



ORDINANCE COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE MEETING

~ MINUTES ~

Wednesday, March 9, 2022,

5:30 PM

Sullivan Chamber

The Ordinance Committee met to conduct a public hear on a petition to amend Article 20.90-Alewife Overlay Districts 1-6 of the Cambridge Zoning Ordinance by inserting a new section entitled Section 20.94.3- Temporarily prohibited uses. (ORDINANCE #2022-1)

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

>> Anthony Ivan Wilson, Clerk: Councillor McGovern the time of the meeting has arrived, and you have a quorum.

>> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: thank you Mr. Clerk. a quorum being present I call this meeting of the ordinance committee to order. the call of the meeting is to conduct a public hearing... the ordinance committee will meet to conduct a public hearing on a petition to amend article 20.90-alewife overlay districts 1-6 of the Cambridge zoning ordinance by inserting a new section entitled section 20.94.3- temporarily prohibited uses. (Ordinance #2022-1) adopted the messages to general assembly and approved by the governor the city's authorized use remote participation and meetings of the Cambridge city council. to watch the meeting please tune into channel 22 or visit the open meeting portal on the city's website. if you would like to provide public comment, please visit [cambridge.ma.gov \public comment](http://cambridge.ma.gov/publiccomment). We will not allow any additional public comment sign-up after 6 pm. all of today's vote will be taken by roll call. Mr. clerk will you please call the members present.

- >> Anthony Ivan Wilson, Clerk:
- >> Burhan Azeem: present and audible.
- >> Dennis J. Carlone: absent.
- >> Alanna M. Mallon, Vice Mayor: present and audible.
- >> Patricia M. Nolan: absent before.
- >> Sumbul Siddiqui, Mayor: present and audible.
- >> E. Denise Simmons: absent.
- >> Paul F. Toner: present and audible.
- >> Quinton Y. Zondervan, Chair: present and audible.
- >> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: present and audible.
- >> Anthony Ivan Wilson, Clerk: there are six members present.

>> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: thank you Mr. Clerk. typically, these meetings would start off with presentations by the petitioners which Councillor Nolan as the lead sponsor has spoken at the planning board last night. I was going to go to her first to ensure she will be joining us but she's not here at the moment. we then we would hear from.

>> Anthony Ivan Wilson, Clerk: Councillor McGovern, Councillor Nolan is trying to logon she's having some trouble, but you should be on shortly.

>> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: hopefully she will get here by the time I'm done. and then we can go on to presentation from CDD to go over what happened at the planning board less than as well as their presentation on this ordinance. we would then counselors can ask some clarifying questions we will go to public comment and come back for further discussion. that is the way this meeting will run. I guess now rather than waiting hopefully Councillor Nolan can get the technical stuff to get up quickly would like to start and we will switch the order. do you want to do that?

>> Iram Farooq, Assistant City Manager for Community Development: certainly, thank you chair McGovern. I'm the assistant city manager for community development. I'm going to request that Jeff Roberts and Mason Wells and I think folks from the city solicitor's office are in the attendee list if they can be promoted that would be great. thank you. and so, as you noted, this petition had a public hearing at the planning board last night. the board did vote to send a positive recommendation to the council, and they have several thoughts they want to send along at the same time and concerns... pardon me there is a fire truck going past... I am going to ask Jeff Roberts to summarize that information if there are any highlights worth mentioning tonight to get the conversation started.

>> Jeff Robert, Director of Zoning and Development: Mason Wells is here with the zoning and development team. he put in a good work on this. as a note as was mentioned a couple times we created a memo to go to the planning board and the ordinance committee, review background information related to this petition including what the petition actually does and specifically how it relates to other types of moratorium proposals that have been adopted in the city . we can talk about that a little bit more. we talked a little bit about the current zoning for the alewife overlay districts, we talk about the alewife district plan and held that evolved in the zoning recognition that came from that and a little bit about development activity and permitting that has occurred since the completion of the alewife district plan and how the plan informed consent development. we talk about climate resilience zoning which is a topic we speak about with the city council in the future. a final piece talks a little bit about zoning considerations. which I think leads into the discussion of the planning board hearing. it's all still very fresh as always, the planning board did vote to submit a recommendation to the city council and that will need to be drafted reviewed and submitted. I can give a very brief summary for those who weren't in attendance at that meeting, the planning board voted to send a recommendation expressing general support for a pause in development in the service of getting appropriate zoning in place for the alewife district. The board express caveats I think are important to consider and they want to communicate to the council including some support for looking at whether this could be done faster than the proposed timeframe in the moratorium and whether it could be closer to a one year rather than a two-year process given there was a sense of urgency expressed in the presentation. that if there is motivation to get action on zoning... again if the point of this... I apologize this is unusual I'm getting ahead of the presentation. the board agreed if there is some urgency it should be more of a general moratorium applying to all new development although some board members did have concerns about that given that it could be an expansion of the scope of the petition and that we need to be considered.

the planning board raised a number of comments in their discussion that they felt were important to have input from the city's law department on and we just were able to communicate some of those comments to the law department but obviously that hasn't been a lot of time to think about it so far but some of the things that the planning board raised as issues were... there had been discussion at the hearing about what is subject to this moratorium and what is not subject to the moratorium. and what would be permissible and fair in terms of the scope of the moratorium and what would be included or excluded. the length of the moratorium is something planning board members asked about and concerns about whether that might end up being extended and taking more time. there were concerns which were also expressed in the CDD memo which the law department did consult with us on. about how existing fuses and existing development might be impacted by this proposal as it is written. and potential concerns about how it might impact just property rights and property values in general and whether they could be concerned about some property owners benefiting over others. those were few of the things that were raised. we will communicate all of this in a formal report will go to the city council. thank you.

>> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: thank you Mr. Roberts for assistant manager are you going to lead the presentation? was that the plan?

>> Iram Farooq: chair we are not presenting, Councillor Nolan will be, as the proponent, be presenting the sides.

>> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: Councillor Nolan.

>> Patricia M. Nolan: should I share my screen or do I do it through the clerk. we can do either. I sent it to them earlier today what is easier.

>> Anthony Ivan Wilson, Clerk: I recommend you share your screen.

>> Patricia M. Nolan: I will do that. hold on let me find it. can everyone see it? this alewife overlay district proposal is a laboratory moratorium. Its entire goal is to freeze zoning. I will go to this relatively quickly if you want me to slow down chair McGovern just signal if I go too fast and speak too fast but also went to get through it. some of this will be familiar to everyone on the council. the petition was filed really just for zoning. the goal isn't the moratorium the goal is to get to zoning. because as we know for years actually decades alewife has been a focus of city planning efforts and is the last, largest undeveloped swath of land in the city. it is now poised for rapid major change and development. so, the zoning to match the vision that is been developed over many years has yet to be presented because there's so many other things that get in the way and we end up doing a different approach and a staff is overwhelmed with a lot of our request but the neighborhood, the council and the community asked for zoning for mixed-use and appropriate climate mitigation.

