



CITY OF SOMERVILLE, MASSACHUSETTS
MAYOR'S OFFICE OF STRATEGIC PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
JOSEPH A. CURTATONE
MAYOR

GEORGE J. PROAKIS
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

PLANNING DIVISION

STAFF

SARAH A. LEWIS, *DIRECTOR OF PLANNING*
DANIEL BARTMAN, *SENIOR PLANNER*
SARAH WHITE, *PLANNER / PRESERVATION PLANNER*
ALEX MELLO, *PLANNER*

MEMBERS

MICHAEL A. CAPUANO, *ESQ., CHAIR*
JOSEPH FAVALORO, *CLERK*
DOROTHY A. KELLY GAY
AMELIA ABOFF
GERARD AMARAL, *ALT*

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

City Council Chambers, 2nd Floor Somerville City Hall, 93 Highland Avenue
Wednesday, August 14, 2019
6:00 P.M.
Joe Favaloro absent.

Previously Continued to a Future Date:

346 Somerville Avenue (PB 2019-08)	
Applicant:	346 Somerville Avenue, LLC
Property Owner:	Palmac Realty Corp
Agent:	Richard G. DiGirolamo
Legal Notice:	Applicant, 346 Somerville Avenue, LLC, and Owner, Palmac Realty Corp, seek Special Permits and Special Permit with Site Plan Review (SPSR) to construct a 100-unit residential structure with inclusionary housing. SZO sections and articles including §4.4.1, §8.5, §7.11, Article 9, Article 13. CCD55 zone. Ward 2.
Date(s) of Hearing(s):	3/7, 4/4, 4/18, 5/2, 5/16, 6/6, 6/20, 7/11 (re-advertised), 8/8
Staff Recommendation:	None at this time.
PB Action:	Voted on August 8, 2019 to continue to August 22, 2019.
Current Status:	Voted on August 8, 2019 to continue to August 22, 2019.



57 Broadway: (PB 2018-08)	
Applicant:	Centrie Realty, LLC
Property Owner:	Centrie Realty, LLC
Agent:	Richard G. DiGirolamo
Legal Notice:	Applicant and Owner, Centrie Realty, LLC, seek Special Permits to alter a non-conforming property. The existing structure will be demolished and a new building with three residential units and ground floor retail will be constructed. Parking relief. Articles 4, 5, 7, 8, & 9 of the SZO. CCD45. Ward 1.
Date(s) of Hearing(s):	5/2, 5/16, 6/6, 6/20, 7/11 (re-advertised), 8/8
Staff Recommendation:	None at this time.
PB Action:	Voted on August 8, 2019 to continue to August 22, 2019.
Case Status:	Voted on August 8, 2019 to continue to August 22, 2019.

365 Somerville Avenue: (PB 2018-08):	
Applicant:	Nikhilsh Rao Goruknati
Property Owner:	Riggins Holdings, LLC
Agent:	N/A
Legal Notice:	Applicant, Nikhilsh Rao Goruknati, and Property Owner, Riggins Holdings, LLC, seek special permits to convert from a café use to dentist office. Parking relief under Article 9. CCD-55. Ward 2
Date(s) of Hearing(s):	7/11, 8/8
Staff Recommendation:	None at this time.
PB Action:	Voted on August 8, 2019 to continue to August 22, 2019.
Case Status:	Voted on August 8, 2019 to continue to August 22, 2019.

9 Sanborn Court (PB 2019-17)	
Applicant:	Sara Markey
Property Owner:	EJH Realty LLC c/o Edward Kepnes
Agent:	N/A
Legal Notice:	Applicant, Sara Markey, and Owner, EJH Realty LLC c/o Edward Kepnes, seeks a special permit under SZO §6.1.22.D.6 to conduct a portion of the business outdoors by installing a patio. CCD-55/Arts Overlay Zone. Ward 3.
Date(s) of Hearing(s):	8/8
Staff Recommendation:	None at this time.
PB Action:	Voted on August 8, 2019 to continue to August 22, 2019.
Case Status:	Voted on August 8, 2019 to continue to August 22, 2019.

<u>176-182 Broadway (PB 2017-22)</u>	
Applicant:	Yihe Patsy's Corporation
Property Owner:	Yihe Patsy's Corporation
Agent:	Richard G. DiGirolamo
Legal Notice:	Applicant and Owner, Yihe Patsy's Corporation, seeks a Special Permit with Site Plan Review (SPSR) to construct a 26-unit mixed-use building with commercial space along the street frontage and residences above. CCD-55 zone. Ward 1.
Date(s) of Hearing(s):	2018: 6/21, 8/23, 10/4, 11/8, 11/29, 12/13 2019: 1/9, 1/24, 2/7, 2/21, 3/7, 3/21, 4/4, 4/18, 5/2, 5/16, 6/6, 6/20, 7/11 (re-advertised), 8/8
Staff Recommendation:	None at this time.
PB Action:	Voted on August 8, 2019 to continue to September 5, 2019.
Current Status:	Voted on August 8, 2019 to continue to September 5, 2019.

