broader conversation?

Dennis J. Carlone: Well, I...

Alanna M. Mallon: To put it on their Agenda.

Dennis J. Carlone: I, I, I know they're busy, uh, extremely busy, which Ms. Farooq would almost certainly agree with. Um, Ms. Farooq, your response to the Vice Mayor's, uh, smart, uh, suggestion.

Iram Farooq: Um, thank you Chair. It's certainly, um, good to add. Uh, like I said, their, uh, schedule is programmed almost through the end of the year, so realistically, um, they will be able to get to this in January, but, uh, we will certainly, and they will certainly prioritize, uh, given a Council Order.

Marc C. McGovern: Mr. Chair.

Dennis J. Carlone: Please coach her.

Marc C. McGovern: Just a, a question, uh, to Ms. Farooq. Um, I sort of, I, I kind of thought that you'd be having that CDD and the Planning Board would be having these conversations, not at a regular Planning Board meeting that's going to have a full Agenda. And like, this seems more like a working meeting between the two, the two bodies, not Vice Mayor shaking her head. So maybe I got, maybe I got that wrong. So, um, uh, you know, would you, is is the plan that you would be hashing all of this out in all these details out in a public Planning Board meeting? Oh, all right. Well, yeah, luck, good luck with that.

Iram Farooq: It's, um, through the chair, it, the Planning Board is, uh, similarly a public body, uh, like the City Council. And so they are not able to have, uh, ex parte communications and, uh, we need to have the discussions with them in, in public. They are, um, I would say majority of Planning Board members are really interested in the, in the topic. And so, um, so would be very much interested in, in, um, being part of those discussions.

Marc C. McGovern: And, and I'm sorry, um, through you, Mr. Chair. And would that, do you think that that would happen at sort of a regular, regularly scheduled Planning Board meeting? Or, or would you call some kind of special meeting where this is the only thing on the Agenda, so that you have, I mean, I know the Planning Board, oftentimes they're meeting past midnight on a bunch of, on a bunch of things, and I just, yeah, you know, I want to make sure that you all have the time and the space and the opportunity to, this is going to take probably maybe more than one meeting. Um, so...

Iram Farooq: Uh, through the chair, this, uh, those are, those are wise observations, and I think, uh, that's the reason why the addition that the Vice Mayor proposed is actually a good thing to, to include as part of the Order. Um, and we would almost certainly try to schedule, um, a meeting that is devoted to the topic. Um, so it's not cluttered with other topics which we have done, uh, when we have really complicated issues for them to discuss. So, um, and you are also right that it could certainly take more than one, realistically, it would take more than one meeting to, um, to conclude, but, um, we'll get the conversation started as, uh, as early as we can in the new year and be able to, uh, with the intention of coming back to Council, um...

Dennis J. Carlone: Ex- excuse me, co-chair, Ms. Farooq, it seems to me that both Petition groups should be included in this, or at least as, uh, um, a reference, um, being available at these meetings to discuss their point of view. Not saying that

you would accept that, but as input, they've studied these, both groups have studied this, and it, it seems odd not to learn from that. Is that possible?

Iram Farooq: Um, thank you chair. Yeah. Um, well, the Planning Board has had extensive discussion on the, um, the...

Dennis J. Carlone: Missing Middle.

Iram Farooq: ...missing Middle Petition, and will be having a hearing on the Petition as well. Um, their meetings, um, as as I noted before, are all public. So any of the proponents of either of those, uh, petitions and more are, um, certainly welcome to, uh, to join the meetings. Whether the Planning Board wants in that context to, uh, really devote their time to, to digging into the issues, um, or whether they feel like it's valuable to take Public Comment, I think, um, is generally a topic that's up to the board because in, in a working meeting like this, there is not a requirement, there's not a legal requirement for a public hearing. And in those contexts it is up to the board's discretion, um, how they handle engaging other, um, members of the public.

Dennis J. Carlone: So, uh, we're running out of time. I, I...

Marc C. McGovern: Mr. Chair, real quick, do we have to ask officially for the report to be sent back to, to the committee? I know sometimes we get into that gray area if we don't ask for it. So maybe that should be part of the amendment as well?