Last fall the council passed a petition requesting this moratorium and then because of scheduling it had to be refiled because the deadlines were passed. In January mayor Siddiqui, myself Councillor McGovern and Councillor Azeem refiled essentially the same petition and the council referred it to the planning board in January hence why we are here. the goal is for zoning to be put into place that incentivizes and requirements of the realization of the vision we had which is a neighborhood with mixed-use. so, the moratorium simply to set a deadline for that to get done. We all recognize labs will be part of the development, they should be part of the development, yet currently the entire area could be old labs as of right. that would be counter with the city and community needs. The alternative to this moratorium and having comprehensive zoning is to continue with a piecemeal approach that we been doing within individual development pieces and there will be no certainty of a holistic comprehensive result. so, to take us all back very briefly in 1979 there was an alewife revitalization plan. The CDD created this, and it was intended to provide a vision in 1979 for this future of this area would look like. and I'll just highlight a couple of things. you noticed a green on it, mixed use buildings, different sizes, in the middle of it there's a pond, because recognizing that this is a flood zone there is going to be need for some kind of water retention.

that was in 1979. 40 years later, 40 years later, there is actually about five or six various plans along the way between 1979 and 2019 the previous council after the envision process said focus on doing a plan specific to alewife because that's the area of intense focus. this is from the alewife envision plan, which is actually the same, it is the same principles, its livability, connections, mobility, and public transit options, it's mixed-use, its residential, light industrial, public uses and open space. I forgot to mention on the slide before, I can go back... in the slide before there's a bridge, if you notice in the middle, that bridge we talked about a lot. sure enough 40 years later in the 2019 plan there was also a bridge probably in a more appropriate place which is at the right end of the quadrangle where the right-of-way for the DOT and state is much wider which means possibility of it incorporating a commuter rail station... to make the connectivity throughout the quad. the point is this was the plan, this is 2019 this is three years later. Envision alewife with the green and the pond in the middle the plan, to these colors show you what the envision alewife plan came up with, which is mixed-use as we know and there was a really concerted, clear call for light industrial mostly because those kinds of jobs are available, there good paying, low barrier to entry jobs unlike if labs which typically requires higher levels of education and skills and would not be available to the wide range of socioeconomic peoples that we want to ensure that they will be included in the vision for this. the idea here, this color just means let's have a whole bunch of different uses, residential, light industrial... but right now as of right while this is the vision, as of right the entire area could be covered with labs as of right. and economically that is something you probably see if you were just only considering maximizing your earning potential. [unclear audio].

There has been a consistent vision for the quad, but zoning is not yet in place. the Cambridge vision for alewife includes a neighborhood with accessible open space. so, concluding I will say is you know from the CCF bridge meeting with grocery stores and retail, a mix of employment opportunities not just labs but office and light industrial. housing including mixed income and affordable housing, some kind of public infrastructure particularly paying attention to the pedestrian and bicycle connections, paying attention to the pond and the water retention system and open space because this is an area of the city that is one of the areas of the highest propensity for heat island effect and for changes also including climate resiliency needs. a possible rail stops to enhance the commuter network and reduce car use. so, the zoning outlined in these needs is not yet been completed. so, any new construction doesn't have to be in line with the stated goals even though of course most developers are going to want to fill in with what the city wants.

this petition came out partly because it was "oh my gosh" there's so many parcels there were bought by Health Point, the reality is we the council and the city and the neighborhood have actually asked for zoning for a long time and it has never come about so this is more like the catalyst of something that was already brewing which is let's get some real zoning based on the various plans done over the years. this is just a summary of their purchases over the last six months. it's \$625 million. 19 separate parcels through different LLCs. I think several of us have met with them. They want to create something in this area that is in line with the city vision. just to remind us that health point is not the only change in the quad, there are other property owners as well. the area is right now in the midst of development it shows you we have right center wonderful Finch building, 100% affordable, Net Zero, Passive house to the right some other and in the bottom right we have the Kendall kitchen which is one of the Davis companies lab buildings on the ground floor and then you have the current situation for half of the rest of the quad which open-ended parking lot or older industrial spaces that has not been touched for decades.

climate resiliency is also important to take into account as we review this. because while we are thinking that we want this planning and zoning based on alewife envision it also coincides with the release of the climate resiliency zoning task force. which had been formed response to petition from April 2018 to think about how we can be zoning in the alewife area specifically related to climate issues because this is a... the area of the city with again the highest possibility... one of the main concerns for heat island effect and also literally flood prone area and the task force just issued the report after three years of study as Mr. Roberts noted. We will be discussing that later but that zoning regulations can also be included in zoning and should be included in zoning for the quad because since 2019 even when the envision report came out the need for climate adaptation resiliency is a more urgent citywide but also particularly this area. We know sea level rises at the upper end of every single projection we have. so, by taking the climate resiliency zoning taskforce regulations and vision of alewife the hope is that zoning can be done comprehensively, holistic, and also frankly relative quickly because the planning is already done envision and studies have been done. which is something that the planning board noted as well. So, Cabot, Cabot, and Forbes, not to remind ourselves of the challenges that we have, but they own many parcels they filed four different zoning positions and collectively those four positions took thousands of hours of review and discussing, deliberating, debating with communities, city staff and city council. everybody with interested and there was a consistent message that many of us heard during that process which is there has to be a better way. there are some... so three of those petitions expired, the fourth one is denied. Instead of filing a fifth CC and F sold some holdings. so, the overlay proposal by CC and F did have some elements of envision but it was developer driven it wasn't city driven and it wasn't based on the starting point of a comprehensive zoning plan.

I will say obviously advantages of direct negotiations are there. the city council could negotiate if you have an as of right to build something you're not going to say can you give us... can you make sure we can build a bridge over the railroad tracks or commuter rail station or when upon in the middle on the other hand you don't end up with competitive holistic approach to this area. so, the whole net of this we need zoning, the proposed moratorium is a vehicle to give adequate time. the proposed moratorium language... the request as of now and I will note that here it says no new office or laboratory uses can be built in the area until new zoning is ordained until December 31, 2023, or the zoning is ordained... if the zoning is ordained in six months the moratorium disappears. I think the language of... that was presented does not have that actually the planning board mentioned does not actually say new office which definitely was the intention so we should make sure that is clear. that it's only new office and laboratory and the reason to remind us that had to be office and laboratories... when we formulated this is because our zoning doesn't separate office and laboratory you can't

say we don't want new labs without saying no offices. plus, we would want to develop this holistic anyway. note that the whatever new zoning has to be created with the alewife neighborhood groups, developers, property owners, the planning staff, and the wider community. this is very much in line with the idea that we should move together with all stakeholders at the table. then you can build on... the zoning can build on the work already done. You don't have to restudy there are multiple starting points and hopefully that can jump start the process.

so, this is a quick moratorium history. I'm sure another expert in this Mr. Roberts and assistant city manager can talk about it. this would not be the first time, the planning board referenced that as well. they said they do not take moratoriums lightly. they understand that it's only in certain circumstances during their discussion they referenced a couple times and yet it was quite a strong statement that they all supported the moratorium. the vote was actually six in favor, one present, there was no negative, then one was absent. the person was absent happened to be the chair, had expressed that she was going to supported it. She had technical difficulties during the vote. there are some projects at different points along the development, so the question is how do we not show favoritism and be fair. Councillor Toner is working on establishing a working group of neighbors, community members, property owners, developers, all have to be in those zoning discussions. Obviously if there are projects about to go forward, they should go forward but we might not want... if we exempt anybody then are not going to have stake in sitting at the table. we want everybody to table. This proposal would not stop any housing development because that is not included in this proposal.

the planning board asked a lot of questions but expressed overwhelmingly supported. The planning board recommended shortening the timeline. maybe until March 1st of 2023 or even December 31st of this year. I'm happy to support that. Some Planning board members suggested an across-the-board moratorium, in order to get holistic zoning. If that were the case the petition would have to be refiled. I personally am not interested in doing that.

>> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: we will now go to clarifying questions from the council.

>> Dennis Carlone: no schools, no pre-k, fire station, no major parks and I did some urban design project for the city back. I was told don't put in any public facilities. I fear that the same thing happened in this case, and you don't make a neighborhood without a mix of uses including public uses. people will leave after six months which is what happens now in many cases. if Kendall square is 60% commercial and 40% residential, right over a T station, right next to downtown Boston this site should be more housing. everybody on the council wants more housing but we never zone like that. This should be at least 60% housing. traffic is horrible. that use has less of an impact. patty mentioned one bridge, there should be two bridges. we have a large landowner who owns land at both bridge locations. so, we shouldn't let that go. Envision was supposed to include an urban design study of this area. we got an illustrated plan. if you look at what makes up the city, yes, its private development, yes, it's roads and public spaces ,but it's public amenity, public places and if we do it that way again without any of that were going to have a dead zone. the triangle is representative of that.

>> Paul Toner: In general, I support the entire desires to make sure that the quad is a mixed use, vibrant neighborhood that has housing and recreational opportunities and retail and nightlife and everything else. I just want to make sure that we get things going more quickly. as Councillor Nolan mentioned I will be bringing a policy order forward for next council meeting just to get the thing started there is no reason CDD can't start convening groups and having these conversations.

>> Alanna M. Mallon, Vice Mayor: The planning board did vote to give a positive recommendation on the concept. they had some concerns. when I just wanted to speak to the idea that the planning board members wanted to put a moratorium on everything. I think what I heard was they were worried that there was a carve out and whether it was legally defensible. Is a moratorium on just lab and office uses legally defensible or should we include all uses?

>> Nancy Glowa, City Solicitor: yes, we talked about it a little bit after hearing about the planning board if I'm understanding correctly as it presently stands it's to prohibit just those particular uses during this moratorium period. and the question is whether it can be expanded to prohibit anything from happening during that period.

the answer is no unless we readvertised that would alter the fundamental scope of the petition has already been advertised. you would need to re-advertise with expanded scope.

>> Alanna M. Mallon, Vice Mayor: through you Mr. Chair the question was not whether or not we should expand it. It is whether or not this particular carve out of those two uses would be legally defensible. should we opt to have a moratorium just for those two uses.

>> Nancy Glowa: I would like a little bit more time but generally the uniformity principal is so long as everything within my district is treated the same it would not, for example, pose a spot zoning problem. I would like an opportunity to get back to the committee about that to be sure I read the language carefully and can opine on it.

>> Alanna M. Mallon, Vice Mayor: thank you through you Mr. Chair I have another question which is something that came up last night which is a question around should it read no new office and laboratory space just make sure we're not calling into question existing buildings.

>> Nancy Glowa: From a legal perspective first of all "uses" are not built so the language that there now just says built, I would recommend that word be changed to "commence" because "use" is done or commenced or stopped but it's not built. so, we talk about uses not structures. with respect to new uses your question vice mayor Mallon I think the answer is yes, would only apply to new uses because uses there already ongoing are protected if they already have a building or special permit or if they've already commenced and are otherwise protected as a pre-existing nonconforming use. It would only apply to new uses being contemplated during the moratorium period which would be halted by the moratorium for that period of time.

>> Alanna M. Mallon, Vice Mayor: one follow-up question Mr. chair if I'm a lab building and I'm expanding my lab building during the time of the moratorium. I'm not a new building. I'm not a new use. would I be subject to this moratorium and not able to expand my lab building during the period of time where we are contemplating the zoning getting to an ordinance stage?

>> Nancy Glowa: that's a little bit more tricky. we would want to look at language carefully the way it's written. as I said I think its little bit ambiguous. if you try to address the "uses" the language is not right. if you're trying to talk about buildings that are being constructed for a particular use then I don't think it's completely clear either. I think it needs to be more clarification of exactly what it is trying to get at.

>> Iram Farooq: Just note one of the concerns the planning board did raise was around having more carve outs. I will defer to those solicitor on whether that's permitted under language as proposed or not. the board was concerned that if we have additional exemptions that might allow for that exemption of existing buildings or other such similar things that may start to become problematic.

>> Jeff Roberts: so, the petition language states no office or laboratory uses as listed in table 4.34 office laboratory use shall be permitted within alewife overlay districts 1 through 6 until December 31st 2023. I think the issue in the presentation it was characterized maybe with a subtle but important difference of no new laboratory buildings would be permitted. in the CDD memo which we work together with the law department on we noted that other moratoriums have stated a little bit more clearly things... things like no building permit shall be issued, no special permit shall be issued, saying that none of these uses shall be permitted is a little bit... it's a little bit broader than that. and I think what the city solicitor said is very much in line with what the planning board was raising concerns about... there should be more clarity as to exactly what can be done and what can be issued or not issued within that period of time.

>> Alanna M. Mallon, Vice Mayor: it sounds like from today's meeting some language would need to be cleaned up to ensure that we are making sure that we get, at the end of the day, the zoning that we need here.

>> Patricia Nolan: I think the language permitted has two languages: one nothing is permitted here, and nothing can be permitted. one is not allowed to do it, the other is you cannot issue a permit. The intention was the second. the language is to be made clear. if you don't already have a permit, you won't be permitted.

>> Quinton Y. Zondervan, Chair: I agree the language should be crystal clear that we need to say no permit shall be issued. so, the next question is what permits are at stake here? it's my understanding it takes a significant amount of time to approve these permits. if we're going to impose a two-year moratorium presumably, we have a reasonable sense which permits would likely have been applied for during that period. do we have a list?

>> Iram Farooq: we do not have a list and I don't think we can create a truly meaningful list of who might apply for a permit and who may have wanted to apply for a permit in the intervening two years. there were some conversations that we had from some of the property owners. we can provide some information there. but given the two-year timeframe there are folks you may not have come forward who might be interested and last night there were some property owners who spoke to public comment and presumably they might be here today.

>> Jeff Roberts: there are some applications... so the permits as you asked, the permits that are at stake would be building permits, special permits, certificates of occupancy. In terms of planning board special permits there are some that have been applied for but not issued. those would be affected because it would apply to any permits that had not yet been issued at the time that the petition was first advertised. which would be... we are now in early March, I don't know the exact date, would be sometime mid-February when this was advertised. so, we can look at the special permit cases for the planning board we can provide easily. other permits depending on the range of permits, we would have to look to inspection services to see if there are any pending permits.

