

MEMO

Date: 2/21/2019
To: CRA Board
From: Tom Evans, Executive Director
RE: 325 Main Street Schematic Design Review

Project Title: 325 Main Street Schematic Design (SD) Review Submission
Applicant: Boston Properties
Submission Prepared by: Pickard Chilton / Lemon Brooke / VHB

INTRODUCTION

The 325 Main Street Schematic Design (SD) review plans submitted on 1/7/2019 are for a mixed-use commercial office building with retail on the first, second and basement levels. The design of the proposed building contains about 343,000 square feet of office space and about 42,000 square feet of retail space. New and enhanced open spaces associated with the project could total as much as 27,000 square feet. No new vehicular parking is provided, and the building will maintain use of the existing below grade loading dock. The building is replacing a smaller mixed-use office/retail building of about 105,000 square feet and will be connected on 9 floors directly to the existing 355 Main Street building. One of the most significant proposed public benefits of the building is the public 2nd floor open space / retail terrace as well as the combination of staircases and elevators connecting the Plaza to the Roof Garden directly.

It is important to note that there are other significant public benefits contained within Phase 2 of the Infill Development Concept Plan (IDCP). While many of those components are not the focus of the 325 Main Street SD submission, IDCP elements triggered by 325 Main Street include housing production at 135 Broadway, open space enhancements at Broadway Park, and active transportation streetscape improvements on Broadway, Binney and Galileo Way.

CRA BOARD PROCESS TO DATE

1st Commercial Building B Schematic Design Review Book submitted:	9/6/2018
CRA Board Site Walking Tour:	9/12/2018
CRA Design Review Committee Presentation:	9/12/2018
Joint Planning Board / CRA Board Hearing:	10/2/2018
CRA Design Review Committee Presentation:	10/17/2018
CRA Design Review Committee Presentation:	11/14/2018
Joint Planning Board / CRA Board Hearing (IDCP approval):	12/4/2018
CRA Design Review Committee Presentation:	12/19/2018
2nd Commercial Building B Schematic Design submitted:	1/7/2019

The first design of the 325 Main Street building was reviewed in conjunction with the Infill Development Concept Plan (IDCP) amendment at a joint hearing of the CRA Board and Planning Board on 10/2/2018. Significant changes to the massing in response to that hearing were presented at two subsequent public CRA Design Review Committee meetings on 10/17/2018 and 11/14/2018. The November Design Review Committee meeting also included a presentation by Lemon Brooke regarding landscape architecture on the Roof Garden. The IDCP

amendment was approved by the CRA Board and Planning Board at a public hearing on 12/4/2018. Further refinements of specific building features including the staircase to the Roof Garden were discussed at a subsequent Design Review Committee meeting on 12/19/2018. Two Planning Board members participated in these Design Review Committee meetings.

The first portion of this memo focuses on evaluating the resubmission document dated 1/7/2019 with attention to building design issues for review and consideration. Some issues have been discussed in CRA Design Review Committee Meetings. At the end, next steps are outlined in the CRA Design Review and Document Approval Procedures (DRDAP).

A materials board was shown in a photo in the submission and delivered to CRA staff on 2/7/2019. The materials board should also include representative material samples of the directly connected building - 355 Main Street for context. For any future SD submissions by the Applicant, renderings should be photorealistic and not brushed or atmospheric.