Previously Opened Cases to be Heard:

<u>20 Prospect Street (PB 2019-06)</u>	
Applicant:	Union Square RELP Master Developer LLC
Property Owner:	The City of Somerville and the Somerville Redevelopment Authority
Agent:	N/A
Legal Notice:	Applicant, Union Square RELP Master Developer LLC and Owners, the City of Somerville and the Somerville Redevelopment Authority, seek Design & Site Plan Review under SZO §5.4 and SZO §6.8 to construct a general building and a Special Permit under SZO §6.8.10.A.4 to authorize a principal entrance for ground floor residential uses oriented toward a side lot line. TOD 100 underlying zoning district. Union Square Overlay District and High-Rise sub district. Ward 2.
Date(s) of Hearing(s):	6/20, 7/11 (re-advertised), 8/8, 8/14
Staff Recommendation:	Conditional approval
PB Action:	Special Permit was approved on July 11, 2019. Voted on August 8, 2019 to continue the Design and Site Plan Review portion to August 14, 2019.
Case Status:	The Board voted to continue the case to August 22, 2019.

<u>50 Prospect Street (PB 2019-07)</u>	
Applicant:	Union Square RELP Master Developer LLC
Property Owner:	The City of Somerville and the Somerville Redevelopment Authority
Agent:	N/A
Legal Notice:	Applicant, Union Square RELP Master Developer LLC and Owners, the City of Somerville and the Somerville Redevelopment Authority, seek Design & Site Plan Review under SZO §5.4 and SZO §6.8 to construct a mid-rise podium tower building and a Special Permit under SZO §6.8.10.A.5 to authorize a 5% increase to the dimensions permitted for the point tower of the building. TOD 100 underlying zoning district. Union Square Overlay District and High-Rise sub district. Ward 2.
Date(s) of Hearing(s):	6/20, 7/11 (re-advertised), 8/8, 8/14
Staff Recommendation:	Conditional approval
PB Action:	Special Permit was approved on July 11, 2019. Voted on August 8, 2019 to continue the Design and Site Plan Review portion to August 14, 2019.
Case Status:	The Board voted to continue the case to August 22, 2019.



Greg Karczewski, president, designated master developer
31 Union Square
Here to present new ideas for 2.2 (PB 2019-06) and 2.3 (PB 2019-07)
Team has worked closely with staff to address comments from staff, community, and board
Jonathan Fournier is here from HYA to walk through changes

JFournier
Quick recap of D2 site, SomerVision, move to where we are today
Response to community, board, and city staff, walk through design development for particular elements

Residential lobby
Feedback that entry needed to be made more distinguishable
Changes to framing storefronts more by adding spandrel panel above, moving louvers, response to city comments about how to frame storefronts
At entry itself, recessed panel to create more of a chamfer, augment size, add color to respond to residential above
Double door now, was single, landscape in general draws people in, focus people on entry

West façade (prospect street)
Adjust proportions to provide base middle top
Raised ground floor, added spandrels, adjusted window packaging to define the top
Subtle but more respectful of proportions

East façade at Milk alley
Previously was long elevation, long low massing, wanted to break down scale to convey two distinct buildings, be more friendly to neighbors
Will talk about distinct facades, clear building corners in D2.3 presentation
Previous massing was inflected, created break at hypothetical lot line, include return on D2.2 façade, recess D2.3 façade
Allows us to wrap façade all around sides of the building, previously residential and parking relationship was strange, now more distinct segmented elevation, clear massing break

MCapitano - where you are today, does that indent stay continuous for entire elevation
JFournier - it pops back out
MCapitano - so just a recess at corner, entire top portion is what I'm asking about
JFournier - top section of building is all recessed
MCapitano - just wanted to clarify, thank you

JFournier - end for D2.3

GKarczewski - in terms of organization, we do have presentation for 2.3, very related, allow Jonathan to continue through?

MCapitano - agree

JFournier - Good, presentation is set up to continue around with milk alley facades
Setback we were just talking about, recess 6 feet to have further activation of façade, allow outdoor space for residents, terraces, planter beds, better, friendly relation to neighborhood better activity
On façade 2.3 changed to relate more to tower
Previously windows packaged as with 2.2, too similar, so adjust to resolve in relation to tower
Aligned windows to emphasize vertical, make relate more to verticality of the tower
Called out podium element of the tower with subtle texture, added horizontal spandrels between windows and making texture that will contrast with flatter spandrels above, continue around bar building, create shadow to help define podium, relate to back building in subtle way
Changed colors of mid-rise portion to include more of red to relate to tower without taking away from the tower

Pedestrian scale

Height of tower too overwhelming with regard to someone walking by, break down to relate

Frame proportion of storefronts with spandrels and add continuous canopy at 10' high to relate to passersby, break in height

MCapuano - Small question on canopy – will that be slats or solid

JFournier - right now more a trellis

MCapuano – if people walk to and from T can give some cover from rain, seen in other cities where there is solid, glass to provide protection

JFournier - fair point

MCapuano - have more presentation on buildings themselves?

