

## Joint CRA Board and Cambridge Planning Board Meeting

Tuesday, October 2, 2018, 6:30 p.m.

City Hall Annex – Second Floor, 344 Broadway, Cambridge, MA

---

### APPROVED Meeting Minutes

---

#### Call

At 6:39 p.m., Theodore Cohen, Chair of the Cambridge Planning Board (PB) called the meeting to discuss PB only business. At 7:26 p.m., Mr. Cohen explained that there would now be a joint public hearing, with the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority Board, of special permit application case PB #315 for the property located at 145 Broadway, 325 Main Street, 250 Binney Street and 255 Main Street. Boston Properties Limited Partnership (BxP) is seeking special permits pursuant to Sections 14.32.2.5 and 12.37. This is a major amendment to the Infill Development Concept Plan (IDCP) in the Mixed-Use Development (MXD) District to relocate commercial gross floor area (GFA) of Building B from 250 Binney Street to 325 Main Street; to relocate retail GFA from below grade to the ground floor or above grade; to reallocate some Infill GFA from 145 Broadway to 325 Main Street; and to revise the vehicle parking plan by reducing the construction of new vehicle parking spaces. Both the PB and the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority (CRA) have jurisdiction of this area.

CRA Chair Kathleen Born called the Special Meeting of the CRA. Other CRA Board members present were Vice Chair Margaret Drury, Assistant Treasurer Conrad Crawford, and Assistant Secretary Barry Zevin. CRA Treasurer Christopher Bator was unable to attend. Executive Director Tom Evans, Project Director Jason Zogg, and other CRA staff members were present. Ms. Born said that the CRA has shared the communications from the East Cambridge Planning Team (ECPT), as well as a CRA staff review and a report of the project by CRA design consultant Charles Redmon. Public comment will be taken after the proponent's comments. The CRA is recording the meeting.

Mr. Cohen noted that there were only five members of the PB present in addition to himself - Tom Sieniewicz, Mary Flynn, Hugh Russell and Corrine Espinoza. Mr. Cantalupa from BxP said that BxP was prepared to move forward. With respect to the PB's purview, Mr. Cohen said that it would not be appropriate to take up the design review of the building if an IDCP amendment vote does not occur to allow a building to be built on the proposed location. Without a vote on the IDCP, any discussion of the proposed building is advisory and has no effect on the ultimate determination of the design review when it occurs. He also added that, as stated in the ordinance, a design review committee will be made of CRA and PB representatives. Mr. Sieniewicz and Mr. Russel will be sitting on that committee. Ms. Born said that there is a public design review committee meeting on Wednesday, October 17, at 4:00 p.m. at the Cambridge Police Station, 125 Sixth Street.

Jeff Roberts, Cambridge Community Development Department Director of Zoning and Development, said that there was a preapplication meeting on July 31, 2018. As a reminder, this case stems from the 2015 zoning amendment to the MXD district. This is a special district within the Cambridge zoning ordinance which establishes development controls for the site of the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan, overseen by the CRA. Up until that amendment, development in the district was capped at a little over three million square feet. Before 2001, development was subject to review solely by the CRA. Since then, the PB started reviewing some development in the district as part of the project review special permit provisions.

The 2015 zoning amendment was based on the work of the K2 study for Kendall Square, which covered an area including the MXD district as well as other parts of Kendall Square. Zoning changes for various sub-districts have been adopted incrementally over time. However, these all follow a similar theme of allowing additional capacity for commercial growth while leveraging that growth to provide additional housing, retail, and active uses at the

ground floor along major streets, shared innovation space for smaller companies and start-ups, increased sustainable development standards, and contributions to transportation and open space improvements. The K2 study also established guidelines for development review that covers a range of topics including site planning, built form and massing, ground floor design, façade treatments, open space, and streetscapes. In the materials provided for this meeting, there are links to such relevant documents.

The 2015 MXD zoning amendment permitted an additional one million square feet of development in the district on top of the earlier limitation, split 60/40 between commercial and residential uses, with requirements described earlier and discussed in more detail in the CDD staff memo. It also required approval of an IDCP. This was a new concept in the zoning ordinance but works similarly to a Planned Unit Development (PUD) in that it grants a single special permit for multiple phased development across multiple building sites. The IDCP identifies future development sites along with their intended uses, gross floor area, their heights and overall massing, and includes plans for open space, transportation, retail programming, sustainable development, and project phasing. The PB's approval criteria for the IDCP are the same as for a PUD. The main focus is on assessing whether the plan is in general conformance with the planning and guidelines established for the district, in this case, through the K2 planning effort. There is also an assessment of whether the impacts of the additional development are appropriately counterbalanced by the public improvements that will result. When the PB grants a special permit, the conditions of the special permit lay out a set of rules for how development will proceed. The zoning also allows the IDCP to be amended over time, like a PUD.

