

Cambridge City Council Meeting – added notes to presentation

July 30, 2012

Gerald Bergman  
82 Elm Street

I believe that no zoning changes in the Central Square area should be introduced or enacted until the various studies of Kendall and Central Square have been completed and widely and thoroughly discussed by neighborhood residents and businesses. This includes the Forest City up zoning proposal as well as the neighborhood down zoning petition.

Should the Forest City up zoning pass this evening I believe that it would be in the best interests of neighborhood residents to organize behind an 18-month development moratorium, a time period that would allow for the election of a new city council.

Today I am echoing the advice of the Cambridge Planning Board – **NO TO THE FOREST CITY UPZONING PETITION** - wait for the final report of the various committees and hired planners that are preparing their reports for Kendall and Central Square.

Some City Councilors have tried to use the recent passage of up zoning for the Novartis development in Area 4 as a precedent that would logically lead to their support of the Forest City upzoning request. Both developments have asked for an additional approximately 100,000 square feet of development, and both have offered approximately \$1M in payment to the City of Cambridge in exchange for their increased profits.

It is true that both developments are the result of MIT using their power and money to assemble land and lease it to developers to serve the purposes of MIT and the lease holders, not the current residents of Cambridge, and certainly not the working class community (comprised chiefly of middle income families, young professionals, and families and individuals in affordable subsidized housing) that surrounds their new developments.

As MIT adds to their more than 5,000,000 square feet of commercial space, the MIT focus on university development and profit remains steadfast.

Forest City will undoubtedly bring us the same transparency that we saw in the Novartis development. For example, when Novartis argued for their additional square footage of space, Tom Sieniewicz, the architect representing Novartis said in the City Council Ordinance hearing and the Planning Board hearings that, and I quote: “the additional height would allow us to ....provide a very large open space both for the employees of Novartis but perhaps more importantly as a civic

**COM 2012 #346**

**Communications #83**

A communication was received from Gerald Bergman in opposition to Forest City upzoning Petition.

**In City Council July 30, 2012**

**REFERRED TO THE PETITION**

gesture...really great and wonderful green relief. The open space will be publicly accessible and will have openings to the street and pedestrian cut-through routes.

On July 18, Edward LeFlore representing Novartis emailed to me the plan of Novartis for accessibility: the open space will be closed to the public in the evening after work and on weekends. That is, if you work outside of Kendall Square/MIT, don't plan on ever using the open space.

I am quite sure that the MIT-Novartis plan in Area 4, which lacked transparency on this vital issue of green space, can clearly be seen as a precedent and model for the Forest City development. In my presentation on July 24 I referenced and gave attachments regarding the broken promises regarding jobs and housing in the Brooklyn Atlantic yards development being carried out by Forest City.

Will Forest City be like Novartis....if the upzoning is granted what will the final development look like? Will retail space be affordable to the community surrounding the project? What type of jobs for current residents will be provided? Will there be a 30 foot high structure of mechanicals on top of the 95 foot height they are requesting? What volume of noise will be produced. Will affordable and middle income housing ever be provided by Forest City as requested from the outset by the community and the City Council?

Will the City Council, if they vote the upzoning, fail to hold the developers accountable for their promises as they have with the Novartis development?

The obvious answer to these questions, and using Novartis as a precedent, can only result in one course of action: vote NO to the Forest City up zoning. Demand that MIT provide affordable housing and affordable retail on the land in and around Central Square. Demand that big pharma be placed in Kendall Square not Central Square.

attachments:

- 1) March 29, 2011 Planning Board hearing
- 2) May 23, 2011 City Council Ordinance hearing
- 3) Novartis email of July 18, 2012
- 4) MIT 2011 Town Gown Report

March 29, Planning Bd.  
2011

Benjamin  
①

49

1 combination of the historic structure really  
2 I think good planning, good urban design to  
3 set the height back from Mass. Ave., plus the  
4 FAR in the basement means that the planning  
5 of these building needs some flexibility to  
6 go to the higher height.