JFornier - done for buildings

MCapuano - thanks very much

What I want to do now is open testimony on buildings we just saw, be kind to sanity of person taking minutes, speak directly into microphone, little slowly, sign in sheet right below microphone, will limit testimony to two minutes, yellow means you have 30 seconds, red mans end of time, if speaking on group will give a little longer to speak for all

Open to those in favor

Jim McGinnis, 26 Bow Street - on behalf of Union Square Main Streets, reaffirm support, interest in seeing constructed in timely fashion, no specifics about design, but gets better each time we see it, in favor of benefits to local economy, move forward as soon as we can agree on specifics

Marc Russell, 30 Adams Street - like canopy, will be used by elderly and disabled, pass as soon as possible, need jobs, member of carpenter's union, like to see all union, get passed and get working, need jobs to feed families, hope affordable for neighborhood people

Julia Travaglini, 444 Somerville Ave - Greentown Labs, also resident, strong support for project, home to 100 early stage startups, employing more than 600 people right now, lot of companies and employees that come to Union Square every day to shop, go to restaurant, more housing in the area will be impactful esp. for when Green Line arrives, super supportive of project, want to see it move forward as soon as everyone agrees on next steps, happy to support work team has already done

Billy Declos, 86 Electric Ave - support development, think it's sensible, new GLX will support infrastructure of project, request union built project, only way to get by in a city getting more expensive, stipulate low income housing?

Scott Hayman, 337 Somerville Ave - SCC real estate director, involved in citizens advisory committee, locus, follow up, encourage that plans get better and better, but encourage that plans as presented be approved asap, very excited about affordable housing will be 90 units in D2.2/2.3, opportunities for another 60 in the city in cooperation with US2, important to see a commercial tax base established, planning gets better and better, US2 been nothing but cooperative, encourage you to approve at next meeting

Guy Rossnan, 53 Oak Street - walk every day down Prospect to catch bus to Sullivan, like that this is not superblock now, with local 26 hotel workers have agreement with developer to provide good jobs, in favor of project

Rich Antonellis, IBEW Local 103 Biz rep, represent over 100 residents and union members, overwhelmingly in support, provide good paying jobs with good benefits, good tax base, like to see this pushed through <applause from room>

Mary Cassesso, 2 Bigelow Street - managing trustee of Affordable Housing Trust Fund for Somerville, been volunteer for 30 years, also work at CHA aware of importance of housing for overall health of family, project of this magnitude is huge for city, 90 inclusionary units, not many opportunities to have this impact, losing people who can no longer afford to live in Somerville, moving further out, adding to social stress in their life making more challenging to have good health, support project, will be great opportunity, look forward to working with SCC to keep Somerville affordable, diverse

Tom Bent, Bent Electrical, signatory with local 103, been testifying in favor for a long time, every time with the work that PB has done project gets better, impressed with changes from last meeting, esp back wall, at point that we're there, great to see it move forward, last night at jobs training trust committee, looking to money from linkage fee to train Somerville residents, will have recommendation for training opportunities by end of the year, get funding from projects like these, all ties together, makes projects like these stand out in region



James Caffecky, 45 Thurston Street - brother firefighter, grandfather was crossing guard, lifelong resident, been over since 1918 on Thurston street, proud member of union, Somerville is great community, back the project 200% won't get any better labor quality work than from our union, professionalism can't be matched, will put members to work, residents to work, win-win, worked on the road 24.5 years, in biggest cities in the country, every time I come home to Somerville, this will put us on the map, not to that magnitude but will be recognized, important for all, win-win for all involved, like plans, state of the art and can't lose <applause from labor members in room>

Ryan Gale, 188 Powderhouse Blvd - Born and raised in Somerville, support project, with city growing, should push forward to create more housing, make sure that people can stay and live here, be proud of city as it changes, project should go through, member of local 103, 10k members to make sure we finish on time <applause from labor members in room>

Ryan Willard, 12 Miner Street - lived there whole life, mother still there, went to Somerville High, full support of project moving forward, like to see all union labor on project, better pay and benefits

Sam Quaratiello, 19 Gibbens Street - apprentice IBEW, full support

Danny LeBlanc, 337 Somerville Ave - CEO of SCC, here on behalf of SCC board, express strong support, board spent most of two meetings deliberating on particulars of this project, won't comment on design, do want to emphasize that this project will unlock the greatest amount of affordable housing of any single project since Cobble Hill, most that has resulted from this inclusionary housing ordinance which we were a strong advocate for, was part of Union United coalition that led to Union Square Neighborhood Council, understanding that there is an agreement in principle for Community Benefits Agreement, will be considered and voted on soon, strongly advocated and hope to see this and the project approved at same time, can all move forward <applause>

