CITY OF CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

PLANNING BOARD

CITY HALL ANNEX, 57 INMAN STREET, CAMBRIDGE 02139

PUD FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN DECISION

DEPOSITION EXHIBIT
Barber 2
3-13-90

CASE NO.: PB-1

PETITION: Special Permit for Planned Unit Development

PROJECT: Riverfront Office Park

APPLICANT: Riverfront Office Park Associates, a joint venture of George Macomber, Darvel Realty Trust and a group of principals of the Codman Company, Inc.

DISTRICT: PUD-3

DEVELOPMENT PARCEL LOCATION: 67-111 Main Street

OWNER: Darvel Realty Trust, Cambridge Electric Light Company, Commonwealth Gas Company

APPLICATION DATE: June 5, 1979

FIRST PUBLIC HEARING: July 10, 1979

DATE OF PLANNING BOARD DETERMINATION: July 24, 1979

DATE OF FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN SUBMISSION: September 7, 1979

SECOND PUBLIC HEARING: September 17, 1979

DATE OF PLANNING BOARD DECISION: September 25, 1979

THE HEARING

At the public hearing Chuck Redmond, architect for the development team, explained project modifications made in response to the Board's conditional approval of the development proposal. These changes include a bicycle storage area, additional landscaping of the phase one parking lot and the Main Street edge of the project, and reduction in the size of 20% of the parking spaces. No statements in support of or in opposition to the PUD permit application were made at the hearing. Subsequent to the hearing, the Board received a letter from Robert Rowland, Executive Director of the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority. Mr. Rowland cited potential traffic hazards caused by left turns into and out of driveways along the east side of Third Street following full development of the Kendall Square and Riverfront projects. He indicated that the scheduled construction of a raised median island on Third Street will preclude such turning movements. He recommended that the Riverfront Office Park traffic plan be amended to reflect this change. The Board also received a letter from

George Teso, Traffic Director, approving the access/egress arrangements shown in the Final Development Plan but reiterating the eventuality of the Third Street median.

FINDINGS

1. The applicant filed a PUD Development Proposal in accordance with the requirements of Section 12.30 of the Zoning Ordinance. The Planning Board conditionally approved this proposal on July 24, 1979.

2. At that time, the Board determined that the overall development concept of both phases of the project was acceptable. The Board further determined that certain design details of both phases of the project required modification but that it would only require and consider such modifications in Phase I at this time.

3. A Final Development Plan for this project containing all of the required modifications and additional information has been submitted to the Board.

4. The Final Development Plan for the Riverfront Office Park conforms to the general development controls set forth in Section 12.50 of the Ordinance.

5. The Final Development Plan conforms to the specific development controls established for the PUD-3 District in Section 12.90 of the Zoning Ordinance.

6. Formal policy plans or development guidelines have not been specifically established for this development parcel. However, the proposed development is consistent with current city plans and programmed improvements for both the East Cambridge Riverfront and Kendall Square areas. The proposal is compatible with development guidelines established for nearby areas in the East Cambridge Riverfront Plan.

7. Riverfront Office Park is expected to provide benefits to the city which will outweigh any adverse effects that development at this location might create.

   a) The plan indicates a high quality of site design on a difficult parcel. Notable features include provisions for pedestrian linkages between the riverfront and Kendall Square, utilization of the Broad Canal as a pedestrian amenity, ground floor retail space, and stepping back taller elements of the project away from the river.

   b) This project will increase traffic volumes in the vicinity of the development parcel. Phase I of the project can function as designed without causing substantial degradation of traffic flow and safety. Potential traffic problems may be reduced through the provision of bicycle parking facilities. Some access details for the second phase of the project remain to be worked out. These will be resolved during the detailed site plan review for that phase. Scheduled roadway improvements in the Kendall Square area are expected to mitigate any adverse traffic impacts at full development of the area. Details of these changes have been discussed during several joint meetings of the development team and their traffic consultant, the Department of Traffic and Parking and the Community Development Department transportation staff.

   c) Utilities and other public works in the area are adequate to serve this project at full development.

   d) Riverfront Office Park is expected to have a negligible impact on existing public facilities within the city. Roadway reconstruction necessary to accommodate large scale development in the Kendall Square area will be undertaken regardless of whether or not this project is built.

e) This development will have a positive fiscal impact on the city. Under current tax policy, Phase I alone would generate about $850,000 in taxes annually. New office space in Cambridge has a revenue to cost ratio of over 4:1.

DECISION

Based on these findings, the Planning Board hereby approves the application for a Special Permit to construct a Planned Unit Development in accordance with the Final Development Plan submitted on September 7, 1979. This approval is granted subject to the following stipulations and conditions:

1. Phase I of the project is approved in its entirety: development program, design concept and design details.

2. Working drawings for Phase I shall be submitted to the Community Development Department at the 90% completion stage in order to determine compliance with the Final Development Plan. The Community Development Department shall review the drawings and certify their compliance or non-compliance within three working days. If the Department does not reply within said period the drawings shall be deemed to comply with the plan.