In 2017, the PB first approved the IDCP for the district by granting a special permit with a set of conditions. A proposed major amendment to the IDCP, its first proposed major amendment, is now before the PB. This follows the same procedure as the original special permit and the same approval criteria apply as the original special permit. One thing that's different from other PUDs is that the CRA Board also needs to approve the IDCP under its purview of the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan. The zoning requires at least one joint meeting of the PB and CRA Board to review the application, which is happening at this meeting. After this meeting, the boards could decide to meet again jointly or could continue their deliberations separately. Ultimately, each board will independently decide on the proposal.

After a special permit is granted approving an IDCP, and after the CRA Board has approved it, individual building sites are subject to design review and approval by both the PB and the CRA, but there are no additional special permits needed. This is, again, similar to the PUD process. As stated previously, the applicant has submitted an amendment to the IDCP and also a design review package for one of the buildings. This application process is typical for PUDs where there is an anticipated early phase of development, but the Board still needs to complete the process of granting the special permit to approve the amended IDCP before granting approval for the design review. In the design review process, the CRA has appointed a Design Review Committee, which is a subset of its Board, that meets on a continuing basis to review designs as they progress. The current IDCP special permit allows the PB to appoint up to two members to sit with this Design Review Committee for projects that are within the IDCP.

Mr. Zogg added that from a CRA perspective, Section 504 of the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan (KSURP) requires that an IDCP be prepared and all development must conform to it. The most recent IDCP was approved in Q1 2017, with three phases. Phase 1, with 145 Broadway and Sixth Street Walkway improvements, is currently underway. The CRA Board needs to vote on the BxP proposed major amendment to the IDCP for phase 2 which includes shifting GFA to 325 Main Street, the general massing, the retail plan, the relationship to the public realm including improvements to associated and adjacent streets, open spaces like the Plaza and the Roof Garden, preservation of pedestrian circulation, wind and shadow, and other operational improvements to the block necessitated by impacts from the development to the 325 Main site. The CRA Board would need to find that the amendment is in conformance with urban renewal plan. The Board can either approve the amendment, conditionally approve the amendment, request changes for resubmission, or disapprove the application. If the Board conditionally approves the amendment, the Board may delegate a review of conditions to CRA staff and/or the design review committee. The 325 design book was submitted at the same time as the IDCP amendment but this would become relevant only after the IDCP is approved. The CRA process with detailed building design is different than that of the PB. The CRA does a schematic design (SD) approval for each individual building and any open space improvements associated with it. The CRA has the same options for approval as that for the IDCP. Once the SD approval is given by the CRA Board for an individual building, the building then has two more

formal written reviews but with CRA staff only - Design Development (DD) approval, followed by Construction Documents (CD) approval. CRA staff can bring issues back to the CRA Board if necessary during both of these approval processes. The developer may apply for a building permit for vertical construction after the DD phase approval but may not receive the actual building permit until CD approval. If the CRA approves the IDCP major amendment, the focus would shift to SD review and approval of the detailed design and architecture for 325 Main Street. If the IDCP major amendment is approved, BxP said that the SD phase documents for the residential tower on the Blue Garage would be ready for CRA review in 2019. The CD and DD reviews have included CDD staff members Jeff Roberts and Suzannah Bigolin.

Mr. Cantalupa from BxP thanked both boards for today's meeting and the prehearing meeting on July 31 that helped BxP flush-out some issues. He started his presentation showing aerial views of Kendall Center to give a perspective on the appropriateness of the density of BxP's proposed Phase 2 buildings relative to what has already been approved for the three city-block area. The views included the almost completed Phase 1 buildings of Proto (residential) and Akamai (commercial), MIT's five buildings which were approved at the time of BxP's initial IDCP master plan submission which are in various stages of construction, BxP's two proposed buildings for Phase 2, and conjectural schematic massing for the MIT buildings on the Volpe Site. He added that the proposed density in the area is consistent with the K2 plan. He emphasized that the proposed submission is a package which includes twenty-five percent affordability, the largest amount in a single project in the city. This exceeds the minimum amount of required housing but can only be accomplished with the proposed commercial project since the economics is so challenged. The proposal includes a design for new stair access from Main Street to the Roof Garden on top of the East Garage. He hopes to partner with the T. Mr. Cantalupa said that the movement from Broadway to Main Street is more difficult because BxP does not control the hotel and garage. He is open to studying it and working with the Boards. He added that the workforce is changing and desires large contiguous floorplates which result in the proposed building's massing.

