

MIT Responses to CDD Memo

September 12, 2017

MIT In Agreement with CDD Memo (Sept 7)

Issue	Potential City Approach	MIT Response
Sustainability Plan	Require preliminary submission with Development Proposal	✓
Architectural Character Plan	Requirements for approval (needs definition)	✓
Pre-application Conference	Review of architectural character	✓
Uses Language	Clarify and consolidate language	✓
FAR Calculation	Clarify how FAR is calculated, and calculate using Development Parcel as a whole	✓
Exempted GFA	Cap innovation and retail space to avoid unintended issues	✓
GSA Building Not Subject to Linkage Payments	Incentive zoning contributions are not required for any government buildings	✓
Floor plate Size at Taller Heights	Upper floorplates should be smaller than lower floorplates	✓
Mitigating and Shielding Mechanical Penthouses	Implement strategies to mitigate and shield mechanical penthouses	✓
Criteria for Height Review for Buildings above 250'	Apply criteria for height review above the streetwall	✓
Public Access at All Times	Consider implementing a covenant to guarantee public access	✓
Federal Government Land Counts up to 20% of Open Space	Consider requiring the calculation NOT include open space on Federal parcel	✓

MIT In Agreement with CDD Memo (Sept 7)

Issue	Potential City Approach	MIT Response
Importance of Family Friendly Open Space	Open space should create an identifiable civic center within Kendall per the Cambridge Volpe Working Group	✓
Need to Limit Parking On-Site	Consider implementing different parking ratios after shared parking study completed during the development review process	✓
All parking should be Below Grade except for on-Street	Include clarifying statement regarding parking being constructed below-grade except for on-street	✓
Better Understanding of Transportation Issues	Incorporate transportation study requirement from 2015 proposal	✓
Understand more about the Grand Junction Corridor	Transportation study to analyze present and future regional connections including the Grand Junction corridor	✓
Retail needs to serve broader Community, including affordable dining options	Explore non-zoning commitments regarding the specific types of retailers who will be sought and the process for community involvement in ongoing retail programming	✓
Consider more than 65% active-use frontage	Consider whether buildings should have some active-use requirements (park spaces or internal public connections)	✓
5,000 SF too high for small scale	Consider changing to 3,000 SF threshold	✓
Concern about hotel lobby as active-use	Include in a clarified definition of “active uses”	✓
Need local, independent business but also a mix	Explore non-zoning commitments regarding the specific types of retailers who will be sought and the process for community involvement in ongoing retail programming	✓

MIT In Agreement with CDD Memo (Sept 7)

Issue	Potential City Approach	MIT Response
Kid friendly retail is needed	Explore non-zoning commitments regarding the specific types of retailers who will be sought and the process for community involvement in ongoing retail programming	✓
Important for the site, including retail, to be welcoming to the community	Explore non-zoning commitments regarding the specific types of retailers who will be sought and the process for community involvement in ongoing retail programming	✓
Retail plan and space must be able to be flexible for changes over time	Incorporate criteria for the review of retail marketing and tenanting strategies as part of the development master plan approval process	✓
Innovation space promotes “elite co-working space”	Explore non-zoning commitments to more explicit criteria for innovation space	✓
Need to improve sustainability measure requirements	Incorporate site-level sustainability planning and approval criteria into the development review process	✓
Sustainability should be part of urban design guidelines	See above	✓
Community Center needs more explanation	Provide a clearer definition of community space and a framework for how it would fit within an overall development plan for the site, along with its intended purpose and criteria for review as a component of a development master plan	✓
Mitigation of truck traffic impacts should apply to 303 Third St.	Clarify that truck traffic impact mitigation extends to residential uses in adjacent districts as well	✓

Details to be Worked Out

Issue	Potential City Approach	MIT Response
Flexibility for more housing	Add flexibility on height, open space, etc. to allow more residential without reducing commercial	Will consider implementing more flexible language

Discuss Further

Issue	Potential City Approach	MIT Response
Master Plan Area/minimum development parcel size	Development Parcel to result in single development master plan (including specification of government lots)	Increase parcel size, but maintain multi-site approach
Middle Income Housing	Provide flexibility for middle income housing	Study Further
Iconic Identification	Should architectural beauty or another criteria be used?	Discuss Further
Site should have early childhood education spaces	Should childhood education spaces be included in active-use exemption?	Community Center
Noise standards are difficult to apply and lighting should be included	Incorporate provisions for the review of noise and lighting, along with strategies to mitigate potential impacts and nuisance, as part of the development review process	Review with noise and lighting ordinances
Concern about negative effects of glass facades – suitability and aesthetics	Incorporate best sustainability practices in design guidelines and ongoing review processes	Design Guidelines and Sustainability Plan

Position Explanation

Issue	Potential City Approach	MIT Response
Hotel as residential use	Provide flexibility for hotel uses, or develop other creative options	Consider 50-50, affordable housing contribution, open to other ideas
Institutional use	Create rules governing conversion from taxable to non-taxable	Covered by existing PILOT Agreement
Single 500' building vs. multiple buildings at same height	Concern about single 500' building and if there are other ways to "celebrate" the site	Allows for more housing on site
Affordable Housing Percentage	Should this lock in at PUD-Zoning?	Need predictability on all zoning commitments
20% Affordable Housing	Is 20% the correct standard for mixed-use developments?	Correct Standard for Mixed-Use Developments - creates 280 permanently affordable units