>> Quinton Y. Zondervan, Chair: thank you Mr. chair I appreciate that answer I certainly understand we can't predict the future. I think any information that we do know would be helpful.

>> Dennis J. Carlone: thank you I'm not going to expand the conversation. I will do that later. I went to relate to what was discussed. there were five to seven developers that said they were interested in having lab structures, they are in the works. they didn't specify what that meant. a couple referred to small buildings but to get back to what Mr. Roberts just mentioned about occupancy permits. once we get information back from community development, if the building is fundamentally done, I think we can allow an occupancy permit. they have been through the process. that seems to me to be a little different than initiating construction getting a construction permit.

>> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: I do agree it's hard to know what somebody wants to do a year and half from now. they may not even know. we do have projects that are at different stages as Councillor Carlone talked about. you might have a building that's already done and you're looking for an occupancy permit that is one thing. we do also have projects that are in the pipeline already they've had been filed with the planning board. what if you have somebody that is already in front of the planning board, to treat them differently because they are in the process versus somebody who hasn't even started yet. any thought about that? is that even legal? does that have to apply for everybody? we are talking carveouts. Will we be able to consider an exception for somebody who's already in front of the planning board? if you have not applied for a permit yet you will be caught in the middle of this. if you've already had several planning board meetings and you are pretty much... are ready to go it seems a little unfair to kind of, tell you to wait another two years. did that come up at all? any thoughts around that?

>> Iram Farooq: I would bounce this question to the solicitor. there are times when the council and adopted zoning and has exempted people who were in the pipeline, but the planning board did seem to think it was different with the moratorium.

>> Nancy Glowa: thank you Mr. chair. it's a little bit tricky with any zone petition we have to look at the exact language before we can opine on whether it works or not. I can say generally this is governed by state law, the zoning act... under the zoning act there is a clear delineation between... if you have a building permit or a special permit you are protected and allowed to continue to work through to completion. under the state building code if you have performed the work pursuant to the permit you are entitled to certificate of occupancy. However, I do not think that you can protect people through some sort of definition that the locality would create... if you had three planning board hearings but you don't yet have a special permit, I don't think

that would be permissible. we would have to look at proposed language carefully to see if that can be done if that's something the council wants to do. I think it's likely that that would not be permissible.

>> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: thank you another question I had, I was unable to attend last night, I thought there was a question about... most of this conversation is really... most of the presentation and the conversation is focused on the quad, not the triangle. and I think there was some question about should this be... should this moratorium focus on the quad and not include the triangle. Was that discussed? any thoughts around that or are we doing the whole thing?

>> Iram Farooq: thank you chair. that question did come up in public comment. it was not discussed by the board particularly but certainly I would say it's an option for the council to look at since the discussion primarily did focus on the quadrangle.

>> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: lastly something Councillor Carlone said in the beginning, and I certainly agree. I think most of us do in terms of the reason we are doing this. we want this outcome. we don't want this to be an office park, with places for people to live but not places for people to actually experience a neighborhood. I think there's different definitions of neighborhoods but that's another issue. You have one company that bought up a lot of the land in the quad, and under what the current zoning... under what current zoning allows now we are talking about changing and we are talking about schools and libraries ,fire stations, police stations, all things that I think make up a neighborhood and are great. is there any legal issue with... we don't own that land?

A lot of times we get into negotiation, and we say we will give you a little bit more height, a little bit more this, in exchange you will do "a", "b" and "c". but you know how this company that owns a lot of land and how to we go in there to change it. Now we are going to want to take the land for library or school. we don't own it. how do we do that? how do we do that legally. I would imagine that that could be problematic. is that a clear question? we can't really go in and say you have 20 acres and we're going to take ten of them for municipal purposes. I can't imagine we can just do that.

>> Nancy Glowa: through you Mr. Chair the short answer is you can't do it legally without taking the property by eminent domain. if you want their property and want to do something with it? You have to acquire it. you would owe them compensation for it. the difference where we had so many so-called contract zoning situations in the past is where developers have come to us looking for zoning amendments and said if you give me this extra density or give me that, then I will give you these amenities or whatever or you can have certain conditions placed on the issuance of the special permit above what is allowed as of right under zoning. so, the person will be entitled to the permit if they met the criteria, but I think there would be a limit as to... typically that would be mitigation of the impact of that development on the community. there would be a reasonable relationship between what is being imposed as a condition to the special permit and what the developer is required to do.

>> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: the city should be purchasing as much property... if we had bought property here, we could be talking about s school and all of these things without having to enter negotiations that may not lead us to where we want to end up.

>> Burhan Azeem: Would there be any value in considering the moratorium but having the start date for the moratorium be later? would that be possible, and would that help people currently in the process?

>> Iram Farooq: through you Mr. Chair. that is a strategy that the council has used for zoning in the past when creating certain requirements. in an instance like this where they are waiting for a... maybe a special permit, it's a little bit of a double edge sword because it creates this timeline within which the planning board then has to have a hearing and issue a permit. If a project needs a lot of work, it would then place a lot of pressure around the planning board to go one way or the other to figure out a way to improve the project. I'm not saying that that is not a possibility. but just pointing out particularly because we're fresh off the planning board meeting last night. that's a little bit on my mind. I'm sure this may be an arena where the solicitor might have thoughts.

>> Jeff Roberts: to a little bit more detail. as was noted I'm the one involved in this planning review process. there is a lot of value in being able to take the necessary time to work through important issues and putting that

timeline in place can change that dynamic. just to give a sense of what the timeline may look like. if somebody were going to the planning board for a special permit today or at the time of advertisement of this it would be up to two months to schedule a public hearing that is the maximum time frame. up to three months to issue a decision. already the timeframe is pretty long. it often is extended especially for major development, where there's lots of design issues and other issues and transportation and other things that really need to be talked about and worked through. I wanted to give a sense of what that type of... for special permit anyway what that timeframe looks like.

>> Dennis J. Carlone: two points responding to questions or comments just a little while ago. what hasn't been mentioned is one of the planning board members said waiting a year or two is not the end of the world. why that's important is he was a developer, or is a developer, he's a consultant now. in the development cycle a year is no big deal. keep in mind if we find out nobody is at the point to even submit for a permit... nobody has the competitive advantage over anybody else. it's all the same. you asked about the open space and the amenities without an urban design plan you can't... it's harder to negotiate. When we did east Cambridge, we showed where parks were. the triangular parking in front of the Cambridge side, that was owned by three different owners, they had to give it up to the city to build a park as part of the planned unit development. so, if we do the zoning in a way that there is a base zone, which was lower than what it used to be and a planned unit development zone which is greater height and density, this is part of the package. that's why an urban design plans is essential to understand where those opportunities are.

>> Patricia M. Nolan: if we choose to have it be shorter than it really affects very few people. I want all the property owners at the table. if we change the deadline to one year from now... next March 1 or even this December, that means, that give us time. I hope it still keeps the pressure on to do it. it means that this would disappear automatically in a much shorter period of time. every property owner in that area has been on notice literally for several years we are contemplating zoning. The CC&F proposal was an up zoning for part of it. there was discussion at the time about changing zoning for the entire area. November 8th the first iteration of this specific proposal was actually put on the council agenda it was publicly known. even though it was refiled by November 8th any property owners knew. so, anybody since then has known and has been on notice that we are serious about trying to address this.