John Green, 6 Lakeview Ave (Reading), Local 103 - don't live in Somerville, but work here and feel strongly about this project, contactors need manpower for these large jobs, will call on union labor for that, for on time on budget, right the first time work, hope this goes through

Closed

Open to those in opposition/concern

Wig Zamore, 13 Highland Ave - mayor asked me to be head of Union Sq Citizens Advisory Committee, in position for a couple of years, in favor of development, in favor of US2, in favor of labor, and of affordable housing percentages, but against design of the low rise buildings, relevant what the circumference of them is, can't walk around any one of them even though designated as separate buildings, have to walk around all of them, consider that in deliberations, lack of underground parking has taken away "freedom" to plan this as great gateway to Green Line station, makes it a bad neighbor to Allen, Charlestown, Miriam streets, that residential district will have to be folded into high rise district that is being planned around it, will have 357 foot wall in back yard, disagree with 'it's good to have an alley in the middle of the block', the great open space of union should be in center of block where it's protected from traffic pollution, with better air and protected, terrific internal plaza like most of the plazas of the world which are not on busy streets where there is a lot of pollution and health effects

Can you remind us how long the written period for comment stays open

GProakis - at this point it is up to you

MCapuano - Don't believe we settled yet

GProakis - assuming as you said at the beginning that you aren't going to vote tonight, believe that at the end of this meeting you will have all you info you will get to make a voting decision, unless you seek follow up from us, set written comment between now and next Thursday to consider prior to meeting when Joe is back

MCapuano - usually set for Friday before meeting, makes sense to close at noon this Friday to get in for this board to review and consider

GProakis so Friday the 16th at noon

Paula Massoli, 47 Pearl Street - following closely, wanted to point out the comments in staff report in July and updated two days ago, specifically from the office of sustainability, pointing to two major aspects, parking garage in block doesn't have enough chargers for electric cars, electric vehicles said to increase number by 2030, city of Boston has set standards to require 100% ev chargers in new garages, this garage will be outdated very soon for meeting requirements for electrification of fleet that city has set

Building standard is LEED gold which is good but could be built as passive house, ask developer to reconsider energy consumption of the building, ask board to consider these comments from staff report



Closed, written will remain open till 16th at noon

D2.3

Open to those in favor

Stephen Mackey, Somerville Chamber of Commerce - long time supporter of revitalization of Union Square get in ground and start as soon as possible, construction and long term jobs, housing, will bring people with money that will get spent in square, tax base, will be 100s of thousands per week, sooner go forward, sooner we turn on tap for community

Rich Antonellis, IBEW Local 103 – overwhelmingly in favor, like to see it move forward

Danny LeBlanc, 337 Somerville Ave - won't repeat except to say that comments apply to both, entire residential package

Tom Bent, Bent Electrical - ditto, put on government affairs at chamber hat, lot of conversations with local businesses, very anxious to get started, with all infrastructure work is very difficult, affecting business quite a bit,

construction will help feed daytime economic activity, will be a boon for them, design changes will make better Scott Hayman, 337 Somerville Ave - apply comments from D2.2, started to work in Somerville 6 year ago when discussions were starting on D2 parcels, would hope to get started asap, before you know it there could be economic risks involved, downturn

Julia Travaglini, 444 Somerville Ave - Greentown Labs, reiterate comments from earlier, echo what Mr Makey said about economic impact, once we get this in the ground and get started will revolutionize neighborhood and city more broadly

Marc Russell, 30 Adams Street - want to get moving, really need affordable housing and jobs

James Caffeky, 45 Thurston Street - reiterate from before, once projects get going people will eat out at lunch and breaktime, support local businesses, seen projects like this stall getting started, only costs everyone more, sooner project gets going win-win for everybody

Sergio Rosa, 8 School St – resident, school street, local 103, support project

Jim McGinnis, 26 Bow Street - on behalf of Union Square Main Streets, lot of benefits, main reason we support is because of increase in daytime population and boost to local biz as well as more biz in Union Square, consider carefully design changes, much improved, turbulent econ times, longer we wait the more risk, be mindful of the times

Stephanie Jeffers - not resident, travel here from Revere, would be nice to work in Somerville rather than go all the way to Boston, support, nice to see It get started

Closed

Open to those in opposition/concern

Wig Zamore, 13 Highland Ave - remember that years ago when people were in favor of parking lots and big box stores at Assembly, I fought for dense, tall, transit oriented union built buildings, huge doubt that could be done in Somerville, went on to ask Partners to look at Somerville for emergency, office, commercial, telephone, headquarters, they consolidated from 13 or 14 locations across state to Assembly Square