3. Phase II of the project is approved in terms of its development program and design concept. Prior to initiation of the second phase, the applicant shall submit to the Planning Board a detailed site plan of the second phase of the project including Main Street and Broad Canal sections. Floor plans of the parking garage shall also be submitted. Building permits for the second phase shall not be issued until the Board certifies that the detailed design is reasonably consistent with the Final Development Plan or until 30 days elapse from the submittal date without such certification.

4. Gross floor area, as defined in Article 2.000 of the Zoning Ordinance, shall not exceed 598,338 at full development. Changes in the gross floor area of the office or parking elements of the project in excess of ten percent of the figures provided on page 18 of the Final Development Plan shall constitute a major amendment under the terms of Section 12.37. Reduction in the gross floor area reserved for retail uses below 5000 square feet in Phase I or below 12,500 square feet in Phase II (17,500 s.f. total) shall be considered a major amendment. Permanent barriers to pedestrian travel along the edge of the Broad Canal or reduction in the width of the proposed path to less than 10 feet shall be considered major amendments.

5. Bicycle parking area shall not be counted in determining gross floor area.

6. At least 130 parking spaces shall be provided off-site within 1000 feet of the development parcel during construction of the second phase. Documentation of these arrangements shall be provided to the Board at the time that the Phase II design details are submitted.

RECEIVED BY
OFFICE OF CITY CLERK
JUL 31 11 24 AM '79
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

CITY OF CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS
PLANNING BOARD
CITY HALL ANNEX, 57 INMAN STREET, CAMBRIDGE 02139

PUD DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL DETERMINATION

CASE NO. PB-1

PETITION: Special Permit for a Planned Unit Development

PROJECT: Riverfront Office Park

APPLICANT: Riverfront Office Park Associates, a joint venture of George Macomber, Darvel Realty Trust and a group of principals of The Codman Company, Inc.

DISTRICT: PUD-3

DEVELOPMENT PARCEL LOCATION: 67-111 Main Street

APPLICATION DATE: June 5, 1979

FIRST PUBLIC HEARING: July 10, 1979

DATE OF PLANNING BOARD DETERMINATION: July 24, 1979

FINDINGS

1. At the public hearing Larry Bianchi, representing the applicant, and representatives of Cambridge Seven Associates, Inc., architects for the applicant, summarized the Development Proposal. The project would contain two office towers, a horizontal parking garage, and a ground floor retail arcade. It would be developed in two phases, with the taller of the two towers (containing retail on the ground floor, 3 levels of parking and 14 floors of office space) and a surface parking lot being constructed during the first phase.

2. Three persons attending the hearing asked questions about the proposal. Robert LaTremouille, 67 Highland Avenue, Cambridge and Herbert Jacobs, representing the Electronics Corporation of America, asked questions concerning access to and egress from the project and about traffic patterns in that part of Cambridge. These questions were addressed by Norman A. Abend, traffic consultant for the applicant. Arthur Obermeyer, a trustee of Technology Realty Trust, owners of the abutting Moleculon building, expressed concern about the possible impacts of the proposed construction on their building and asked that safeguards be provided to prevent damage to the structure. His concerns were addressed by George Macomber of the development team and Jack Joseph, one of the architects.

3. The Planning Board has received no other testimony concerning the Development Proposal.

4. The potential problems of access and egress to the parcel which were of concern to the Board at the pre-application conference have been dealt with adequately in the Development Proposal.

5. The Planning Board is apprehensive about the extent to which the proposal encourages automobile useage. The Ordinance's parking requirements would be exceeded by nearly 200 spaces. This location is well served by public transportation. Furthermore, we are now at a point in history when the long-term trend of ever-increasing automobile travel may be reversing.

6. The Board is also concerned with the nature of the Main Street edge of the project since this site is located along one of the major approaches to the City from Boston. It is not clear that there is sufficient room to permit a reasonable amount of landscaping along the front edge of the project. The developer should provide and maintain landscaping of the Main Street sidewalk area.

7. The design of the surface parking lot is critical to the image the project and of the entrance to the City. Though this is intended as a temporary lot, it may have a longer lifetime than now contemplated. The landscaping information provided in the Development Proposal is insufficient.

8. The project should be designed to permit smooth and comfortable pedestrian travel between the Riverfront and Kendall Square along the Broad Canal in the future. The first phase development should not create barriers that will be difficult to remove when such travel patterns develop.