Mr. Michael Tilford, from BxP, spoke about the highlights of the 400-page book submission. He noted that there are designers and consultants in attendance to answer specific questions. Public presentation about the amendment started in May 2018. All the meetings have been helpful in refining the project, including a joint pre-application hearing on July 31 and an Existing Conditions tour on September 12. He showed a picture of the 3 phases of the IDCP. The amendment moves the same amount of GFA from 250 Binney Street to 325 Main Street. The team focused on environmental issues, such as traffic, parking, wind, noise, shadow, and thermal comfort. The proposal incorporates feedback on the masterplan to ensure a mix of uses, to increase public realm connectivity, to design with environmental impacts in mind, to create public space for net public benefits, and to give an overview of phase 2 residential. With respect to the 325 Main Street design, focus was given to massing refinements, relationship to adjacent buildings, retail and public amenities, and the design of the Plaza to Roof Garden connection. BxP is "breaking up the super-block" by enhancing the connection from Ames Street to the Plaza via Pioneer Way, connecting the Plaza to Broadway which is dependent on a third party, and vertically connecting the Plaza to the Roof Garden. Mr. Tilford showed a chart of the three-phased public benefits to the sum of at least \$200 million in transportation mitigations, open space enhancements, and housing. He noted that there is an overlap of the master plan and the building design especially with respect to the public realm benefit of connecting the Plaza to the Roof Garden in the building's design.

George Needs, from BxP, spoke about the 135 Broadway residential building proposed for delivery as the mixed-use component of Phase 2. This building was approved as part of the original master plan. According to the presentation materials, Phase 2 is composed of 57% residential (41% market-rate, 16% income restricted), 36% commercial, and 7% innovation space. The 350,000 square foot building is 34 stories with 70-80 condominium units and 275-285 rental units. He emphasized that as part of the master plan, BxP must deliver 20% condominium housing and this is all going into this one building. This is a complicated construction project as the building is situated on the south end of the already existing North Garage. BxP is currently studying taking down two bays, minimizing the impact to the garage while preserving as many parking spaces as possible; this will be addressed in the design review phase. This is a bar building that has a north-to-south orientation which uses the full 350-foot height limit concentrated on the south side, away from the East Cambridge neighborhood. There are currently two lobbies but BxP is exploring the possibility for a shared lobby. The building is fronted by Broadway Park which provides a connection to Broadway. A new Broadway Park and an E-W connector to the Sixth Street Connector are included with the building. Mr. Needs said that this is the largest privately financed high-rise residential tower with a commitment of 20% affordable housing, 5% middle income housing, 20% home

ownership units and 5% 3-bedroom units. This exceeds the minimum amount of required housing. The plan is for a Design Review submission in Q1 20109 and construction beginning in the first half of 2020. Stantec, the architect of record for Proto, is also the architect for this building.

Before Tony Markese, design principle for Pickard Chilton started to speak about the 325 Main Street building, Mr. Cohen emphasized that the design of this building should not be discussed in great detail as both Boards need to focus on the master plan first. Mr. Markese said that the information builds on the feedback from the July preapplication meeting. He spoke about the universal reasons why tech-based companies want larger floorplates. He showed examples of floorplates of various buildings within and around Cambridge that start at 25,000 square feet. The building being proposed is within that range. He added that in other cities and countries, tech firms are looking for even larger floorplate sizes. The plan's guidelines specify the need for large floorplates. He pointed out that the building in the K2 plan looks much like the initial building that was shown to the Boards. However, based on feedback from the Boards and the tenant, he showed a model that was more articulated.

In response to Mr. Russel, Mr. Markese removed the MIT building that was blocking the view. Mr. Markese noted, however, that the design of the MIT buildings was considered in the design of 325 Main Street. The plan's guidelines recommend the building be distinctive and have a sense of being a landmark. The building is cut on its eastern plaza-facing side to provide some relief at the gap between the Marriott and the building as well as some relief for the gap into and viewing the garden. The cuts reduce the scale of the massing and allow light and views into the space. The guidelines advise against creating a monolith by breaking the building into distinct elements. The façade is broken into 100-foot lengths, as suggested by the guidelines. The plan suggests pushing the building back where there is a building entrance to create a recess in the façade marking the entrance. The plan also suggests using 25-to-50-foot long bays to break up the form of a commercial building. This building has three distinct bays on the south and two distinct bays on the north. The plan suggests that when creating a building that has a top, the façade should be continuous but the heights of the parapets should vary and that terraces and balconies in key locations should be employed to make the building richer.