325 MAIN STREET SCHEMATIC DESIGN DISCUSSION

325 Main Street Massing

- Roof Garden elevator: In response to feedback from prior Design Review Committee meetings, the Applicant has pushed the elevator to the Roof Garden west inside the building, opening up the gap between the new 325 Main Street and the Marriott to a greater extent than previous submissions. While the new placement of the elevator inside the building does preserve the viewshed from the Roof Garden to the Plaza, it hides the elevator too much. CRA would prefer that the elevator be legible peeking out of the façade of the building by 1-2 feet, and/or using a different type of glass and/or environmental graphics on the exterior to signal the presence of a public elevator. It is important to signify that a public elevator is available with the architecture not only via signage and wayfinding.
- Aperture insets and tenant outdoor terraces: The aperture insets with sloped glass and potential tenant outdoor terraces is a welcome addition to the façade. These serve to break up the flat planes of the massing and provide visual interest, particularly at night. The color expressed within these apertures is of concern and is discussed further in the materials and lighting sections of this memo. The aperture opening at the gasket between 355/325 Main Street is the only one with trees in the model and rendering. These trees are important in this location and create a subtle visual cue that could work in tandem with environmental graphics to draw people into the new public connector lobby and to the Roof Garden using an existing route. It is expected that these trees are not just in the rendering, but should be included in the planting plans. Because the aperture insets are called out as potential tenant terraces, GFA associated with the potential occupiable tenant terraces should be broken out separately in the Cover Letter. Only those occupiable tenant terraces labeled #2 on page 203 and on floors 4 and above would count as used GFA.
- Gasket between 325 & 355 Main Street: The gasket between the existing 355 Main Street and new 325 Main Street from level 3 and above has been continuously refined in response to feedback at Board meetings and CRA Design Review Committee meetings. The final gasket concept presented in the latest submission visually separates the building by deeply recessing the gasket away from Main Street to create a large aperture inset with a particularly large tenant terrace opportunity. This also increases legibility of the street wall by creating a visual cue for the location of the 325/355 connector and the commercial office entry lobbies. However, CRA needs further details on how that gasket area is resolved at the junction between the sloped glass and the existing building.

Façade Materials

Differentiation: Enclosure Type A1 and A2 do not appear substantially different enough to read as being differentiated surfaces from the ground. If the elemental building massing is supposed to represent two separate levels of parallelograms sliding away from the Marriott and shifting on top of each other, the enclosure types would need more contrast in some manner.

Retail façade: The materiality and massing of both the first and second levels of retail should read as one bi-level retail space from the street. In the proposed configuration, the change in glass and the terra cotta band between the first and second floors make the second level retail read as part of the office above. The ground floor retail also has a dark red aluminum band that is unnecessarily blocking the view of what will be a very deep retail space. Either the glass type on the second floor could change, the terra cotta band could move, or the recess could rise in whole or in part to be between the second and third floors.

Color: From the materials board on pages 56-59 the color of the (e) stack mullion in dark red aluminum, the color of the columns within the aperture insets, and (i) spandrel glass with matching dark red frit should be discussed by the Board in further detail. A strong dark red or black appearance may result in the building feeling unnecessarily subdued, and/or heavy. A dark red appearance also may provide insufficient contrast to the existing red brick masonry buildings that are very prominent on the block. Focus group research from the KSA (which included Cambridge high school students) indicates that Kendall Square would feel more inclusive, accessible and welcoming with more vibrant color and a bolder, more expressive, and less institutional feeling public realm. Not far away, several bright primary colors were used on each side of the new 75/125 Binney building façade with great success. The color inside the aperture insets do not all need to be the same color. Because these aperture insets are going to be highlighted at night with lighting, the coloring needs to be carefully considered and discussed by the Board. An example of a building either in Boston or elsewhere with a similar dark frit stripe pattern should be provided.

- Façade texture: The glass system proposed for 325 Main Street uses a butt glazed mullion which provides a cleaner façade appearance. However, despite the aperture insets, the façade still feels extremely flat. Exterior horizontal sun shade louver bands and/or light shelves could be considered to help to preserve the views and natural light, maximize glass area for the interior occupants while decreasing the solar heat gain in summer, and sufficiently add texture to the façade.
- Recesses: As shown in the SD submission, slanted glass aperture insets meet the façade at different points (either at the top of a spandrel, or at the bottom of a spandrel). The insets should meet the façade in a consistent way throughout the building.
- Clarifications – Materials labeled (g) and (f) on the materials sample board do not appear to be used anywhere in the façade diagrams. It is also unclear if the tenant chooses to install outdoor terraces in the aperture insets, what the materiality and design of those railing systems is and how it would change the façade. The material and color of the canopy above the 325/355 connector entrance with the square holes pushed through is unclear. It is unclear from the renderings if the terra cotta used on the band above the first-floor retail is the same terra cotta used on a band surrounding the MBTA head house, the 2nd floor roof terrace and on the walls adjacent to the staircases. Clarification is needed for all of these items.

Staircase, 2nd floor terrace, MBTA Headhouse, Kendall Plaza

- Redundant elevator at headhouse: The ground level entrance to the redundant elevator which also goes to the second-floor terrace is showing the elevator doors opening north instead of facing Main Street. This

may seem hidden to someone needing the elevator and looking at the staircase from Main Street. It would be potentially beneficial to have an elevator door opening on both sides. An additional door on the Main Street side would have a more direct and equitable visual relationship to the staircase and serve where most people will be coming from which is Main Street. A ground level vestibule for the elevator as shown may not be necessary. Additionally, in the basement level floor plan it is not clear where the passenger exits to get into the MBTA ticketing lobby. These should be addressed.