>> Paul F. Toner: how much time is spent by staff with property owners filing for special permits before the process is complete?

>> Jeff Roberts: thank you. it can vary quite a bit depending on the scale and scope of the project. for development proposals in the alewife area since the alewife plan has been completed, we spent a lot of time working on each development project to make sure that the priorities of the plan are communicated, the design is responsive. it could take six months... longer than six months of working both with staff and on community engagement. so, one of the... before an application goes to the planning board there are two things happening in parallel. one is working with staff departments and that is CDD, traffic and parking, public works understanding infrastructure in the area which can be complicated in alewife. working with other departments as needed. also doing community engagement. the planning board requires community engagement process for development as well. so, it can take to take six months and it could take longer than six months.

>> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: I'd like to get the public comment.

>> Matt Lerner: I'm a senior project manager with Longfellow realty partners. We are asking that consideration be given to amending the petition so as to exclude the triangle district also known as Cambridge Park drive. as noted in the envision alewife plan that triangle is the most recently developed portion of the alewife overlay district and has undergone significant residential redevelopment over the past five years. transforming it from an office precinct to an emerging mixed-use district. we've undertaken significant renovation to these building in the last four years, including the introduction of restaurant uses, expansion of public open space, improved bicycle and pedestrian paths and enhancement to stormwater management. we shared with the city's community development department our plan for a 40,000 square-foot addition at 125 Cambridge Park drive. that includes additional office space and further enhancement to pedestrian bicycle connections. this will also include sustainable features such as electric vehicle charging stations and solar panels to support Cambridge's initiatives

to reduce the city carbon footprint. If exempted the triangle district is not appropriate, consider an alternative amendment that would exempt additions less than 50,000 square feet.

>> Ann Tennis. we support the alewife overlay districts moratorium. the highlands quad neighborhood association and the fresh pond resident's alliance have a long history of working with the city, the council, and the surrounding neighborhood association. both associations actively participated in the envision and alewife district plan meetings. the alewife quad has been under intense development because the envision alewife district plan have never been implemented in zoning. they remain only guidelines for neighborhood associations and developers. after the city and the public learned of the large investment trust specializing in building lab campuses becoming the largest landowner in the quad the city council filed a policy order asking that there be a pause until 12/31/23 or until sometime when the new alewife zoning is adopted whichever happens sooner. the city council refiled policy order which passed unanimously in January specifically notes that the city staff has not produced zoning for the district in line with the plans including the recent alewife envision plan ". we want the city to rezone and formally plan the quad to ensure best mix of small business, housing, civic retail, and labs requiring open space with protection in perpetuity and guided by the principles of livability, walkability, connectivity, and resiliency.

>> Eric Grunebaum: besides being a neighbor, I was a member of the envision alewife working group. please accept the following comments in support of the alewife overlay district permitting pause. I completely agree with Councillor Nolan and Carlone. having served on the envision alewife working group and spending hours on the plans for the quad and other areas of alewife and north Cambridge, I think this is an incredibly important moment. the result of that multiyear, multimillion dollar planning process was supposed to be zoning. now is our opportunity. as you know there's intense development pressures here because the plan has not been implemented in the zoning, we only have guidelines. until there is zoning provided by these plans and permanent protection for proposed uses and amenities, I believe a pause of commercial development is justified. I want to say that I agree with the immediate neighbors in the highlands that there should be plan for the quad. it's times for some place making in Cambridge and honestly as a lifelong Cambridge resident is a bit embarrassing that Somerville has been able to do mixed-use development in similar circumstances at assembly or, but Cambridge has allowed large suburban office and apartment blocks elements to proliferate in the quad and triangle. matter.

>> John Chun: good evening I'm here to express my support for the alewife overlay development zone petition. the alewife district plan was published in the fall of 2019. two and half years ago. I asked the city to start review, revision, and adoption process of the plan. there are many developments already in progress being planned in the quad. I asked the city to update the zoning to allow for development and ensure a balanced mix of residential and commercial buildings with ample green space and public amenities. the alewife overlay development zoning petition simply forces the city to initiate a zoning change process although it does not guarantee the change. after two and half years of waiting that the least I can ask for. At yesterday's planning board meeting there were suggestions to shorten the duration of this moratorium. having seen how long zoning changes took place in the past, shortening the duration would risk the moratorium expiring prematurely. the petition already allows the moratorium to expire when rezoning is proposed. therefore, I oppose shortening the duration of the moratorium. I like to ask for your support of the petition tonight.

>> Lee Farris: great conversation tonight and at the planning board. I'm speaking for the Cambridge resident alliance in support of the alewife overlay district zone petition. we participated in many invasion and alewife meetings others refer to. we really would like to see that plan turn into zoning so that developers don't just keep building biotech labs in alewife using the old rules. which as Councillor Nolan pointed out as a right is what they can do. we do think the community development should be given up to two years to develop that zoning. but not allowing commercial development in alewife during that time. We would like to see a diverse job mix in alewife. we are concerned that if there's more labs, large number of more labs, that helps drive up the demand for housing and therefore the cost of housing. also, that there could be more traffic on the parkway which is already really bad. What we would like to see is a real neighborhood in the quad. we like to see zoning that results in a plan that includes at least one bridge over the tracks. ideally a commuter rail station and public open space and buildings, such as a school or library etc. we want to ensure attention to climate resiliency and take into account the new climate zoning resiliency report. We would like the plan to include at least 60% housing if that can be done while ensuring the light industrial jobs. It would be helpful to have an urban design study to be

clear on the public amenities we seek to achieve and how they can be achieved through zoning. I think the planning board members made a good point that allowing housing to proceed during this time may foreclose opportunities to the area.

>> Ann Stewart: I live in the quad. I was disappointed last night by your comments to the planning board of the policy orders timeframe as not possible. I went and looked at the January 2022 policy order that you passed. it lists the areas to address land user, open space, urban farms, mobility, climate, environment, housing, and economy. if the parties agree to one year and they assign one month to each area. they clarify the legal language. You still have a cushion of four to five months. the statement of purpose from the fresh pond resident's alliance and the highlands neighborhood association, which I am involved, says our hope is that by the end of 2023 or sooner we can all celebrate a two-year collaboration of successful place makers but it's clear from the discussion tonight first of all, all parties need zoning certainty.