Boston and Cambridge have greatest excess of jobs over housing in state, Cambridge has more than 6k excess jobs per mile relative to housing, those cities combined need housing for 800k more people, Somerville has greatest opposite imbalance in the commonwealth, greatest excess of residents, most leave the city during the day and don't visit our local shops and businesses, and we're short of balance by 5k jobs per sq mile, greatest imbalance in state, because of this we don't have tax base to support low and medium income residents, wealthy residents are fine, need balance here

Point out that right across tracks, lab and office buildings going up with underground parking garages that weren't required by anyone, is no water issue, we can do the same kind of mixed use with underground garages and preserve space in key blocks for open spaces and public enjoyment

Closed, written will remain open till 16th at noon

GProakis - point out to board that you should have updated staff report with updated dates, for both, highlighted language where there are changes

D2.2 on p17 added paragraphs to explain our take on some of changes, have worked on design to go through things addressed this evening, noting revised elevation changes

D2.3 similarly, paragraph explaining rear massing and revisions to front and tower to meet with definitions, etc.



Sum of all this was that staff recommended removal of conditions for concerns because those have been addressed in designs, conditions no longer necessary

Two paragraphs on bottom of 16 of D2.3 and 17 of D2.2 to address follow up discussion with office of sustainability, LEED gold required, staff proposed (request that came from board) to include conditions from d2.1 to make sure that building was certified in the future

Passive house not feasible for different standards to move from LEED gold to passive house, would break budget given previous standards and funding sources, use passive house for future buildings in this district, buildings as designed already exceed what is required in district by CDSP, provide more community benefits than anything required anywhere else in the city, above and beyond what we felt could be requested through site plan review process, appreciate analysis, will hold to everything in checklist of LEED gold, updates on reports cover that Can see other updates, mostly small, happy to address further questions

10-50 Prospect Street (PB 2019-05)	
Applicant:	Union Square RELP Master Developer LLC
Property Owner:	The City of Somerville and the Somerville Redevelopment Authority
Agent:	N/A
Legal Notice:	Applicant, Union Square RELP Master Developer LLC and Owners, the City of Somerville and the Somerville Redevelopment Authority, seek Design & Site Plan Review under SZO §5.4 and SZO §6.8 to construct a Plaza civic space type. TOD100 underlying zoning district. Union Square Overlay District and High-Rise sub district. Ward 2.
Date(s) of Hearing(s):	6/20, 7/11 (re-advertised), 8/8, 8/14
Staff Recommendation:	Conditional approval
PB Action:	Voted on August 8, 2019 to continue to August 14, 2019.
Case Status:	The Board voted to continue the case to August 22, 2019.

MCapuano – will have present on civic space next, then testimony, then we will have discussion so that people can get testimony in before board starts making its discussion

GProakis - would like civic space update to note before we get too far, tonight was posted later than normally would like, published last week, realized in follow up that there were conditions that were cut and paste from building staff reports that didn't belong in an open space staff report, have removed them from open space, as not relevant, condition 3 and 4 under legal, 2 under transportation, 1 and 2 under site features, conditions under architectural design and building resilience and replaced with 3 conditions under site features that site features that ensure Director of Public Space and Urban Forestry and Director of Mobility as appropriate will have chance to sign off on issues like ground cover, lighting, cycle track and bike racks, signage, details so that while plans today are pretty specific, in some cases they say "or similar" but we would want to see designs before anything goes in, will get this online today so that this could be giving the public a chance to comment, will get this online today as soon as discussed, if intention is to hold this open as well, will give public opportunity to comment on changes
 MCapuano – thanks, will have presentation on civic space now

GKarczewski - no new presentation, was fully presented last time, new info was solely in staff report, do have slides to reference as needed, at pleasure of the board,

MCapuano – presentation last time was fantastic and helpful, thanks for clarification, no new questions at this point
 Open to public testimony, presentation was still on website can look at if you like, review and add written testimony by noon on 16th

Open to those in favor

Rob Buchanan, 16 Wesley Park - speak in support of civic space in general, not had a chance to see conditions yet, sent comments with suggestions for ways to make improvements and tweaks, keep in mind as you review application, want to take a moment to comment on location of civic space, talked a lot about air quality concerns, sent additional comments yesterday, reiterate that we live in an urban environment and should demand real and



systemic solutions to vehicle emissions, should prioritize, source of emissions and pollution itself is fossil fuel vehicles, are everywhere in communities, if we want to have bang for buck in terms of improving air quality, should focus policy interventions there, have plazas and parks all over, trying to solve air quality concerns on a parcel specific basis won't be successful

Natasha Perez, 15 Sycamore - in support of civic space, opens up to community makes transport accessible, allow people to hang out, look at what Lechmere looks like have made this a part of community to make lively, not just passing through, spending money at businesses and spending time