- Main Street overlook: The southernmost point of the terrace at Main Street should be widened and cantilevered from the building to create a more dramatic experience overlooking the sidewalk, which it had been in prior versions. CRA believes this is an important element of the 2nd floor outdoor terrace.
- Public vs retail delineation: The dotted outline of the public vs retail area of the 2nd level roof needs to be clarified and finalized. The dotted line is inconsistently applied across diagrams (1.4.7 pg. 41 vs. 1.5, pg. 82). The exact linework will become important in writing the public easement for the staircase and public areas of the second-floor rooftop. These items will need to be addressed.
- Greenery on stair and trees on 2nd level terraces: The proposed staircase to the Roof Garden is open to the sky all the way up and features wide stopping points along the way. These stopping points should feature small furniture. The greenery following the staircase from Main Street to the Roof Garden, and trees proposed in certain diagrams associated with the staircase and the second level terrace (1.4.10, pg 70) (1.5, pg 82, 88-93) are important in drawing people up to the Roof Garden which is the ultimate destination of the multi-tiered open space system we are connecting. CRA staff would like to see furniture at stopping points, see the trees proposed in the renderings near the stair to the Roof Garden shown in the planting plan, and understand the technical design details of how greenery will be achieved on the second level terrace and on the various staircases. This should include a planting schedule for the greenery along the stair and how it will be maintained.
- Private events: The newly improved Roof Garden and the larger areas of the second-floor terrace will be attractive to people and organizations hosting private events. Similarly to how picnic pavilions and sports fields can be reserved in more traditional City parks, a framework for utilizing privately owned public spaces (POPS) that act as public open spaces for private events should be created. Later in 2019, CRA staff will work on developing a framework for this in collaboration with CDD staff and property owners in Kendall Square. CRA staff will provide an update to the CRA Board at the appropriate time.
- Trellis: A plan for creative re-use of the trellis structure was not provided in this submission but should be provided. This re-use may include the grid, or the use of just the support towers without the grid. It may include art, lighting, a walkway or patio, seating, or other creative ideas.
- Second level terrace and glass railing: The glass railing system shown in the renderings will need to be detailed. There should always be a direct line of sight along the 2nd level terrace down to the Plaza, and should not feel trapped behind bushes. The retail-related seating is well spaced and generally unobtrusive to the public area of the roof. CRA staff appreciates and is supportive of the operable walls on the second level retail, which will help support activity on the second level by being a welcome summer attraction. The public programming zone on the second level is welcome (1.4.7, pg. 41).

Roof Garden

- Broadway look out: The Broadway side of the Roof Garden should have a look-out to Broadway and the Volpe site. In today's Roof Garden there is no way to walk up to the edge and look out to that direction of the City. The northeastern most corner of the Roof Garden should feature a cut out in the planter box allowing someone to have a view over Broadway and give people a reason to go to that corner. The cut

out should be large enough to be noticeable but small enough to maintain the sound dampening qualities the planter box provides to the Roof Garden.

