

**Bishop Petition:
Rolls Back February 2000
30% Density Increase
of Special District 2
to Conform with
“The 1998 Planning Board
Petition”**

Unintended Consequences

“17.22 Purpose. It is the intent of this Special District 2 to encourage the establishment of residential uses in the district in a form and density compatible with the adjacent residential neighborhood. ... “

- for large lots, Special District 2 is double the density of Residence B
 - 30% Affordable bonus
 - 30% density increase at the council vote

“to Res-B or not to Res-B”

- Special District 2 is
 - embedded in Residence B
 - surrounds The Linear Park
- streets from 1890 not designed even for current conditions
- Life is **not** less crowded than 10 years ago
 - time for review
- detached Single Family homes command premium in Cambridge
 - 100 apartments at \$500,000 each
 - 50 homes at \$1,000,000 each

Fawcett Example

- Residence B
 - 48 units
 - 69,000 SF
- Bishop Petition = 1998 Planning Board
 - 77 units
 - 96,000 SF
- Current Zoning
 - 104 units
 - 124,000 SF

Density Roll Back Results

- Emerson
 - no change because Variances required
- Cambridge Lumber
 - Still 27 units allowed
 - 34,500 SF from 45,000 SF
 - Validated by Planning Board
 - approved last week 34,313 SF and 20 units
- Fawcett
 - 77 from 104 units
 - 96,000 SF from 124,000 SF

Our Alternate Vision

- Protect people, neighborhood, the park
 - 30% smaller
 - Ownership
 - Stability
 - Residents will “buy in”
 - Financially
 - Emotionally
 - model is “Lofts at Brookford Street”
- Why are we so special?
 - Our geography is unique
 - Many have lived here 50 – 70 years
 - nobody lived at Faces or Northpoint

We Will Ask For Your Vote

- protect us, the residents -- SAFETY
 - workman's streets from 1890
 - narrow, not for cars
 - dangerous dog-legs
 - street grids truncated
- protect the neighborhood
 - Residence B, two family homes
 - A community
- protect Linear Park-Minuteman Bikeway
- it's the law: zoning to be uniform
- traffic is already impossible in places
 - parking is right behind

Residents?

- 671 Whittemore Triangle to Cedar St
- 922 North of Dudley
- 2,074 South of Dudley + across Mass Ave
- Almost 3,700 people
- Abutters of Presumed Standing
 - 384 for Special District 2
 - 275 for Fawcett Oil
- Ward 11 Precinct 3 highest voter turn out

State law requires “Uniformity”

- Residence B nominally
 - Two family
 - 0.35 FAR for large lots
 - 0.5 FAR for minimum size lot
 - 35’ high
- Special District 2
 - Multi Family
 - 0.84 FAR after 30% Affordable bonus
 - 40’ high

Part 1: Delete Commercial

Delete 17.23.2 entirely

A₁₀

Part 1A: leave Art behind

Delete 17.23.21 (a) and (c) as shown:

17.23.21 The following nonresidential uses, not otherwise permitted in a Residence B District, shall be permitted as of right, in this Special District 2 provided the conditions set forth in Section 17.23.22 are met. Nevertheless, for purposes of the Zoning Ordinance, Special District 2 shall be considered a residential district.

Section 4.35 - Retail Business and Consumer Service Establishments, Paragraph q (arts & crafts studio)

Part 2: density

Change all occurrences of 0.65 and 0.75 in Sections 17.24.1 (1) and (3) to 0.50

Change "one thousand and eight hundred (1,800)" in Section 17.24.2 (1) to "two thousand and five hundred (2,500)"

Change "0.65" and "one thousand and two hundred (1,200)" in Section 17.24.2(3) to "0.50" and "one thousand and eight hundred (1,800)", respectively

Add the following to the end of Section 17.24.3(3):

"However, any portion of a building located fifty (50) feet or less from the boundary of any other zoning district with a maximum building height of thirty-five (35) feet or less or from the sideline of a street shall have a maximum height of thirty-five (35) feet."

Part 3: Protect Our Park

Add new

"Section 17.25 Protection of The Linear Park Open Space":

Any fences within the building setback of the Linear Park Open Space will be such that sight lines are minimally obstructed. Examples of conforming fences are wrought iron, wire, or chain link. Examples of non-conforming fences are board, stockade, or concrete walls.

Status: New & Approved Cambridge Lumber Plans

- Planning Board was right 10 years ago
- Reduced from 29 to 20 units
- Gross Floor Area reduced to conform with
 - “The Planning Board Petition”
 - “The Bishop Petition”
- Park “interface” still a work in progress ...
- Emerson Project status: unknown!
 - Likely needs variances

Status: Fawcett

- First copy of plan to neighbors August 31
- No traffic plan dialog
 - Traffic Study not disclosed
 - will not connect Edmunds Street with
 - Cottage Park or Tyler Court
 - No plan for Health Clinic parking
- No mitigation
 - No sale of community garden to the city
 - Force access to Brookford Street (?)
- Two 52 Unit Buildings fit in neighborhood?