>> Diane Martine: The initial Cambridge committee that started in 2016 along with other city worker groups advocated for new and revised zoning. a report for the alewife planning study was published in the fall of 2019. the report calls for a balanced mixed of landings. I would invite any of you, all of you actually take a walk down Cambridge Park drive, next time you are near alewife T stop. I live in north Cambridge; I regularly visit that area just to see what's going on. I will tell you in spite of what the first speaker said there are not a lot of restaurants, there is not much going on, except for big buildings, heat islands and flood risks. if we don't want that to continue, we better do something fairly quickly. the community development department asserts they are too busy to work on these zoning regulations. in the meantime, lab and other commercial developers are buying up property in alewife as fast as they can before any new zoning requirements are put into place. Lab and office development in the triangle, quadrangle, fresh pond mall should not move forward at its current accelerated rate without new and revised zoning requirements. what is the purpose of the special citizen process like envision Cambridge and hiring expensive consultants to manage it if the recommendations are set aside for this long without any significant follow through? the policy order you are considering seems to give the CDD the time he needs to update his zoning language to match recommendations. I hope you will vote for temporary hold for large-scale lab and office development in the alewife area. thank you.

>> Suzanna Schell: I'm here tonight to speak in favor of this pause is permitting as recommended by the planning board. I also support the comments made by the highland residents and those of Councillor Nolan and Councillor Carlone. we need a zoning plan for the quad that is an inviting mixed-use neighborhood guided by the principles of livability, walkability, connectivity, and resiliency. if the CDD doesn't have the capacity to work on this hire some more people. we need to implement zoning before any more new development takes place in this area. thank you.

>> Chris Chandor: I am senior vice president of development at the Davis company. as a longtime property owner and developer in the quad we have concerns about some of the unintended consequences and very much appreciate your diving into those this evening on what may come to pass if the amendment were adopted in its current form. we do have a building under construction out there. for nearly the past year we've been engaged in a very collaborative planning process with CDD, DPW for new building. based on experience, we designed the building to meet the goals of the envision plan. most notably the creation of the first vertical length of the multimodal path that runs along the southern portion of our property. I think we can all agree that the world has changed dramatically in just the past two weeks. so, the length of time that is being discussed to shut down permitting is obviously of great concern to us and our ability to bring that path to fruition. as well as the ground floor restaurants and retail space that we are attempting to bring in the project. we held early community engagement meetings and filed the special permit application with CDD, and we are waiting a date for our first public hearing with the planning board. as a longtime property owner and developer in the quad we are extremely mindful of infrastructure, sustainability, and broader goals for this neighborhood. we are requesting the committee modify this petition to allow the project that is this far along in the process to continue along.

>> Mike Nakagawa: I'm in the leadership team of the alewife study group and the fresh pond resident alliance. first note both group support the zoning petition. I just want to note that the sooner the zoning gets done, the sooner the pause will be over. so, keep the end of two years to ensure the city staff prioritizes addressing it rather than riding out the pause without action. in 2016 the envision Cambridge working group specifically for to address the complexities of this area. also, in 2016 when the climate change preparedness resilience planning

started the alewife focus group of which I was a member was a pilot study because the particular vulnerabilities of this area. There were two processes that started in 2016, we now have the alewife district plan and the alewife preparedness plan. it's 2022 now and still no zoning changes. alewife was the last place with significant light industry which provides low barrier to entry career jobs which have been pushed out by all the tech development and they pay an average of four times the weekly wage of retail and service jobs. also, fresh pond parkway in the second most congested road when the state according to a 2019 report. this temporary change on zoning would allow time for them to plan the infrastructure and align the development rules with the various city plans we already have. the planning board was pretty certain that this can be done well within the year. so, let's keep the time pressure out there to address it now rather than just keep on not having the zoning in place.

>> Scott Bohn: I'm Health Peak executive vice president, as you are aware we acquired several properties in the alewife districts over the past year. it's important to note several of these properties have long-term leases include existing uses such as outpatient medical services which are part of our core business. as I committed publicly to you and other members of the council in November when this petition was first filed Health Peak is committed to collaborate with the community and city leaders to address critical issues in the quad as we plan for the long-term future of properties we own. since that time, we have met with members of the community and reinforce the desire for true mixed-use throughout the quadrangle including housing, commercial, retail, transportation, and resiliency. alewife and the quad have seen significant housing delivered over the past several years. we look to plan in a thoughtful manner to incorporate the existing and new projects to create a cohesive neighborhood. Health Peak has always anticipated that any redevelopment in this area be mixed-use and require a thoughtful and collaborative process. interestingly the 2019 alewife district plan notes that there were previously 48 different property owners among the 99 parcels within the quad. therefore, significant transformational development will be challenging. with the recent concentration of ownership including Health Peaks ownership of several properties and our commitment to work collaboratively with the city is a unique opportunity for a comprehensive master plan that can actually be delivered through public and private engagement beginning with the properties we own.

>> Joel Nogie: I am individually in support this zoning petition... moratorium for all the reasons they were expressed by Councillor Nolan in her presentation and by Councillor Carlone in his comments and others. I also agree with the planning board that this is a legitimate and important reason to pause development long enough to incorporate the envision goals into the zoning so that the community and neighborhoods can be achieved that was envisioned during this process. as a member of alewife study group, I can speak to the value of a strong collaboration between property owners, community members, community groups, city agencies, city council and other stakeholders to create a good community result from development. I think we need to be realistic about the amount of time that will be needed and so make it two years or one year but let's not have the zoning moratorium expire before the work can be done.

>> Johanna Schneider: I'm an attorney. I'm permitting counsel for a proposed 50,456 square-foot lab building at 180 Fawcett Street, which is currently seeking a project review special permit from the planning board. our team began working with CDD staff on this project in January of 2021. in order to make sure that we were developing a project that met the city's planning goals as expressed in the envision alewife and the concord alewife plan. We focused on making the project sustainable, resilient, and improving the surrounding public infrastructure to contribute to the transformation of this area. from its current auto centric condition to a pedestrian and bike friendly environment. after months of working on it we filed the special permit application last November and first appeared before the planning board on December 7. since our initial hearing before the planning board in December we continue to work closely and in good faith with CDD staff and to refine the project to address the planning boards and staff's comments. our next hearing before the planning board is scheduled for March 29. this project is an excellent example of how even under current zoning, applicant, staff, and the planning board can work collaboratively to bring to bear the provisions of the principles of envision. however, to do nothing more than a bad timing if the proposed moratorium is passed this project will not be allowed to move forward. As several councillors noted tonight there are several projects at different stages in the development pipeline and there seems to be some desire to explore ways to approach this with an eye toward fairness. the council in its wisdom and coordination with the city solicitor will decide how to handle this but I am requesting that the city find a way for the proposed amendment to provide some sort of exemption for projects like this one that are so far along in the process but may not yet be fully approved the time the city council votes on the moratorium.

>> Heather Hoffman: I commend to you all of the wisdom that the residents of the area imparted about how much work they put in, how much work so many people around the city have put in, working on studying zoning and other planning projects on behalf of the city, without getting paid for it. because I live in east Cambridge and I have watched what has happened to studies, to zoning following the studies, to my neighborhood, I have words of good cheer for all of the developers. and that is residents get one bite at the apple. you get infinite bites. fear not because you will get the opportunity. it doesn't matter what they pass. you will get the chance to shape it to your own desires. I hear people... developers saying well we did stuff that is in accordance with the studies that we don't have any zoning for yet. over and over it's a broken record I've heard it so many times. we have an opportunity here. to do something where we try really hard to come up with what would be good for the city. and what would be good for the residents. instead of just shoveling more money into the pockets of developers and into the city coffers. in order to do that, we have to take enough time to look at that honestly and think what it is and not just think with dollar bills. I'm sorry to be the voice of cynicism. I'm also the voice of hope. because I keep believing that we will get it right one of these times.