- Programming: The greatly expanded Roof Garden programming schedule is a welcome commitment and CRA staff will work with the Applicant to keep iterating on the contents, hours and promotion of the programming over time to ensure it is successful. Storage may need to be added to the plan in order to store furniture and equipment to properly accommodate the planned and potential future programming. The Applicant should coordinate with MITIMCO's open space programming manager, and KSA's new Placemaking Working Group. The Applicant should continue to come to the CRA Board annually to present programming plan updates for all of the Kendall Center open spaces for feedback in the winter before each programming season. The Roof Garden should be considered a living laboratory and should be in a state of continuous change. It should adapt, remain relevant and creative, and not be limited by the shackles of consistency.
- Art & sculpture: CRA is very supportive of proposed locations and precedent images for public art – both three dimensional and painted murals. CRA is an active participant in the KSA which convened a series of focus groups last summer. The participants articulated an interest in more public art in Kendall Square that both expresses the physical manifestation of what it means to be the most innovative square mile on the planet, and also adds more bold color with a sense of playful wonder. A clear commitment to implementing a long-term public art vision for the Roof Garden should be made by the Applicant prior to the CofO for 325 Main Street.
- Lighting & sound: The lighting plan is excellent, it has a variety of different lighting systems that help break up the space and make certain zones feel more intimate while the subtle edge lighting on four sides frames the space. If the new extended hours are successful from June to September, CRA would encourage the Applicant to extend the summer late hours from May to October depending on weather in the spring and fall. Informed by CRA staff's prior experience with park programming, the Applicant should consider built-in sound on the lighting mast arms for simpler, more efficient and safer setup of movie nights or similar programming.
- Synthetic turf: CRA staff has worked on highly successful urban park designs in the past where a new generation of synthetic turf is used with positive results. If chosen properly, it can perfectly mimic sod, drain better, and handle more intensive more frequent use demanded by some of the programming proposed especially near the staircase/elevator portal.
- Coffee Cart: The coffee cart concept adds another reason for people to go up to the Roof Garden and is a welcome addition. However, the coffee cart might be more successful if it is closer to the stair/elevator for maximum exposure. The Applicant should experiment with the best location.
- Tenant bridge: CRA staff is supportive of the compact size and subtle placement of the tenant bridge. This demure scale and placement hidden within larger planting beds helps keep the Roof Garden from feeling like a private extension of the new 325 Main Street building.

Retail Plan

- Retail entrances: Four "possible entrance" locations are labeled to/from the retail on the Kendall Plaza side and the Main Street side with no doors yet indicated on the architectural plan. Only one door is indicated on the ground floor plan near the public restrooms. It is expected that at least the quantity of doors shown as possible will be present on both the Kendall and Main Street sides of the ground floor retail. A minimum number of doors should be committed to by the Applicant on each side of the building.

Exact door locations should be selected. The design of the doors and their scale and integration into the retail facade needs to be shown.

- Program in the 325/355 connector: Based on the layout plan (6.2, pg. 223) there is no longer a coffee kiosk inside the connector space as exists today. The proposed new furniture layout needs further details and should contain a broader variety of furniture types and a more inventive layout than in the drawing. A direct pathway between the north and south doors in the connector should be maintained by the furniture layout. It is noted on page 220, that this space will include free public Wi-Fi, and may include public art displays or publicize programming on the roof garden, all of which is encouraged by CRA. Furniture should be laid out in a way that preserves the interior eastern wall for public art as indicated on page 220. This commitment should be included in BP's annual Kendall Center programming report to the CRA Board.
- Design within the 325/355 connector: The CRA holds an easement through this space, which will not be impacted. CRA staff is supportive of the existing sliding glass wall being maintained for warm weather use. The second level retail appears to be open-air with a glass railing looking down on the double-height space, which will help make the second level of retail more legible, but this design needs clarification. The Applicant should thoughtfully consider if or where the existing ceiling art lighting feature in the current connector can be salvaged or reused indoors or outdoors.
- Basement retail: There is no access indicated to get to and from the basement retail on the ground floor floorplan. An elevator at minimum or an elevator and stair will be required. A direct retail access from the MBTA head house should also be explored similar to Downtown Crossing.
- Public restrooms: The two single-use public restrooms provided may not be enough capacity to serve both the typical restroom demand from the Plaza as well as the scale of the ground floor retail space especially if the ground floor tenant is a food and beverage use.
- Second floor terrace retail doors: The folding walls on the 2nd floor terrace will only be open in good weather during warm months. There are no access doors labeled in the plan to access the retail from the second level terrace when the operable walls are closed. This should be resolved.

Circulation, Transportation

- Loading dock: The 9/14/2018 VHB memo to TPT (#6, pg. 15) states, "The details of loading will be submitted as part of the design Review process." However, the submission does not contain more detailed information about the use of the subsurface loading docks. With 355 and 325 Main Street under a single tenancy and connected on many floors, CRA would like to see as much loading and unloading as possible for 355 Main Street commercial and retail be moved out of Pioneer Way and consolidated into the subsurface loading dock for 325 Main Street. The commercial *and* retail tenants at the new 325 Main Street should all be using the subsurface loading dock. If this arrangement is not possible, CRA would like an explanation in a more thorough loading dock management plan that includes 355 Main.
- Width and location of doors on 325/355 connector: The width of the doors on the north and south side of the 325/355 connector have shrunk from the existing condition. On the south side, there are more doors overall which is good for the increased foot traffic, but the door width on the north entrance from Pioneer Way should not shrink. In the submission, the doors on the north side are also shifted to be off-center from the doors on the south side, and should be moved back to aligning with the Green Garage stairway doors. The vestibule on the north side creates potential dead corners within the interior space that should be eliminated for security reasons.