Edmunds & Cottage Park: SAFETY

- Very Narrow
 - Cottage Park 26' wide at Mass Ave
 - 6.42 of Zoning Ordinance
 - 8.5' width of standard parking space
 - Edmunds is narrower!
- “Dog Leg”
- Tyler Court makes three Dead Ends
 - a Dead End must be a two way street

Bill Fox

Cottage Park Ave since 1955

the city has to do something with the street to bring new traffic in and out. You can't just build ... an island without a road to it. That's the problem The street's not big enough to handle even with the residential traffic.

Remains a street from The Past

- Still only 6 houses, mostly from 1887
 - 11 units total
 - 16 units (?) Emerson development
 - 52 units Fawcett development
 - 79 units to be serviced by Cottage Park
- Dangerous:
 - Bill Fox: two pets killed, one recent
 - most residents have seen near “head-on”
- Today’s traffic from Fawcett
 - Dance studio
 - Office space rentals

It's not all about you ... it's about all of you !

- Brookford St closed by court order
- Edmunds St blind to inbound traffic
 - Also Dunkin' Donuts driveway
- Tyler Court
 - it's just a driveway at Mass Ave
 - really not wide enough for two cars
 - Very blind at sidewalk
 - 2456 Mass Ave Special Permit
 - Built on lot line

1890	Brookford Street & Cottage Park Ave subdivision
1924	first Cambridge Zoning Ordinance
1930	Metropolitan Ice, Oil, & Coal warehouse blocking Brookford Street
1964	MBTA to create regional public transportation - very "smart"
1967	City sells Whittemore Ave stub to Metropolitan Ice to greenhouse guy
1969	Fawcett buys "Metropolitan Ice, Oil, & Coal"
~ 1970	Red Line extension to Alewife announced
1970	Fox daughter close call with Fawcett truck; her dog is killed
1970	Fawcett grandfather verbal agreement to use alternate truck access: Tyler, Whittemore, rail line right-of-way considered
1972	City takes land & extends Tyler Court for Fawcett Oil
1974	"Railbanking" for The Minuteman Bikeway proposed
1976	Fawcett buys 25 Edmunds Street & acquires more access

1977	last passenger train
1979	former Metropolitan Ice, Oil, & Coal warehouse burns to the ground
1981	last freight train
1983	Fawcett sues City to open Brookford Street & Cottage Park Ave
1985	Red Line & Linear Park open
1986	Feds create North Cambridge Stabilization Committee
1987	first proposal for down zoning Industrial A-1 area surrounding Linear Park to Residence B
1987	Special Permit for building at Tyler Court & Mass Ave
1988 - 1989	CDD's North Cambridge Neighborhood Study recommends down zoning Industrial A-1 area surrounding Linear Park
1989	Court closes Brookford St & stops commercial trucks on Cottage Park

1997	Cornerstone Co-housing plans large multi-family development in IA-1
1997	Open Space districts protected under city wide down zoning
1998	Frankleton Petition filed to down zone IA-1 to Residence B
1998	Inclusionary Housing: 30% up-zoning developer mitigation
1999	Planning Board Petition to down zone to Special District 2
2000	PB SD2 Petition ordained but with 30% up-zoning in the council
2004	Fawcett buys greenhouses
2011	Cottage Park Ave down zoned to Residence B
2011	Cambridge Lumber, Fawcett, JH Emerson announce developments

Past Public Policy Decisions

- Federal, State, City decisions for park
 - Could well have been a street
 - easily could have had cross streets
 - City decision in 1970 for Fawcett access
 - Tyler Court, Whittemore, railroad right-of-way
- Streets never improved for access
 - Instead old maps show reduction!
 - Variance at Tyler & Mass Ave
- Planning Board & CDD proposed .5 FAR
 - same as Bishop Petition
 - State Law MGL 40A requires uniformity

Alternatives to Bishop

- Widen an access street
 - Binney Street was widened in recent times
 - Edmunds inexpensive
 - only four houses
 - BUT dog leg still iffy
 - tear down house at Cottage Park & Mass Ave
- Improve Tyler Court
 - add traffic light
 - “prune” 2456 Mass Ave
 - prohibit 2464 parking at Mass Ave
 - make Mass Ave a “real” intersection

Actual Alternatives

- Lawsuits: horrible damage to community
 - Fawcett sued the City of Cambridge
 - Neighborhood joined with the City against Fawcett
 - folks still passing out copies of the decision
 - Cornerstone Co-housing
 - Settled with Industrial A-1 carve-out
 - “The Sliver House”
 - Marino Restaurant spot zoning
 - etc. etc. etc.
- all before my time!

Drury, Margaret

From: Michael Shapiro [sifka@earthlink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, December 20, 2011 8:38 AM
To: City Council
Cc: Drury, Margaret
Subject: SUPPORT Bishop Zoning Petition

Dear Councilors,

I am writing to support the Bishop petition to reduce the density of proposed development in my North Cambridge neighborhood. I live on Madison Ave, and believe the neighborhood could be close to a tipping point in terms of density. Right now, it is a comfortable neighborhood. The planned development will put too many people and too many cars into this mix making this a less pleasant neighborhood to live in. I hope you will act to reduce the size of the planned development.