Rich Antonellis, IBEW Local 103 – in support and would like to see approved

Read statement on behalf of Philip Parsons, 20 Bonner Ave - has been suggested that civic space adjacent to road creates danger to public health, disproportionate, lacks context and not supported by data. Tufts data looked at health issues for those living within 300 feet of I93 (7th most congested in US), not comparable to Prospect Street, traffic counts are 10 times Prospect, can't extrapolate data, small civic space will move people back from road, is buffered from road by plantings and a grade change, vast majority of civic spaces (as opposed to parks) are close to roads, separating civic from road would shut down most spaces in City and in Boston, city air not as good as country, but other public health metrics are better for cities, air quality has improved dramatically, premature mortality dropped by 60% recently

More in comment, submitted via email

Danny LeBlanc, 337 Somerville Ave - did have opportunity to hear full presentation, thorough and impressive, comment on behalf of SCC board, collaborating with Affordable Housing Trust on possible development on D2.4 and another site that could fit in well, think we have a design consistent with rest of open space design, would love to leave open possibility of something that could be developed, keep open as possibility, don't foreclose that

Jim McGinnis, 26 Bow Street - on behalf of Union Square Main Streets, civic is essential part of design, would love to see project proceed, has been progressively refined, increased in quality, speaking for self, looking forward to elevator for access to base of Prospect Street, like to see incorporated in plans in formal way

Closed

Open to those in opposition/concern

Paola Massoli, 47 Pearl Street - concern from previous meeting, Bennett court open to traffic is a terrible idea, if designated as pedestrian area should be closed to traffic, issue with safety, not safe at all would not want people to hang out with cars zipping by, can have ten years long conversation about cars and air quality, exposure to traffic, how many cars are bad, traffic is bad, we know that, minimal safe exposure is probably zero, understand that there are constraints, encourage people to think of where public spaces should go in the future which is not by traffic
Wig Zamore, 13 Highland Ave -

Besides Paola and I, no one here has measured traffic pollutants, no one spoken who has measured traffic pollutants, no one here knows very much about the physical connections between ultrafine particles from transportation and the immune system, inflammation and chronic disease, including neurological effects like autism spectrum disorder, accelerated Alzheimer's, cardiovascular disease, high blood pressure, accelerated mortality from cardiovascular disease, pulmonary disease, <garbled - speaking too close to microphone> has absolutely nothing to do with traffic ultrafine particles, people didn't distinguish at all in speaking about that, true that traffic volume helps drive higher pollution and traffic effects, but so do street canyons, because nowhere for air pollutants to escape, when we did research in Chinatown, lower volume streets are just as polluted as right next to i93, you're building a canyon in the middle of Union Square, we have measured literally billions of data points of air pollution in Somerville, not just along i93, also in Union Square, Art Farm with funding from City, much more polluted and much more dangerous of public health than clear air areas with no traffic a few blocks away, people keep confusing regional pollution like mp2.5 and ozone and local traffic pollution which has very significant pollutant effects

Closed

MCapitano - open for discussion, questions of all three applications of planning board, staff and applicant
Have many thoughts but I will let others go first

AAboff

Continue to have concerns about all three, fall into three categories: sustainability, design, and public participation (or lack thereof) from local elected officials



Sustainability: robust public comment about concerns of different kinds want to focus on building scale elements, site layout is accordance with CDSP, not as clear that they are exceeding CDSP standards, sets LEED gold as minimum, not max, leaves room for individual strategies to be evaluated as plans progress, don't feel that LEED gold is silver bullet, LEED is great standard, commercially accessible, around for many years, but there are things that are trivial that are given points, any sustainability efforts are good, but this plan gets points for good views, less light pollution, for an explanatory plaque for what a sustainable building is, 12 points for location but only 9 of 18 for energy performance, can have conversation with staff and sustainability director about whether passive house is applicable, but points provided here are 44, nationwide average for multifamily residential is 49, not demonstrating above and beyond performance, may be other parts are important to community, great to have points for bike racks, stormwater reuse, but part of our mandate is to look at other plans established by the city, Climate Forward is one of them, SomerVision 2030 and 2040, all set higher standards for environmental performance and energy use than we are getting here, may be different from what US2 is planning on, may slow process, but this building will be here for 150 years, should exceed our expectations for energy performance, welcome feedback and input

DKelly Gay - no expert on this area, but I hear issues especially around energy use, huge issue, won't get better, is getting worse, but do appreciate how far we've come, like that this is getting better, have accommodated facade changes, definite improvement, still have concern about plaza and pollution, talked to a lot of people about, not as concerned as I am, maybe because I am healthcare professional, been around watching people being outside, asking especially in union square, people prefer to be outside, that is something that I am trying to get into my mind, asked at restaurants, people will wait in order to eat outside, people choose not to think that is a problem, very hard to educate people, only thing I can think about is more greenery, move back more from road, saw some of that in last presentation, still more to be done, will have to look at sustainability more, brought issues that I was not aware of