- Pioneer Way weather protection & lighting: The current existing outdoor weather protection awning in Pioneer Way connecting the Green Garage stair/elevator core to the 325/355 connector and the former Coop Food Court appears to be removed in the plans. The lighting on the western most section of Pioneer Way near Ames Street is much improved due to the recent 88 Ames residential project, but lighting on this section of Pioneer Way remains a concern. A replacement awning proposal and a revised lighting plan for this portion of Pioneer Way should be provided. The new Pioneer Way string lights should be extended further down the alley toward the new 325 Main Street.
- Basement bicycle storage: The potential routes to and from the basement level bicycle storage facility are circuitous by either elevator or staircase. Cyclists are instructed to take the one passenger elevator that goes to the basement to get to and from the bike room, but the bike room entrance door does not line up with that elevator. The bike room door should be moved to align directly with the elevator cyclists will be instructed to use, and that elevator should have clear signage in the lobby level to indicate it is the elevator to the bike room. The bike room storage door should be a glass automatic slide-open door to make it as easy as possible to go in and out of the hallway and to ensure the room is visible from the hallway. All or a majority of the bike room/hallway wall should be glass to enhance safety and security. All of the doors cyclists need to go through on the path to the elevator from the sidewalk should be extra wide and have power assist. Additionally, the plan view and adjacent axonometric view of the bike storage room on the same page do not match in size, layout or number of spaces (1.4.7, pg. 39). This will need to be clarified and resolved.

As an alternative, CRA has observed extremely low utilization of the existing three-floor 88 Ames residential bicycle garage in Pioneer Way and would support the shared use of this underutilized facility between both the office and residential buildings. This would be a superior location and bicycle parking access point for 325 Main Street employees compared to the proposed basement plan. Such a shared use bike parking arrangement would need to be discussed with the Planning Board at the hearing on 2/26/2019.

- Width between MBTA headhouse & ground floor retail: Page 77 (1.4.10) shows a 9' and 14' entrance gap, but it appears to narrow further with an unlabeled dimension that is considerably smaller than that. CRA staff would like the Applicant to investigate pulling back the northwest corner of the headhouse wall in order to widen the pinch point. On a recent site visit, this appeared reasonably possible while maintaining the MBTA's ability to close the head house at night. This should be addressed. The look and feel of the area between the stair and the MBTA on the ground, especially the materials and lighting design should be provided. This area will need to be carefully designed to feel safe and be legible as a corridor. A rendering from eye level within this space would be helpful.
- Second floor elevator access to Roof Garden: There is no door on the 2nd floor plans for someone going from the 2nd floor roof terrace to access the elevator to the Roof Garden. The folding walls will only be operable in good weather in warm months, so a clearly labeled set of doors should be added to the plans.
- Look & feel of three key building gateways: Renderings of the Pioneer Way nook of the building at eye level are necessary. This should show doors to the 325/355 connector, as well as to the ground floor retail and the Green Garage elevator vestibule. Renderings of the trellis nook entrance to the ground floor retail at eye level are also necessary. Renderings of the narrow space between the MBTA headhouse and ground floor retail are also important. These are the three least understood but important building interfaces that need further consideration by the CRA.