7 The other thing, obviously the green  
8 area, the campus area, the start of the  
9 discussion, the additional height would allow  
10 us to stack the program and provide a very  
11 large open space both for the employees of  
12 Novartis but perhaps more importantly as a  
13 civic gesture giving us a sense of the campus  
14 and a sense of the place really great and  
15 wonderful green relief. And what I should  
16 perhaps have pointed out in those photographs  
17 we were looking at, you can see in your  
18 package before you, there's virtually no  
19 green space. Virtually and certainly no  
20 grass. Some trees in that portion of  
21 Cambridge so we think this would really be a

1 starting a really amazing transformation here  
2 at this site. So the additional height  
3 allows us to provide that space.

4 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Can you  
5 talk about the proposed site on Mass. Ave.?

6 TOM SIENIEWICZ: The proposed height  
7 of Mass. Ave. is in the order of 175 feet.  
8 The proposed site on Mass. Ave. is between 70  
9 and 75 feet at the corner of Mass. Ave. and  
10 Albany Street.

11 HUGH RUSSELL: Is there any planned  
12 parking going to be below grade?

13 TOM SIENIEWICZ: That's correct.  
14 Parking will be provided below grade.

15 CHARLES STUDEN: How many levels  
16 below grade of program space did you say part  
17 of your programs being met below grade?

18 TOM SIENIEWICZ: It hasn't been  
19 finally determined because we're in very  
20 early stage of the design how many levels we  
21 could go below. But the program spaces that

Bergman

# CITY COUNCIL

## Committee Report

### Committee Report #4

#### ORDINANCE COMMITTEE MEMBERS In City Council May 23, 2011

- Councillor Sam Seidel, Chair*
- Councillor Leland Cheung*
- Vice Mayor Henrietta Davis*
- Councillor Marjorie C Decker*
- Councillor Craig A Kelley*
- Mayor David P Maher*
- Councillor Kenneth E Reeves*
- Councillor E. Denise Simmons*
- Councillor Timothy J Toomey*

The Ordinance Committee held a public hearing on April 6, 2011 beginning at 5:08 P.M. in the Sullivan Chamber and a follow-up public meeting on May 17, 2011, beginning at 4:14 P.M. to consider a petition to amend the Cambridge Zoning Ordinance filed by Novartis Institute for BioMedical Research, joined by M.I.T. as land owner, to allow for the creation of a new Special District 15 along a portion of Massachusetts Avenue between Albany Street and Windsor Street opposite the location of the Novartis main campus at the former Necco Building (**Attachment A**).

Present at the April 6<sup>th</sup> hearing were Councillor Sam Seidel, Chair of the Committee, Mayor David P. Maher, Vice Mayor Henrietta Davis, Councillor E. Denise Simmons and City Clerk D. Margaret Drury. Present from the city administrative staff were Brian Murphy, Assistant City Manager for Community Development, Susan Glazer, Deputy Director of the Community Development Department (CDD), Stuart Dash, Director of Community and Neighborhood Planning, CDD, Iram Farooq and Jeffrey Roberts, CDD. Novartis was represented by Jeffrey Lockwood, Vice President of Novartis, Robert Wiggins, Project Coordinator, Novartis, Tom Sieniewicz, Cambridge, architect, and James Rafferty, Adams and Rafferty, Cambridge, attorney representing Novartis.

Present at the May 17, 2011 public meeting were Councillor Sam Seidel, Mayor David P. Maher, Councillor Leland Cheung and Councillor Kenneth E. Reeves. Present from the city administrative staff were Brian Murphy, Assistant City Manager for Community Development, Stuart Dash, Director of Community and Neighborhood Planning, CDD, Iram Farooq and Jeffrey Roberts, CDD. Novartis was represented by Jeffrey Lockwood, Novartis, and Attorney James Rafferty.