9. Several aspects of Phase II of the project are troublesome, among them the additional parking spaces, the service entrance on Main Street, the size and nature of the pedestrian pathway along the Broad Canal and the uncertain timing of that phase of development. The Development Proposal as submitted contains less detailed information about the second phase of the project than about the first phase. The Board does not feel that it is now appropriate to attach conditions on the second phase of the project or to request additional details at this time since conditions existing in two or three years may dictate other changes.

10. It appears likely that the proposed development will satisfy all of the criteria of Section 12.353 of the Ordinance, provided that the modifications requested by the Board in this report are made.

Based on the information which the Board has received in the Development Proposal this project is expected

a) to conform with general development controls;

b) to conform with development controls for the PUD-3 district;

c) to conform with current City plans and development guidelines for East Cambridge; and

d) to provide benefits to the City which will outweigh adverse effects.

(i) Some site design adjustments must be made as specified below.

(ii) Potential traffic flow and safety problems will be alleviated by the proposed access/egress arrangements and by the programmed public roadway improvements.

(iii) Utilities and other public works are adequate.

(iv) Negligible impact on existing public facilities is expected.

(v) Positive fiscal impact is anticipated (Revenue:cost ratio will be approximately 6:1).

The Board will make a final evaluation of compliance with these criteria prior to approving a Final Development Plan for this project.

DETERMINATION

The Planning Board conditionally approves the Development Proposal as it pertains to the first phase of the Riverfront Office Park. The Board conditionally approves the second phase of the project at a programmatic/schematic level only. Final issuance of a special permit for this planned unit development will authorize the eventual development of a second office tower containing approximately 260,000 square feet of office, retail and mechanical service space and a parking structure of sufficient size to serve the completed project. However, the Board intends to require Planning Board review and approval of the second phase site plan, including access/egress and service arrangements and landscaping details, at a later date prior to the issuance of any building permits. The scope of this later submittal and the procedure for future site plan review and approval will be specified in the Planning Board's decision on the Final Development Plan.

The applicant is invited to submit a Final Development Plan containing more detailed information concerning the first phase of the Riverfront Office Park project. This plan shall be submitted no later than September 7, 1979. The Final Development Plan shall contain the modifications listed below.

REQUIRED MODIFICATIONS

1. Elaborations and modifications of the Development Proposal requested herein should be made for all aspects of the project intended to be constructed during the first phase. The Planning Board will not consider site plan details of the second phase at this time.

2. The Plan should include a detailed landscaping plan showing type, size and location of proposed plantings for all portions of the development parcel and for the area between the front edge of the development parcel and the Main Street curb.

3. The Plan should provide enough room for installing and maintaining a reasonable amount of landscaping along the Main Street frontage. While this could be accomplished by setting the building back from the street a few feet, the Board is not requiring that such a setback be provided. At a minimum, the applicant should provide drawings (plan and typical cross section) of the Main Street edge showing the relationship of curb, sidewalk, right-of-way boundary building edge, arcade edge, trees and other plantings and utilities and should indicate commitment to maintain the plantings.

4. The initial building should include space to provide sheltered, secure bike storage areas sufficient to accommodate at least 150 bicycles.

5. At least 20% of the parking spaces in the building and in the parking lot should be reduced in size to 7½' x 15' to accommodate compact cars only. The Board suggests that the front row of the lot be designated for compact spaces. The area of the lot leftover after this reduction should be landscaped.

6. Two parking spaces should be removed from each of the four long rows in the lot and the area used to provide a landscaped buffer between each group of eight spaces. A hedge, low fence or similar landscaped feature should be included in the landscaping plan to soften the front edge of the lot.

7. The Plan should include information concerning Conservation Commission review and the status of other necessary reviews by agencies with jurisdiction over the Broad Canal.

8. The Plan should provide detailed written and graphic information showing proposed facilities for bicycle users.

9. The Plan should include drawings showing the interior layout of the garage and the vertical and horizontal relationships of the garage ramp to the pedestrian walkway along the Canal.

10. Explain the proposed arrangements to prevent damage to the Moleculon Building during construction.

11. Correct area calculations on drawing A-7 and height threshold statements on page 20 of the Development Proposal.

12. Explain anticipated design features intended to conserve energy.

13. Revise Development Proposal statements, as appropriate to reflect any currently contemplated changes or new information relative to this project and to incorporate conditions or modifications required by the Planning Board.

This determination of CONDITIONAL APPROVAL under Section 12.352 of the Ordinance has been made by a majority vote of the Planning Board on July 24, 1979.

Arthur C. Parris

Arthur C. Parris
Chairman

ATTEST: A true and correct copy of decision filed with the offices of the City Clerk on July 31, 1979 by Mary T. Flynn, Authorized Representative of the Cambridge Planning Board.