Architectural Lighting

- Lighting on staircase, elevator, 2nd floor terraces: The architectural and pathway lighting on the staircase, elevator, and second floor terraces should be just as pronounced if not more pronounced than the building. This should be addressed, and should be brought to the CRA Design Review Committee for input. Lighting for the public areas may need to be different than the building to signify that these areas are not owned by the occupants. Lighting for the nook underneath the trellis at the northeastern-most door to the building, lighting for the passageway between the MBTA head house and the building, as well as the nook at the Pioneer Alley entrance needs to be discussed further and thoughtfully considered.
- Architectural lighting: It is unclear if the lighting proposed is white light reflecting a dark red color from the frit pattern, or red light. This is an important distinction that will need to be clarified to the Board. In general, CRA is supportive of architectural lighting. In multiple planning documents such as the K2 and Envision Plans, Kendall Square is highlighted as one of great innovation districts of the world, a primary driver of regional economic growth, jobs and tax revenue. It makes sense for a commercial district of such stature have the night time presence to match. Architectural lighting is elegantly used in the iconic skylines of the world – from the Chrysler Building to the Space Needle, the Prudential Tower to the Eifel Tower. The K2 Design Guidelines (pg. 19) and the IDCP Design Guidelines (pg. 307) both encourage lighting to enhance a building’s architectural expression including in recessed soffits or bays, to make distinct building tops more legible, to highlight a building’s unique identity or to reduce apparent scale. CRA staff is supportive of the horizontal light bands and the lighting of the aperture insets as shown on the submission. The architectural lighting is appropriately reduced on the north-facing side which is visible from the East Cambridge neighborhood. All façade architectural lighting should be dimmable.
- Lighting renderings: architectural lighting renderings should always be provided with a realistic sense of the operational background lighting that will inevitably be on inside the building. A building will never appear perfectly black on the skyline as shown.
- CRA Design Review Committee: The Committee discussed principles for architectural lighting at the 1/16/2019 meeting. The group developed the following outline:
 - o Public amenities and spaces should be part of the architectural lighting plan, not only the building
 - o In the future, a uniform shutoff time should be considered for architectural lighting in Kendall Square, with a differential for when a building is directly adjacent to or across the street from a residential building
 - o Within Kendall Square, the designation of blocks as primary architectural lighting locations or background architectural lighting locations would help create a hierarchy within a major urban commercial center. Primary would be allowed to have more and/or be brighter, while background would be allowed to have less and/or be dimmer.
 - o If the lighting is tracing the architecture with a thin strip of light, it should be as subtle and as dim as possible in order to be seen from a reasonable distance
 - o Color in architectural lighting is ok
 - o A dimmability feature should be required
 - o Minimize uplighting or shield uplighting in accordance with dark sky standards
 - o Maintenance is important, a coherent scheme can turn into a failure quickly

- Understanding what the architectural lighting scheme will look like with the building's operational lighting in the same rendering is important to inform decisions, the building should not be presented as a black box
- Shielding for all parking garage lighting should be required

Signage, Wayfinding, Environmental Graphics

- The signage, wayfinding and environmental graphics can and should include locations more ambitious in size than what is shown (1.6, pg. 97). Today the Roof Garden is signified by not only a sign but a graphic of green vines going up the entire existing building on Main Street as well as the Green Garage at Pioneer Way and Broadway. Similarly, the environmental graphics for the public amenities can be significantly larger in scope and bolder in creativity. This is especially true at walls adjacent to staircases. CRA will need to review detailed signage, wayfinding and environmental graphics related to:
 - Going to and from the Roof Garden through existing 325/355 Connector (the current condition)
 - Public restrooms
 - New staircase and elevators to/from Roof Garden and to/from the second floor roof terrace
 - Pioneer Way
 - MBTA

Infrastructure Resiliency & Sustainability

- Kendall Station resiliency measures: CRA staff would like to see trench drains surrounding the MBTA headhouse and on-site storage for mobile flood barriers, as recommended in the 2015 Environmental Impact Report.
- Rooftop solar and green roof plan: The shading and labeling on 4.7 pg. 203 is confusing and is not clear on the difference between green and red shading. Numbers 1 and 4 are labeled the same thing – potential PV and potential solar roof. If all three could be solar PV, would that change the details of the array capacity in that maximum configuration vs the minimum configuration? If solar PV is not possible in all three areas, would the remaining no-PV areas be green roofs, or nothing at all?

Construction Staging

On 1/11/2019, CRA staff reviewed and commented on a draft copy of the Construction Management Plan for 325 Main Street via email. CRA staff looks forward to reviewing the final draft prior to demolition work beginning.

Miscellaneous clarifications

- The loading dock doors on the basement level plan do not appear to properly line up with walls or openings.
- The new MBTA elevator and elevator machine room does not appear to have any openings into the MBTA station lobby on the drawing.
- Details of the look and feel of the FCC and emergency egress doors on the Main Street façade should be provided.
- Material sample of the pavers ringing the base of the building at the sidewalk should be provided.
- Is the tenant's existing bike cage in the Green Garage going to remain?
- Are some or all of the bus shelters being put back? The shuttles that operate there today may not need as many since the MBTA buses were moved down the curb several years ago.