Mr. Cohen asked Mr. Markese to bring the conversation back to the specifics of the amendment. Mr. Markese said that the building responds to the urban condition with open and transparent pedestrian uses as noted by Mr. Tilford who spoke about enhancing the connection from Pioneer Way eastward toward the plaza, the north-south connection through the existing lobby, and the connection of the Plaza to the Roof Garden. Retail is going to exist on two levels so that the intermediate level is active in addition to the active ground level. The western edge of the Plaza will be improved with a series of stairs and platforms that gradually climb up to the Roof Garden with places to stop along the way. He showed some conceptual images with a cascading staircase with plantings, a projecting seating tray over the MBTA headhouse, a glass elevator, and an open active 2<sup>nd</sup> level retail space. He said that the open stair creates a gap in the center to lookout over the plaza. These were developed from feedback received in the pre-application meeting with regards to the comment about the Spanish Steps.

In response to Mr. Cohen, Mr. Markese did not have any other more detailed images of the building and adjacent buildings from within the Roof Garden nor from the Plaza.

Mr. Russell said that the model includes at least one building on the Volpe site that he hopes never gets built so the area will not be quite as dense as depicted. Mr. Markese said that the information he used for the Volpe buildings might not have been the most current.

As Mr. Cantalupa said that the presentation was concluded, Mr. Cohen started the discussion by the Board members.

Ms. Born noted that a memo was received from ECPT although it wasn't addressed to any particular person or group. The motion to place that memo on file carried unanimously. Mr. Evans explained that a final version was actually received late in the day but that it was too late for distribution. The letter filed was a draft memo. Ms. Born said that there are two reports that should also be entered into the record – one from CRA staff and one from CRA design consultant Chuck Redmon. Ms. Born also acknowledged the excellent reports from the City staff.

The PB decided to hold its discussion after public comment. Mr. Cohen explained the procedures to follow for speaking, the 3-minute limit, and the lighting signals used to keep speakers within the time allocated. He

reminded everyone that the hearing is for the IDCP amendment and would appreciate if questions and comments address only the plan.

*Heather Hoffman*, 213 Hurley Street, said that she is still bitter about what was done to the Roof Garden. This is an opportunity to rectify things and it should be taken. She was happy to see more greenery presented in this proposal than she has seen in the past. The public lost a great deal, even though many people didn't know about it. The current handling of the garden is very rule-bound. Although she didn't see any locked gates, she would like to know if the stairs will be policed similarly. BxP should be proud of this space and invite all to experience it. They should create a nice garden that is not shaded or windswept.

*Steve Kaiser*, 191 Hamilton Street, said that his comment was five minutes long and requested to speak in full, consistent with the way the CRA Board runs its meetings. In a July 11 memo, the Planning Team said that there were no proposed enhancements to the public transport system. This is unfortunate as there are opportunities to do good transit planning. He urged the Board to get BxP to use an out-of-state consultant to take the 2017 Kendall Square Mobility Task Force's report and the 2015 Single EIR for Kendall Square and produce a plan with transit recommendations that will reduce bunching and provide more efficient train operations.

*Ken Barr*, who lives in Auburndale, MA but works at 355 Main Street was also concerned about the shadowing effects on the Roof Garden. He voiced issue regarding the parking study in the amendment. Although the numbers suggest that the garages were 82% full on the busiest day, having garages at 100% full could be problematic. The trip generation calculations should reflect the density expected versus Massachusetts averages. He doesn't think there will not be enough parking.

There were no other members of the public who wished to speak. Questions and comments were taken from the Boards.

In response to Mr. Crawford, Mr. Cantalupa explained that an business opportunity presented itself to BxP which created the shift of massing from Binney Street to Main Street. When the Akamai building was being approved, Tenant B, Biogen needed a building at 250 Binney Street to grow but their business plan changed. They have since leased the site to a subtenant through 2028 making that site undevelopable for 10 years. The building that is proposed to be taken down in the new plan is also leased until 2025 but one of the two tenants in the building needs a larger building and will move so that the building can be developed. The other tenant, the Coop, will also move temporarily to accommodate the development.