Best regards,
Michael Shapiro

Drury, Margaret

From: Roy Kring [roykring@verizon.net]
Sent: Tuesday, December 20, 2011 9:02 AM
To: City Council
Cc: Drury, Margaret
Subject: SUPPORT Bishop Zoning Petition

I urge you to SUPPORT the Bishop Zoning Petition to limit residential density along Linear Park. There must be efforts made to protect the safety, open space, and livability of the Linear Park community.

Thank you,
Roy M. Kring
2440 Massachusetts Ave.

Drury, Margaret

From: karenkumor2@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, December 20, 2011 9:11 AM
To: City Council
Cc: Drury, Margaret; Stephen Cherington; Roger Yeh
Subject: Support of Bishop Zoning Petition

To the Council;

We support the Bishop Petition. We live next to and abut Tyler Ct. We suffer from excess of noise because there is no set back of our building from Tyler Ct. Tyler Ct extends to the edge of our building: no sidewalk, curb or grassy area provides any space from the court. It is not appropriate to make Tyler Ct in effect a real street. The increase in traffic will affect our quality of life with the noise and difficulty of access and egress from our building.

When the current residents bought property we were accepting of the state of affairs as it was despite the fact that large trucks were rumbling on a court not appropriate for heavy traffic. Now we will suffer excessive noise and a loss of property value if there is no plan to divert traffic from our court and the density of residents is increased. We also have concerns that the excessive vibrations will affect our building foundation and cause leaking into it.

Therefore we urge you to restrain the resident density of the local area and provide a plan for access to new construction that excludes Tyler Ct as an access or egress route.

Sincerely,

Karen Kumor, Trustee, 2456 Mass Ave (next to Tyler Ct)
203-376-7614

E

Drury, Margaret

From: Jon Foley [jf2@United-Pipe.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 20, 2011 12:30 PM
To: City Council
Cc: Drury, Margaret
Subject: SAVE OUR NEIGHBORHOOD!!!!

Importance: High

Cambridge City Council,

Please save our neighborhood and vote the Bishop Petition through. Please keep our streets safe from the overburden of additional vehicles the current Fawcett project will impose on us.

Our neighborhood does not support the size and impact of this current project. We do support litigation if the Bishop Petition does not go through.

Jon and Rebecca Foley
53 Magoun St

Jon Foley
Sales Manager
United Pipe & Steel Corp.
Tel: 800-777-7473
Fax: 978-356-5553
www.united-pipe.com
email: jf2@united-pipe.com

F

Drury, Margaret

From: Carolyn Russ [clynruss@earthlink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, December 20, 2011 4:52 PM
To: City Council; Drury, Margaret
Cc: 'Kellogg, Jarvis P.'; 'Joshua Walker'; 'Ted McKie'
Subject: I do not support the Bishop Petition

Dear Council,

I DO NOT support the Bishop Petition to downzone the areas abutting Linear Park.

In addition, please remember that the North Cambridge Stabilization Committee does not speak for North Cambridge.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Russ
186 Harvey St.
Cambridge, MA 02140

Drury, Margaret

From: Audrey Ellerbee [akellerbee@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 28, 2011 9:19 AM
To: City Council
Cc: Drury, Margaret
Subject: Please Refer Bishop Petition To 2012 Council

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to ask that you please refer the Bishop Petition to the 2012 Council so that a full set of hearings with broad attendance can be had. The current planned work in the North Cambridge area affects my personal property, and as a concerned resident I don't believe that holding the hearing between two public holidays (Christmas Day and New Year's Day) is likely to effect sufficient turnout for this important discussion topic.

Thank you for the work you do for the city, and for taking into consideration the concerns of its residents, like myself.

Cheers!

-- Audrey K. Ellerbee, PhD
"Don't just be good at what you do... do good with who you are."

H

Drury, Margaret

From: Gary Dmytryk [dmytryk@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 28, 2011 12:56 PM
To: City Council
Cc: Drury, Margaret
Subject: Bishop Petition - please refer to next Council

Dear Councillors,

I am writing to urge the Council to please refer the Bishop Petition to next year's Council for a full hearing and discussion among all interested persons before voting on the petition.

Thank you,

Gary Dmytryk
2440 Mass. Ave.
Cambridge

I

Drury, Margaret

From: julia.bishop@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, December 27, 2011 4:30 PM
To: City Council
Cc: Drury, Margaret
Subject: Bishop Petition 12/28

Honorable Mayor Maher and Councilors,

Regarding the re-filing of the Bishop Petition, the neighborhood has been assured that this Ordinance Committee meeting is a procedural meeting to move the petition on to the new year's city council. I hope that this is a correct assessment, as the timing of this meeting, right after the holidays, could limit the turnout of neighbors who are deeply committed to this petition.

In any case, I would ask that the Bishop Petition is moved along through the usual procedure allowing for the necessary neighborhood input on a development of this size that will have an immediate, non-reversible effect on the quality of life in this north Massachusetts Avenue neighborhood.

Julia Bishop