Dennis J. Carlone: Yes. Uh, so we, we don't officially have a motion before, or do we have to amend what we have?

Mr. Clerk: So you have to amend. So currently what I have is, um, that the Planning Board work with the City, work with community development to develop concepts and principles to eliminate single family and two family only zones in the City of Cambridge. I would also suggest if you are asking for a report back, that that actually be, uh, that the City Council hereby request that the City Manager instruct the community development department to work with the Planning Board so that you'll get the, uh, report through the...

Dennis J. Carlone: And did we want to add a date?

Patricia M. Nolan: As soon as practicable. And can I also just add Chair Carlone one thing we also wanna build on the fact is the City Council itself also had a Council Order specifically on single and two family only zones before either of these petitions came forward. CDD, we had joint meetings of the housing committee and, and the neighborhood. And long-term planning CDD presented some info. I, I think that's part of the background to all this and should be obviously included as well. And again, so that we don't limit it to just the specific, um, of these two Zoning petitions, there were ideas presented and from a range of different places. And obviously I, I see assistant City Manager Farooq nodding her head, but, but those are part of the background and why it's important that we gather all the ideas from all the work that's done and build on it instead of just,

um, start anew. We've done a lot of work in preparing for it, both on the Council as well as in preparation, uh, for addressing these petitions.

Dennis J. Carlone: Okay. I move that we had, as, uh, Councillor Nolan said as soon as practical that we received the report.

Mr. Clerk: Got it. The motion currently reads that the City Manager being hereby is requested to instruct the community development department to work with the Planning Board to develop concepts and principles to eliminate single family and two family zone, two family only zones in the City of Cambridge. And to report back to the City Council as soon as practicable.

Dennis J. Carlone: All those in favor?

Mr. Clerk: Roll call. On, uh, that motion. Councillor Carlone, Vice Mayor Mallon?

Alanna M. Mallon: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Councillor McGovern?

Marc C. McGovern: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Councillor Nolan?

Patricia M. Nolan: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Councillor Simmons? Councillor Simmons? Absent. Councillor Sobrinho-Wheeler? Absent. Councillor Toomey? Absent. Councillor Zondervan?

Quinton Y. Zondervan: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Mayor Siddiqui? Mayor Siddiqui?

Sumbul Siddiqui: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Councillor Carlone?

Dennis J. Carlone: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Motion passes. Six in favor. Three absent.

Dennis J. Carlone: I also, I also wish to move that we recommend, uh, that we as the Ordinance Committee, we keep this in Committee for future meeting, uh...

Mr. Clerk: That doesn't need to be you just, you're just not going to move up.

Dennis J. Carlone: Oh, I'm told I don't even have to do that. So a move to adjourn.

Mr. Clerk: On that motion. Councillor, Vice Mayor Mallon?

Alanna M. Mallon: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Councillor McGovern?

Marc C. McGovern: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Councillor Nolan?

Patricia M. Nolan: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Councillor Simmons? Absent. Councillor Sobrinho-Wheeler? Absent. Councillor Toomey? Absent. Councillor Zondervan?

Quinton Y. Zondervan: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Mayor Siddiqui?

Sumbul Siddiqui: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Councillor Carlone?

Dennis J. Carlone: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Motion passes. Six in favor. Three absent.

Dennis J. Carlone: Thank you all for coming and, uh, and we look forward to feedback from the Planning Board tonight, as well as their report. Hopefully by January. Take care.

CERTIFICATION

I, Chloe Brown, a transcriber for Intellectix, 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 October 2024.

Chloe Brown

1. **ORDINANCE 2021-17: A Zoning Petition Has been received from Francis Donovan, regarding Advancing Housing Affordability (AHA) zoning petition.**
2. **A communication was received from Francis E. Donovan, 42 Irving Street, regarding the Advancing Housing Affordability (AHA) citizens petition**
3. **A communication was received from Francis Donovan and Suzanne Blier transmitting a presentation for the November 16, 2021 Ordinance Committee meeting**