MCapitano - similar concerns at updated staff report, raised eyebrow at office sustainability said that want applicant to do better, several paragraphs from director think it is feasible to meet standards not currently being met, sounds like our own director is asking us to do better, purview of this board to say that we expect them to do better, reach standard that is higher, and we think it is achievable that we can. Don't have expertise of Amelia, who I want to congratulate for achieving AICP certification, make that officially recognized, we're very proud of you. Do want to have discussion with staff to see what conditions we can place to meet expectations and aspirations of director, if feasible and can be accomplished, agree with Amelia that we don't want to be held to a good standard today that in 40 years will be substandard, particularly about electrical vehicle charging standards, if Boston is garage required to be 100%, we can do the same thing

GProakis - take a stab at where and how far can be done, starting concern is that what we have in front of us is site and design review, final step in permitting process that followed multistep planning process, with community benefits conversation that is unlike anything else in the city, to see that applicant is giving back as much they possibly could through negotiations with community above and beyond the ones they have with us. Not special permit, establishing compliance of a by right project issue of impact mitigation and compliance assurance, where there is impact on community from something they have done or they are out of compliance with our standards, that is where we look at condition

Courts on site plan review have take position that PB member on site plan review can only say no if there is a situation that is so intractable that no reasonable condition can address it,

MCapitano - this board was involved in such a case

GProakis - I remember that, this board was, have yet to see a court that has found that intractable standard, discussion about conditions is a good place to be, a no vote is not defensible position on site plan review, condition to impact compliance issue is a defensible piece, brings back to issue at hand

Two key questions:

Environmental standards - have not been a part of this, Sarah, Dan and Alex have, but not here today for variety of reasons, I have not been part of one on one discussions on conditions, but staff has come back in highlighted text don't feel it is feasible to hold them to different standards given construction costs and previous funding sources - jump to passive house standards and the way that project is financed combined with community benefits package agreement. If this group had not negotiated agreement that assured wages, affordable housing commitments on site, don't even know half of what they are still, if those pieces weren't there, might be more space in project to make



some of these changes, in and among the trade offs, maybe sustainability should have been part of this conversation earlier, have conversations about commitments to higher standards for buildings, can agree on future buildings, have agreed on gold standard

Think we should be predictable, make clear what expectations will be for future buildings before they go into design, difficult to change at this late date

Spaces and environmental issues - seen comments on all sides of this issue, interesting to consider if Prospect is the most difficult urban canyon in the city, used to get 13 - 14k cars a day, down to 11k cars since switch to two way, will pick back up but not anywhere near magnitude of other highways or thoroughfares, whether particulates get trapped is an interesting question, at this point, subdivision which places buildings is set, approved, filed, does improve size of plaza, average of 74 feet set back from street, up to 132 feet, substantial space, and will not have towers on other side, might potentially have five story, provide ability to hide transformer site but will not be creating a canyon in here that traps ultrafine particulate, other areas of the city where much more likely to happen, understand concern, relative to what we can do have done as much as we can, don't want to dive deep into science, magnitude of problem we are trying to solve with i93 I understand, far more perplexed about concern with this site, have made changes with the trees here, allow trees to grow bigger, faster in this space to provide substantial, lush space here, particularly as gets closer to T, has been strategy from beginning, that's where we are

MCapitano – thanks for explaining where we are on conditions, addressed some of my concerns, especially with holding to the applicant to particular standard, vote no if standard not met, informative and reasonable response to my concerns, I appreciate where applicant is compared to where they were, appreciate response to my concerns about layout of buildings, wish we could get underground parking, understand not feasible on this site, glad we had that meeting and presentation, neutral third party asked to justify, clear that answer was no, respect that, I respect the perspectives, have heard what vast majority of people in this room have said, appreciate what team has done, not going to vote tonight, but so long as tweaks that can be made, such as solid canopy, minor but can be managed, I am in support of applications right now, think presentation on open space from other day sold me more than I thought it would, was incredibly hesitant, now on board, particularly with addition of extra open space, as it stands right now, i think have addressed, by and large, issues we and neighborhood had under constraints that we as a board were able to put on you, I expect next week to be in support of applications

<applause from room>

Dorothy won't be here next week, Joe and Amelia will be, will have quorum, don't know if anyone else has any further comment, do want to address one more thing, don't move forward simply because "economy is about to go bad" not a motivator to me, not in general, not on this project, but with addition of lab building, this will continue to evolve that block, important to continue without delaying to be nitpicky, could always be slightly more perfect, but important now that we are mostly agreed, not the role of this board to hamstring project more than it needs to be, one of my reasons for wanting to move forward on this project, based on what provided, what feedback has provided that has been incorporated, should be able to move forward on these things