NEXT STEPS

Once the CRA Board approves an SD submission, the CRA Staff will write an SD phase approval letter with conditions as instructed by the CRA Board. The next steps in the CRA's Design Review and Document Approval Procedures (DRDAP) would be for the Applicant to submit Design Development (DD) drawings for CRA Staff review and approval, and then Construction Documents (CD) for CRA Staff review and approval. This includes providing CRA Staff with a materials board and designing and building out an outdoor mock-up for review by CRA Staff and CRA Board members. See Attachment 2 for the DRDAP Standard Process Map.

ATTACHMENTS

Attached to this memo for the Board's reference are:

- Document review memo from Charles Redmon, the CRA's urban design consultant, regarding the 1/7/2019 Schematic Design Review submission
- CRA Design Review and Document Approval Procedures (DRDAP) Standard Process Map for Building Design Review

It should be noted that Staff Review memorandum from City department staff will be provided to the Board and posted on the CRA website.

Charles Redmon, FAIA/Urban Design

DESIGN REVIEW NOTES: 325 Main Street Commercial Building Design Review Resubmission Issued January 7, 2019

Date: January 31, 2019

Specific Comments

I reviewed the Design Review Resubmission by Pickard Chilton for Boston Properties. They were dated January 7, 2019.

In general, I found this documents to be very professional and complete. I have the following specific comments about 325 Main Street:

1. Building B Overall Massing:

- The overall building massing has been refined and improved. The new corner indentions add another level of scale to the elevations. However, the general stacking of base, middle and top still seem awkward: with the 4:4:10 proportions. Using 4:3:11 would be more elegant and vertical in my view, thus the middle would read more like a belt rather than a comber bun. See page 35, South Elevation. I believe this revision would also resolve some odd massing relationship on the North and East Elevations.

2. Design of the Gasket between 325 and 255:

- Adjusting the massing as described above would also provide more breathing room for the Gasket to sit between 325 and 355. I would further suggest that the top level for the gasket be the 9th floor rather than the 10th floor. See page 49. This would further separate the 325 from 355 and allow the gap between them to be more transparent. In addition a new, accurate section should be drawn through the gasket, between columns lines 1.1 and 1.2. See pages 37 and 38.

3. Building Enclosure:

- The different building enclosure treatments in Section 1.4.8 look very interesting, dramatically articulating the distinctive façade zones of the building. It would be nice to see the actual materials in a sample panel; particularly the color of the sloped soffit on page 62. I also believe more consistency in the transition to the sloped soffit needs further study. See page 68, should the slope begin below the spandrel?

4. Ground Level Circulation:

- The ground level pedestrian circulation diagrams clearly show the movement patterns on the proposed ground floor, but fail connect it to the proposed critical garage pathway through from Broadway to Main Street, see page 64. It would also serve to reinforce the specific locations of vestibules of the ground level lobby of 325. I would suggest that the vestibule to the lobby from Pioneer Way be increased and aligned with the Main Street vestibule, shown on page 75.

5. Connector to the Roof Garden:

- The revised design of the Kendall Plaza Connector to the Roof Garden is much improved and should become a major civic element. The revised upper staircase is particularly appealing. Likewise I hope Alternative 2 on page 85 can be achieved. In Section 2.3 the section though Kendal Plaza shows a very solid and large balcony railing; I assume that is a mistake, as it should be transparent and lower.

Charles Redmon, FAIA/Urban Design

6. Signage:

- The upper level Retail Signage Zone shown on pages 94 and 95 seem very excessive and should be reconsidered. How large is the area of the actual sign within the zone?

7. Lighting:

- The façade exterior lighting strategy shown on pages 98 and 99 appears very dramatic and interesting. I would suggest they be presented on a façade showing typical interior office lighting to more realistically present the concept.

8. Landscape:

- The proposed streetscape landscape treatment is quite elegant and should be a much needed enhancement of the Main Street/Kendall Plaza environment. Again Alternative 2 shown on page 110 is preferred.
- The proposed revisions to the Roof Garden both should enhance the character of this amenity and provide for a wider range of uses appealing to the public.

Overall, I was impressed with the Design Review Resubmission of 325 as presented; however, I recommend that the designers further address the issues outlined above.

I look forward to further discussions and review of these new and exciting commercial building planned for the Kendall Square built environment.



Submitted by: Charles Redmon, FAIA, CR/UD

Attachment 2: Standard Process Map for Building Design Review

CRA Board / Planning Board

CRA Staff / CDD Staff