Mr. Russell noted that a lot of thinking has been done with respect to this project as indicated by the reports from the CRA, CDD, traffic and parking, public works, and design consultant Chuck Redmon. Everything has been said so he will highlight what he thinks is important. He has lots of issues regarding the building but he'll comment on those at a later date. As for the master plan, there is an enormous impact on the Roof Garden with the shift of a 400,000 square foot building. Almost all of it will be in the shade eight months of the year. The wind studies also show that it will not be comfortable for sitting. Although the proposal of pulling the garden down the side of the building is very creative, the master plan needs to improve open space or create open space perhaps on top of the blue garage on the residential site rather than have it house a collection of solar panels. The retail plan should also be a coordinated effort with the other developers to evaluate and meet the needs of the large number of residential occupants that are coming.

Mr. Zevin agreed that it is hard to separate the building from the plan. There is a significant amount of retail planned in the MIT development which is expected to happen quickly. As expressed in the ECPT memo, there is a danger to project all needs onto this tiny site. He is dismayed that he might need to concede that the Roof Garden will be shadowed in significant times of the year. If this building was actually planned as opposed to reacting to a real estate market, a thinner residential tower would be put on this site which is what the K2 plan diagrams seemed to show along with a separation from 355. Because of the large square foot requirement and the height limit, it is now being pushed against an adjacent building. It would be better if there were some way to poke another hole in between the two buildings, allowing an extension of the Roof Garden to Main Street where there is some sun and longer views. He questioned the floorplate analysis. Combining the proposed building with the building next door at 355 creates a floorplate closer to 40,000 to 45,000, which is much larger than the targeted 25,000 square feet. While the buildings are sort of contiguous, choke points such as a ramps or stairs do

exist and there is probably a fire separation between the floors so it is not as wide open as advertised. While the examples of large-floorplate building plans were helpful, it still appears difficult to interact with the people on the far side of any of these buildings. A bridge-like connection could be a feature to allow views to the outside. He also raised the issue of the various floor-to-ceiling heights and possibly squeezing a few of floors to get another floor that would then help to achieve the required square footage with less bulk.

Mr. Markese said that the taller floor-to-floor heights within the body of the building were two-fold. They provide the ability to restack the building so that floorplates can align. They also map onto the reveals. The tenant wants to leverage the exterior terraces and create opportunities for larger meetings rooms or venues for food service. For each of the larger floors there is a corresponding setback and for at least two of them there is a transition space between the existing building and the new building. Mr. Zevin appreciates the complexity of the situation but he does not like the buildings abutting each other.

In response to Mr. Russell, Mr. Markese said that the cantilevered corner at the southeast corner of Cambridge Center 5 is not getting obliterated. Mr. Markese said that 355 is a building that has minimal architectural merit but is a fine background building. The one interesting aspect is the glass corners. The new building necks down to a smaller dimension than 355 to allow the façade to wrap and to allow the glassy corners to read on both sides. The building would meet the building, not at the corners, not at the edges, but inset significantly from the corner. The higher floor to-floor heights correspond to the bays as well as to the reveals. The bays respond to the precepts outlined in the guidelines. They are not just decorative. They mark the spaces of transition and the zones in the new building floorplate where there is a double height space that has been created to allow for the stair and the ramp to create the transition. The bays reflect the program within the building. The new building shows a relationship between the exterior and the interior of the building.

Mr. Sieniewicz focused his comments on the modification of the urban design approach to the district. It is a mixed-use building and has concerns about the building not being mixed-use. He is an advocate for the space outside the building. The effect on the garden is a problem. Building taller and thinner seems better. He suggested that the tenant should go elsewhere. This is a City with an architectural character to be proud of and Cambridge is in a fortunate position that it can push back on the premier tenants on the planet in favor of what the community actually needs. The Board has expressed the desire for height and slenderness and a marking of this place which this proposal doesn't meet. We need the effects on the parks and the open space addressed. There is a need for a better connection to Broadway and this is a moment to get that right on a civic scale. The City cares about the environment. All-glass buildings are not desirable and the LEED spreadsheet indicates modest to poor points regarding energy and the environment. The City is proud of Kendall Square and wants to get it right. He doesn't think that the proposal sufficiently addresses the public needs. The flow of the garden to the plaza is a start. The renderings are not indicative of Cambridge and perhaps the developer should try harder.