CITY OF CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

PLANNING BOARD

CITY HALL ANNEX, 57 INMAN STREET, CAMBRIDGE

DEPOSITION EXHIBIT
Barber-4
3-13-90

In reference to the application of RIVERFRONT OFFICE PARK ASSOCIATES, a joint venture of George Macomber, Darvel Realty Trust and a group of principals of the Codman Company, Inc., for a Special Permit to allow a Planned Unit Development on premises located on 67-111 MAIN STREET, CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS, the Planning Board has APPROVED the application in accordance with the Final Development Plan submitted on September 7, 1979 and subject to the following stipulations and conditions:

1. Phase I of the project is approved in its entirety: development program, design concept and design details.

2. Working drawings for Phase I shall be submitted to the Community Development Department at the 90% completion stage in order to determine compliance with the Final Development Plan.

3. Phase II of the project is approved in terms of its development program and design concept. Prior to initiation of the second phase, the applicant shall submit to the Planning Board a detailed site plan of the second phase of the project including Main Street and Broad Canal sections.

4. Gross floor area, as defined in Article 2.000 of the Zoning Ordinance, shall not exceed 598,338 at full development. Changes in the gross floor area of the office or parking elements of the project in excess of ten percent of the figures provided on page 18 of the Final Development Plan shall constitute a major amendment under the terms of Section 12.37. Reduction in the gross floor area reserved for retail uses below 5000 square feet in Phase I or below 12,500 square feet in Phase II (17,500 s.f. total) shall be considered a major amendment. Permanent barriers to pedestrian travel along the edge of the Broad Canal or reduction in the width of the proposed path to less than ten feet shall be considered major amendments.

5. The bicycle parking area shall not be counted in determining gross floor area.

6. At least 130 parking spaces shall be provided off-site within 1000 feet of the development parcel during construction of the second phase. Documentation of these arrangements shall be provided to the Board at the time that the Phase II design details are submitted.

A copy of this decision has been filed with the office of the City Clerk, this date. Appeals, if any, shall be made pursuant to Section 17, Chapter 40A, Massachusetts General Laws and shall be filed within twenty days after the date of filing of such notice in the office of the City Clerk.

Authorized Representative,
Cambridge Planning Board

Case No. PB-1

CITY OF CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

PLANNING BOARD

CITY HALL ANNEX, 57 INMAN STREET, CAMBRIDGE 02139

DEPOSITION EXHIBIT
Barber-3
3-13-90 ewo

MINOR REVISIONS

CASE NO.: PB #1

PREMISES: 67-111 Main Street

ZONING DISTRICT: O-3A/PUD-3

PETITIONER: Riverfront Office Park Associates, a joint venture of George Macomber, Darvel Realty Trust and a group of principals of the Codman Company, Inc.

MINOR REVISIONS SUBMITTED: February 1, 1983

PLANNING BOARD APPROVAL OF MINOR REVISIONS: February 1, 1983

Petition

The petitioner requests approval for minor revisions to their approved special permit authorized by the Planning Board on September 25, 1979. The proposed modification would delete a portion of a pedestrian walkway and guardrail running along the edge of the Broad Canal between Third Street and First Street (refer to drawings SKA.99, 100 and 101 by Cambridge Seven Associates, Inc.). This modification would be temporary. The petitioner proposes to construct the walkway and guardrail as part of Phase II development. In the interim, the existing 6'-0" high chain link fence would be retained as protection from the canal edge.

The Final Development Plan Decision, dated September 25, 1979, contained the condition that "Permanent barriers to pedestrian travel along the edge of the Broad Canal or reduction in the width of the proposed path to less than 10 feet shall be considered major amendments."

The Planning Board at its regular meeting on February 1, 1983 approved the proposed modification as a temporary minor revision with the following condition:

The pedestrian walkway and guardrail as approved in the Final Development Plan Decision, September 25, 1979, shall be constructed during Phase II of the development project. If Phase II construction has not commenced by May 1, 1984, the applicant shall on that date

commence construction of the approved pedestrian walkway and guardrail. The Planning Board may extend this commencement date by one year upon findings that particular circumstances of this development warrant a second extension.

Respectfully submitted,

For the Planning Board

Arthur C. Parris

Arthur C. Parris
Chairman

This APPROVAL of the application for a PUD Special Permit, under Section 12.364 of the Zoning Ordinance, has been made by a unanimous vote of five members of the Planning Board on September 25, 1979.

For the Planning Board

Arthur C. Parris
Chairman

ATTEST: A true and correct copy of the decision filed with the offices of the City Clerk on 1979 by
authorized representative of the Cambridge Planning Board.

Twenty days have elapsed since the date of filing of this decision.
No appeal has been filed _____
Appeal has been filed and dismissed or denied_____

Date:_____ _____
City Clerk, City of Cambridge