AAboff - do have some additional questions about façade design, echo that I appreciate significant changes being made to shape, way it approaches street, huge improvements that reflect responsiveness to concerns of board and community

Know that design review board did not weigh in on materials, would like more clarification, what is the color palette selected, materials in slides seem different than renderings, would like to understand better what will actually look like and understand community context, have image in my head of Mass College of Art residence hall, very afraid of this, don't think we are close to this but the more clarity on palette and whether appropriate for neighborhood we could get the better, as well as staff sign off on materials which I know will happen in due time

Before we vote, respecting Michael's take on this might be different, this project has no input from elected officials due to JT being an abutter and having recused himself, have variety of at large councilors, particularly as with rear abutters having opted not to participate in planning process, would be good, preferably in person, have some input from an at large councilor before we move forward, make sure that someone has been making sure community is adequately reflected

GProakis - would love to invite in person if they did not have meeting that night as well, happy to reach out

AAboff - shouldn't that make it easy for someone to pop over?



GProakis - where are we next week? VNA? If we were at the high school that would make it easy, tho we're at 6 and they are at 7, so I will reach out to at large and to Councilor Ewan Campen of Ward 3, know that this is a Ward 2 site but is on border with Ward 2, as local on the ground, has been more involved, have been interacting with us, upon decision here there will be a council vote following for a smaller piece of land to transfer to SRA, that will be last two votes to launch this project forward, know they will chime in there, happy to have them preview some of that here if I can get them to do so

AAboff - don't know status of neighborhood agreement, in broader scheme where trying to make decisions based on things in neighborhood agreement, would be good to have a final sense of whether we are greenlighted by them
MCapuanp – we can't incorporate that into our planning, understand if you want information on it

AAboff - I know, but to the extent that we care being told we can't push for better sustainability measures because those funds are being dedicated to community benefits agreement, would like to know that it is on track and meeting goals of community representatives, seems reasonable to me

GProakis - if pleasure of the board, can have representative speak to that

Michelle Hanson - on negotiating team also cochair on neighborhood council, have met with US2, have agreement we are close to, will have meeting on Tuesday in front of board then if goes well will have public meeting (at least one), then all members of Neighborhood Council will vote, if 2/3 vote to pass, that's where we stand with that
One comment, not sure, concerned with why you want to hear about this, don't know where we stand in the way of you being able to ask for more so would like clarification on that

AAboff - understand there's more regulation on what can and can't be shared than I was aware of so we can pick that up at a later time

Last point of question is that heard that we can't change the standard they are being held to, this may not be a path we want to pursue but we can raise for consideration, if we remove standard to achieve LEED gold and instead ask that they prioritize optimizing building's energy performance over things like local materials, or other standards less significant to the city's goals is there a moment to consider value engineering some of the less impactful measures and prioritize those more important to the city's goals and community comments

MCapuano – fair question to ask, like staff's opinion

GProakis – off the cuff don't know but happy to sit with planning division staff and project team and see if there's a way to make sure that as we look at the strategy of LEED that we prioritizing things more about long term energy efficiency and less about some other standards, if that is where the board's priorities lie, see what we can do on that front

MCapuano - think you can get response before next meeting

GProakis - should be possible, want to give you all you need to vote for next Thursday, that is goal

AAboff - input from sustainably director would be valuable on that

DKelly Gay - apologize that I won't be here next week, was known with staff, have asked a lot of questions about civic space, has been a worry for me, don't feel that I could hold up project because of that, on some other issues I've criticized the buildings on you have come through and done great job, especially changing entrance was a big plus, disappointed we don't have underground parking, but I also remember years ago when we had the flood in union square, when miller's river resurfaced and should be mindful of that with underground parking, will be looking at it for future projects, will be expecting higher sustainability standards for future buildings, wasn't as aware as when I read the sustainably report, was an eye opener, not as educated on that as Amelia, do wish you all the best next time, had I been there I would be voting in favor

MCapuano - on request for underground parking for future buildings, with discussions we've had on that, not holding applicant on it now

DKelly Gay - I have it in writing that there will be commitments on future buildings, one that Greg sent us

MCapuano - that concern will be addressed in future developments in union square

If no further discussion from the Planning Board tonight

Other Business

Approval of Minutes:

June 13, 2019 - Voted on August 8, 2019 to continue to August 22, 2019.

July 11, 2019 - Voted on August 8, 2019 to continue to August 22, 2019.

NOTICE: While reasonable efforts have been made to assure the accuracy of the data provided in these minutes, do not rely on this information as the complete and accurate portrayal of the events in the meeting without first checking with the Planning Division staff. If any discrepancies exist, the decisions filed by the Board serve as the relevant record for each case. The Planning Division also maintains audio recordings of most Board meetings that are available upon request.