Mr. Rafferty provided an overview of the proposal. The petition provides for a map change for the portion of the Industry B district along the centerline of Massachusetts Avenue for 326.30 feet in an easterly direction from the intersection of Windsor Street to the intersection Street, then proceeding in a southeasterly direction along the centerline of Albany Street for 144.92 feet to the intersection of Osborne Street, then proceeding in a westerly direction along the centerline of State Street for 390.07 feet to the intersection of Windsor Street, and then proceeding along Windsor Street in a Westerly direction for 423.26 feet to the intersection of Massachusetts Avenue, to create a new Special District 15. All of the requirements and regulations applicable to the Industrial B base zone would apply to the special district except that maximum FAR for any lot would be 3.5 and the maximum permitted height could be increased to 140 feet by special permit from the Planning Board.

Mr. Lockwood stated that Novartis has been looking for some time to create a research campus. In 2002 Novartis, a Swiss institute decided to come to Cambridge to set up

their world headquarters. This was part of a strategic decision to re-invent their approach to life science. At that time it was very new to locate in a city instead of out in a suburb. A suburban location works very well for marketing, sales and manufacturing, but not very well for drug discovery. Drug discovery requires a team of people working together collaboratively to create a new medicine. The process is 1/3 art, 1/3 science and 1/3 serendipity. It takes collaboration with other entities as well.

Mr. Lockwood stated that what they have found in Cambridge has exceeded their expectations. Novartis in Cambridge now consists of more than 2,000 employees and more than one million square feet of office space. Sixty four percent of their workforce uses not single occupancy motor vehicles but rather alternative modes of transportation. The Novartis workforce really likes being a part of the Cambridge community. Novartis is piloting in Switzerland and wants to bring to Cambridge a radically new approach to laboratories, which utilizes a wide open floor plan rather than separate labs and cubicles.

Mr. Sieniewicz described the architectural and design concepts for the new project. Novartis has chosen world famous architect/designer Maya Lin for the project. The initial plans include keeping the 30,000 square foot "castle" building as is; that building is not suitable for research. There will be an open space with another 30,000 square feet built below the open space. The open space will be publicly accessible and will have openings to the street and pedestrian cut-through routes. The height would step down to 85 feet at Mass Ave.

No public testimony was offered at the public hearing on April 6, 2011. Charles Marquardt, 10 Rogers Street, submitted a letter in support of the zoning amendment for the record (**Attachment B**).

Councillor Seidel invited comments and questions from committee members.

Vice Mayor Davis expressed pleasure at Novartis's desire to grow in Cambridge and desire for that growth to be a part of the design planning for the area that Goody Clancy consultants will be leading and coordinating. She is expecting a vision, not a project-by-project approach to that area. She also needs to know more about the open space. To her it looks like it is hidden - a great area for Novartis but not very available to the city. Vice Mayor Davis also expressed her desire to see the accurate depictions of the scale and height of the mechanicals in the drawings. Just because they are not in the FAR does not mean that they are invisible. Mr. Murphy noted that in addition to the zoning amendment process the Planning Board will conduct extensive design review.

Councillor Simmons emphasized the important of successful ground floor retail and connections to the neighborhoods, in particular the Area 4 neighborhood. She does not want to see another University Park open space that relates only to the office buildings and feels unwelcoming to the neighboring residents. She is concerned about the overall amount of development that is going on in and around Area 4 and would like to see a development timeline.

Councillor Seidel said that he is delighted that Novartis wants to stay and expand in Cambridge. He too has concerns about the open space as currently shown. He cannot think of an open space as enclosed as that shown that really works as public open space. It always feels like it belongs to the people who surround the space. He also noted some questions about the right height limit for buildings along Mass Avenue.

On motion of Vice Mayor Davis the petition remained in committee and the April 6<sup>th</sup> hearing was adjourned at 7:50 P.M.

The May 17<sup>th</sup> hearing focused on the Planning Board Report (**Attachment C**), which was received by the City Council and forwarded to the Ordinance Committee at the May 16, 2011 City Council meeting. In the report the Planning Board suggested some changes to the proposed amendment and recommended ordination of the proposed amendment with the suggested changes.