>> Jonathan Agger: first I'd like to start by thanking council members. is imperative that the city update the zoning for this district. before there is further development of the quadrangle and remaining undeveloped parts of the alewife district. updated zoning is needed, and I will go further and asking for formal urban design plan for this area. that reflects best practices and the recommendations of the envision alewife working group. this is a unique opportunity for the city to address climate resiliency goals, with respect to flooding, tree canopy, open space, transportation if this area is developed further. without a formal urban design plan and updated zoning developers will continue to be the drivers of development. We will lose the opportunity for the area to become a livable, resilient neighborhood with open space and a mix of light industrial jobs. please let's not lose this last opportunity to utilize undeveloped space to realize a greater community for the people of Cambridge. I strongly support the alewife district overlay permitting pause and hope that the quad will truly become a welcoming neighborhood for both workers and residents.

>> Anthony Ivan Wilson, Clerk: no further speakers send of for public comment.

>> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: thank you Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk we need a motion to close?

>> Anthony Ivan Wilson, Clerk: yes

>> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: an emotion.

>> Anthony Ivan Wilson, Clerk: on that motion.

>> Burhan Azeem: yes.

>> Dennis J. Carlone: yes.

>> Alanna M. Mallon, Vice Mayor: yes.

>> Patricia M. Nolan: yes.

>> Sumbul Siddiqui, Mayor: yes.

>> E. Denise Simmons: absent.

>> Paul F. Toner: yes.

>> Quinton Y. Zondervan, Chair: yes.

>> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: yes.

>> Anthony Ivan Wilson, Clerk: motion passes eight in favor one person absent.

>> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: thank you everybody participated in public comment. we can go to council members if they have any further comments, I think we will have the motion to request certain information from the law department or maybe from CDD.

>> Patricia M. Nolan: have a question. There has been back and forth on timing perhaps you know Councillor McGovern since you have been on the council a long time. I can see an argument for, keeping two years because we don't want people to just wait it out. I can see the argument if we make it two years and people may not even start the process. despite Councillor Toner's call for working group. we know sometimes when the deadline is there you wait. I'm curious as to which state we think would have the most pressure and incentive for us to get this done as quickly as possible.

>> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: thank you Councillor Nolan. I will, just personally, I think you're right. I think it can cut both ways. we've been spending a lot of time talking about having more aggressive goals and timelines of things because they are important. sometimes the longer the timeline is it then gives people a sense of we don't have to actually start talking about this for another year. CDD is certainly busy, but we got the envision report that we haven't pushed for deadlines on things either. I could go either way to be quite honest. I think I would like to certainly hear from CDD. I don't think that this is, as noted in your presentation Councillor Nolan, this is not like we're starting from scratch. which makes me think we could do this more quickly.

>> Dennis J. Carlone: thank you chair McGovern. I would ask CDD in a policy order or request from you to think about this and respond because they can tell us tonight. they have to sort of plan it out, but here is the thing, the beautiful thing about the moratorium if there is anything beautiful is the pressure is there to get whatever needs to be done, done. there are seven developers who want to develop and even though they are just starting the process they indicated that they are ready to build. so, community development has all the pressure on them that they need from the council from developers and quite frankly from the manager. I think it should be two years. I hope it's one year. they need to do it right. can you imagine if they're forced to do it and they're not comfortable with the final result and we then learn it's not complete. I think we should request a schedule from them including urban design and public infrastructure, public improvements, public amenities. with the wealthiest city in the state, one of the top 10 in the country per capita. we can afford doing this correctly.

>> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: I'm going to go to the vice mayor. I don't disagree with that, and I think I go either way, but we also could... if we hold people's feet to the fire and say you got a year and they don't get it done in one year, we can always extend the moratorium.

>> Dennis J. Carlone: but that is one more failure on other failures. I would rather do it right and hear back from them. they might say a year is all they need. thank you I will be quiet.

>> Alanna M. Mallon, Vice Mayor: thank you Mr. chair. That question came up of whether or not it could be extended and what the process would be last night at the planning board. I would want some guidance from CDD on what the process would look like if we needed to extend. I certainly agree with Councillor Carlone, which is asking CDD at this point for their guidance there. one thing that come up during public comment, there is someone who's pretty far down the road with CDD and with the planning board putting together a small lab in the quad. I would like CDD in our next meeting to bring a list of who has already met with them, had a planning board meeting, that would get tangled up in this and suggested edits to language. how we can protect those folks who have been diligently working and working with CDD staff to say they are going to be working as if envision alewife actual zoning and some clarifications from the solicitor's department on the question of carveout and whether or not we should be exempt... the moratorium she covers all uses or if we can pull out lab and commercial uses.

>> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: The motion first being CDD come back to the ordinance committee with a list of projects and where they are in the process.

>> Anthony Ivan Wilson, Clerk: on that motion.

>> Burhan Azeem: yes.

>> Dennis J. Carlone: yes.

>> Alanna M. Mallon, Vice Mayor: yes.

>> Patricia M. Nolan: yes.

>> Sumbul Siddiqui, Mayor: yes.

>> E. Denise Simmons: absent.

>> Paul F. Toner: yes.

>> Quinton Y. Zondervan, Chair: yes.

>> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: yes.

>> Anthony Ivan Wilson, Clerk: motion passes eight in favor one person absent.

>> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: second motion is to request that CDD report back to the ordinance committee with suggested language and edits to the proposed moratorium.

>> Alanna M. Mallon, Vice Mayor: suggested language in edits to the ordinance.

- >> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: roll call.
- >> Anthony Ivan Wilson, Clerk: on that motion.
- >> Burhan Azeem: yes.
- >> Dennis J. Carlone: yes.
- >> Alanna M. Mallon, Vice Mayor: yes.
- >> Patricia M. Nolan: yes.
- >> Sumbul Siddiqui, Mayor: yes.
- >> E. Denise Simmons: absent.
- >> Paul F. Toner: yes.
- >> Quinton Y. Zondervan, Chair: yes.
- >> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: yes.
- >> Anthony Ivan Wilson, Clerk: motion passes eight in favor one person absent.
- >> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: motion city solicitor report back to the ordinance committee regarding clarification regarding carveouts or...
- >> Alanna M. Mallon, Vice Mayor: clarifications on whether or not lab and commercial uses can be carved out... whether or not it would be legally defensible...
- >> Patricia M. Nolan: that the city manager works with the city solicitor to provide a legal opinion on how the council might if so, desired allow buildings somewhere along in the process of development to be exempted and whether the current language applying to office and lab uses is appropriate.
- >> Anthony Ivan Wilson, Clerk: on that motion.
- >> Burhan Azeem: yes.
- >> Dennis J. Carlone: yes.
- >> Alanna M. Mallon, Vice Mayor: yes.
- >> Patricia M. Nolan: yes.
- >> Sumbul Siddiqui, Mayor: yes.
- >> E. Denise Simmons: absent.
- >> Paul F. Toner: yes.
- >> Quinton Y. Zondervan, Chair: yes.
- >> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: yes.
- >> Anthony Ivan Wilson, Clerk: motion passes eight in favor when absent.
- >> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: Councillor Carlone, you requested that CDD report back with a timeline.
- >> Dennis J. Carlone: requesting the city manager work with CDD to report back to the ordinance committee on a proposed timeline for the implementation.
- >> Iram Farooq: we can work on the timeline that the council would want us to work on given that we have a range of things that our zoning and development staff are working on in terms of zoning initiatives that are coming to us from the city council. so, we can find front-end whichever one of those items the council feels is the highest priority. the issue then is if we are advancing everything it will take a lot longer than if we can say this is the topmost priority, we move with this first. we can certainly do that, and it happens a lot faster than if we are trying to advance everything.
- >> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: motion to extend 30 minutes.
- >> Anthony Ivan Wilson, Clerk: on a motion.
- >> Burhan Azeem: yes.
- >> Dennis J. Carlone: yes.
- >> Alanna M. Mallon, Vice Mayor: yes.
- >> Patricia M. Nolan: yes.
- >> Sumbul Siddiqui, Mayor: yes.
- >> E. Denise Simmons: absent.

