

**Nadia Khan**

---

**From:** Lisle Baker <councilorbaker@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 16, 2020 12:32 PM  
**To:** Rick Lipof  
**Cc:** Richard Lipof; Nadia Khan; Susan Albright; David A. Olson; R. Lisle Baker; Pamela Wright  
**Subject:** Re: parking waiver for Union Street

[DO NOT OPEN links/attachments unless you are sure the content is safe. ]

Policy aside, here is the condition as drafted:

*The Petitioner shall not lease any of the existing parking stalls on site to those not associated with their tenant spaces for any non-accessory use.*

I believe the following strengthen it. We were trying to avoid these stalls becoming part of the City's shared parking for those outside the site when there are so few spaces on site.

*The Petitioner shall not lease or license any of the existing parking stalls on the site subject to this waiver to parking users not associated with the Petitioner's tenants, and shall include in any tenant leases the same limitation, so that the existing parking stalls shall be preserved for use by Petitioner's tenants alone.*

If you, Law and Planning concur, perhaps this could be a floor amendment offered by you tonight, or I could offer it, depending on how you want to proceed.

Note I still am concerned about the total waiver itself, but we should make this work best.

Thanks.

Lisle

On March 15, 2020 at 11:11 PM Rick Lipof <rlipof@lipofres.com> wrote:

It may not may not be needed. I will talk to Lisle tomorrow.

Rick

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 15, 2020, at 10:49 PM, Lisle Baker <councilorbaker@comcast.net> wrote:

[DO NOT OPEN links/attachments unless you are sure the content is safe. ]

Dear Rick:

It was not clear to me that the restaurant was omitted from the waiver request. Did the Petitioner seek an increase over the last request? Also, I can understand consolidating current demand, but I am cautious about allowing increases this way. Can you or someone clarify that?

**Also, the last condition is a little unclear though its intent is sound. I cannot copy it here as it is a PDF, but can it be made clear that leasing or licensing of an existing physical space may not be done to others than tenants of the landlord, through the city's shared parking program or otherwise. I believe the Land Use Committee wisely wanted to make sure that all the existing spaces were not available to be diverted to other users than tenants of the applicant. To allow you to respond or propose an edit to the last condition for clarification, I'd like the item on second call.**  
**Thanks, Lisle**

**When responding, please be aware that the Massachusetts Secretary of State has determined that most email is public record and therefore cannot be kept confidential.**