Mr. Murphy and Ms. Farooq described the changes, which are summarized as follows in the Planning Board Recommendation: "The suggested additions to the zoning language are intended to address a few of the Planning Board's specific concerns, and have been made in consultation with the Petitioner, Community Development Department staff, and the City's planning consultants for the Kendall Square / Central Square Study. The



3  
Bergman

Novartis Research Institute Cambridge

---

## Accessible open space

---

Gerald Bergman <geraldbergman@gmail.com>  
To: "cambridge.campus@novartis.com" <cambridge.campus@novartis.com>

Tue, Jul 17, 2012 at 1:01 PM

What is the current situation in regard to the hours during which the public space will be accessible to the general public?

Gerald Bergman

---

Campus, Cambridge (Gen) <cambridge.campus@novartis.com>  
To: Gerald Bergman <geraldbergman@gmail.com>

Wed, Jul 18, 2012 at 1:50 PM

Dear Gerald -

Thank you for your inquiry.

Our current plans are for the courtyard to be accessible to the public from 6:00 am - 7:00 pm, Monday through Friday.

Thank you  
[Quoted text hidden]

---

Campus, Cambridge (Gen) <cambridge.campus@novartis.com>  
To: Gerald Bergman <geraldbergman@gmail.com>, "Campus, Cambridge (Gen)" <cambridge.campus@novartis.com>

Wed, Jul 18, 2012 at 4:01 PM

Good Afternoon Gerald,

Our current plans are for the courtyard to be accessible to the public from 6:00 am - 7:00 pm, Monday through Friday.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions.

Thank you

Ed

Edward LeFlore  
Novartis Institutes for BioMedical  
Research, Inc.  
200 Technology Square  
Cambridge, MA 02139  
USA

Phone +1 6178718000  
Fax +1 NA  
edward.leflore@novartis.com  
www.novartis.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Gerald Bergman [mailto:geraldbergman@gmail.com]  
Sent: Tuesday, July 17, 2012 1:01 PM  
To: Campus, Cambridge (Gen)  
Subject: Accessible open space

40

Borgman

### D. Facilities & Land Owned<sup>3</sup>

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2021 (projected)
<b>Acres</b>						
Tax Exempt	160	160	160	160 <sup>4</sup>	<b>160</b>	
Taxable	85	95	95	94	<b>93</b>	
<b>Number of Buildings (academic)</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>110</b>	
<b>Dormitories</b>						
Number of Buildings	26	25 <sup>5</sup>	26	26	<b>28</b>	
Number of Beds	5,290	5,290	5,364	5,524	<b>5,491</b>	
<b>Size of Buildings (gross floor area)</b>						
Institutional/Academic	6,032,363	6,286,578	6,015,884	6,401,422	<b>6,766,465</b>	
Student Activities/Athletic/Service	2,159,664	2,208,555	2,245,478	2,443,534	<b>2,462,281</b>	
Dormitory/Nontaxable Residential	2,679,144	2,677,669	2,930,504	2,930,215	<b>2,919,890<sup>6</sup></b>	
Commercial <sup>7</sup>	4,771,460	5,112,406	5,112,406	5,138,431	<b>5,096,716</b>	
Taxable Residential <sup>8</sup>	172	175 <sup>9</sup>	175	175	<b>171</b>	

#### Parking spaces maintained in Cambridge

Number of parking spaces maintained for students:	<b>1,103</b>
Number of parking spaces maintained for faculty, staff and visitors:	<b>3,923</b>

<sup>3</sup> MIT and the City agreed that sub-area divisions are unnecessary in this section.

<sup>4</sup> While this figure remains the same, previous years' acreage erroneously included 1 acre that was not tax-exempt. The acreage should have been reported as 159 for 2007, 2008, and 2009.

<sup>5</sup> The change in number of dormitory buildings is due to a change in reporting methodology.

<sup>6</sup> The decrease in the gross floor area of Dormitory/Nontaxable Residential is due to a correction in space plans for NW86. In 2010 the gross floor area should have been reported as 2,903,504 gsf.

<sup>7</sup> MIT's commercial properties are measured by rentable square feet.

<sup>8</sup> MIT's taxable residential properties are measured by rental units.

<sup>9</sup> The addition of three units is the result of a change in reporting methodology.