>> Paul F. Toner: yes.
>> Quinton Y. Zondervan, Chair: yes.
>> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: yes.
>> Anthony Ivan Wilson, Clerk: motion passes eight in favor one absent.

>> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: I want to return to discussion about a possible motion around the timeline.

>> Sumbul Siddiqui, Mayor: this was February, I think, 2020 the council held a roundtable to talk about legislative priorities where we went through our zoning priorities. I think alewife obviously was on there but then covid happen. I think to the question of how do we sequence. I'm wondering if there's some way to council can demonstrate to CDD, it can be here, but to say there is alewife and here is the rest of it. I guess I don't have a great sense of the long list that we have. and so, I think to make CDD's job easier telling them as far as legislative priorities and zoning priorities that alewife is number one. so, there is movement on this. I think some of it we just... I'm happy to call a round table. the council has been so busy with a number of other things, but I think that's what I'm hearing from assistant city manager Farooq. I'm wondering how we... what are the next steps should be on that. I am happy to call a roundtable, or we do it in this meeting.

>> Iram Farooq: through you Mr. chair I would say when the council held the roundtable and talked through their priorities that was actually... even though we didn't have a real clear 1, 2, 3, 4 we did have some semblance of understanding of where there was... greater weight was placed in more Councillors. it kind of gave us a sense of the council's priorities. at that point there were a lot of other things that actually were ahead of alewife and how we assessed the information. we can certainly provide to the council or to the ordinance committee the list of items that we have that we see on our plate summer coming from council there's always also understanding that if there is a zoning petition that is filed whether it comes from council or whether it comes from the community that almost always end up taking timeline precedence because it just has usually it has a timeline associated with it for when hearings have to be held and so forth. with that said just the sense of priorities... if I'm understanding correctly the message to us is that this is the top priority, and we should move this as fast as possible even if it means that some of the other things that we are working on are moved slightly lower in the priorities we are absolutely happy to do that. we can provide what that timeline might look like particularly also in this case given we're talking about a community process in addition to the writing of the zoning. we are certainly happy to do that with keeping in mind that this is the topmost priority and may be in our response we can provide a listing of all of the other items that we have on the list and that could be a catalyst then for discussion whether it's at this committee or at a roundtable.

>> Paul F. Toner: I just had a process question. I know I said I was intending to bring a policy order two weeks from now. we don't have a meeting this Monday. but I'm hearing all of these motions being made. Could I appropriately bring forward a request that we simply had the city manager directed the CDD to begin a community process as soon as possible rather than waiting two weeks to do that. if I have to wait two weeks I will. I didn't know what was appropriate to bring that up here?

>> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: Mr. Clerk correct me... I've been down this road a few times one of the things that will when you file a motion in a committee before that motion comes before the council and minutes have to be written that is important sometimes second can sometimes take longer to file within the committee and if you read it in.

>> Dennis J. Carlone: thank you Mr. chair. the plan as presented, the illustrated plan, does not show public amenities to a degree that is needed. which means we don't have urban design plan. that is essential to get what we are asking for to figure out where it is. yes, I know things change. the city has to buy land. you probably know this that the little open space that was shown on the plan was available for purchase months ago. nothing's happened. so that is all part of a plan. is developing a strategy... a purchase we have the bucks, do we have the guts to do what is necessary. the beautiful plan that was shown to us, lovely trees. it is not a full urban design plan. that has to happen. there is one senior urban designer who can lead that effort and that has to happen immediately, with the neighborhood as well as writing zoning. zoning gave us the triangle, by itself zoning. so, I just want to clarify it's broader than just writing zoning. thank you.

>> Patricia M. Nolan: I understand there's other things that get in the way. any plan for the quad be put on hold. and couldn't we just basically send the word out that this is number one priority and no other developments are going to be even considered and the council isn't even going to look them until zoning is done or should we do a citywide moratorium to get this done... I'm not really saying that. We have to send the message this has been on the boards for so many years. I talked to people who seem to think we can do this. this is not an overhaul zoning like Somerville did. if that took several years ago. as the planning board said last night a recent study was done. I would hope that we could do this quickly and I echo, I do think there is a high priority. This is the last part of the city and some of those projects that will... this has to take precedence because they can't move forward until this happens.

>> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: if folks are happy with the language again, I will repeat the city manager work with CDD and the city solicitor's office to report back to the city council on CDD's current zoning workload and how long CDD would need to it advance alewife zoning.

>> Anthony Ivan Wilson, Clerk: on that motion.

>> Burhan Azeem: yes.

>> Dennis J. Carlone: yes.

>> Alanna M. Mallon, Vice Mayor: yes.

>> Patricia M. Nolan: yes.

>> Sumbul Siddiqui, Mayor: yes.

>> E. Denise Simmons: absent.

>> Quinton Y. Zondervan, Chair: yes.

>> Paul F. Toner: yes.

>> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: yes.

>> Anthony Ivan Wilson, Clerk: motion passes eight in favor one person absent.

>> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: in motion by the vice mayor to adjourn. roll call.

>> Anthony Ivan Wilson, Clerk: on adjournment.

>> Burhan Azeem: yes.

>> Dennis J. Carlone: yes.

>> Alanna M. Mallon, Vice Mayor: yes.

>> Patricia M. Nolan: yes.

>> Sumbul Siddiqui, Mayor: yes.

>> E. Denise Simmons: absent.

>> Paul F. Toner: yes.

>> Quinton Y. Zondervan, Chair: yes.

>> Marc C. McGovern, Chair: yes.

>> Anthony Ivan Wilson, Clerk: motion passes eight in favor one absent.

That Article 20.90- Alewife Overlay Districts 1-6 of the Cambridge Zoning Ordinance be amended to insert a new section entitled Section 20.94.3- Temporarily prohibited uses. (ORDINANCE #2022-1)

A communication was received from Councillor Nolan, transmitting presentation for the Ordinance Committee meeting on March 9, 2022.