Mr. Crawford asked for more details regarding ride share effects on traffic and trip generation calculations, as well as on the environmental and sustainable analysis done for the proposal. Sean Manning from VHB said that ride sharing was part of the parking analysis and the subsequent recommendation. The data based on TP&T's prescribed mode-share categories and the data collected by CRA over the past decades are used in the traffic study. Rideshare numbers will impact that data. Mr. Crawford suggested BxP take a more future-forward look.

Ms. Drury liked Mr. Russell's idea regarding the blue garage for open space but would like to use it for the public as there will be a big need. She said that the staircase idea was some compensation for lessening the Roof Garden's appeal. A real well-defined passthrough from Broadway to Main Street is very important.

Ms. Flynn said that although there are balconies, the larger floorplates are counter to Mr. Markese's statement that the knowledge worker of today values access to nature and light as they will be farther from the windows. This building will also have a negative impact to the existing nature for the community as the Roof Garden will not be used in any significant way. More thinking is needed for a taller smaller floorplate version. If the tenant wants to be in Cambridge, they need to help Cambridge keep what it values. She suggested breaking up the connection between the two buildings. While creating the staircase greenery and retail are helpful to show the public nature of the space, the minimal sunlight on the Roof Garden is too big an impact.

Ms. Espinoza focused on net public benefits. She appreciates the responses to the housing needs and some of the improvements of the open space. She is not convinced that the consideration being requested benefits the community holistically. BxP can do better. BxP's urgency is motivated by a business opportunity. She is motivated by community. Eighty affordable units does not offset the program bringing in thousands of employees and an increased housing shortage.

Ms. Born said that the proposed building is a 400,000 square foot building. The building at 350 Binney Street was 360,000 square feet and the site on Binney Street had more land around it. Mr. Cantalupa explained that the some of the square footage of the building coming down on Main Street is folding into the total square footage of the proposed building. Ms. Born added that given the building envelope of the site, this is not the building that one would build for the site; a designer would go taller. She said that each of the staff reports are saying this in different ways. She cited specific statements in CDD's and Mr. Redmon's reports which emphasized the lack of separation between the buildings. Ms. Born would like the building taller or in a different space. A clear picture of what the Roof Garden will be like is lacking. She wants to know BxP's commitment to reimagining or rebuilding the Roof Garden. Mr. Cantalupa responded that there is a study of how the flora will tolerate the varying sun and shade conditions over the year; a detailed plan will be presented at a subsequent meeting. He added that over the years, the Roof Garden has been revered and BxP has been complemented on its maintenance. Ms. Born said that it is due for a refreshing.

Ms. Born welcomed the MBTA representative. Ashley Emerson, from MBTA Capital Delivery, emphasized that the MBTA has been involved in preliminary discussions regarding the design of the building. Ms. Born noted that a jazzy glass head house would be welcomed and would add value to the area. Mr. Cantalupa said that Mr. Evans had suggested incorporating the headhouse. Mr. Cantalupa hopes to include the headhouse into the design at some point in the future. Ms. Emerson said that the MBTA's highest priority is safety during construction and continued operations. Ms. Born said that there is more work to do on this plan. This project is a different project than what it would have been on Binney Street and hopes BxP understands that. This project will redefine the center of Kendall Square.

Mr. Cohen is really concerned about the public benefits, the urban form, and what is being gained in return for what is being lost. This building is being driven by the proposed tenant's desire to connect it to the existing building. The Roof Garden is being lost as the wind shadow studies show that it will be undesirable for most people. The Roof Garden design is still uninviting to the public, so it will be used mainly by the tenant of the building. He liked the concept of the stairs but the design is uninviting to the public on the street. He is interested in good public programming for the existing plaza. He disliked the connection between the two buildings as they create a wall on the street and suggested a glass connector or a bridge be considered. He would prefer a taller, narrower building. Mixed use would be better, too.

Mr. Russell suggested aligning the proposed building's floors with the floors in Cambridge Center 5 to pick up flexibility in what happens above that. This could deliver the 40,000 square foot floorplates. This is not physically impossible.

Ms. Espinoza gave ideas of community benefits. With respect to the \$200 million worth of benefits, rather than blue bike stations, she suggested \$10,000 scholarships allocated to kids who are on free or reduced lunch programs, paid internships in BxP or the tenant's company, 50 paid high school internships for public high school students who are on free or reduced lunch programs, public nursing pods, temperature controlled public spaces for those who cannot heat or cool their homes, etc.

Mr. Sieniewicz noted that if the proponent considered "325 Main Street Design: Urban Design Drivers" rather than "325 Main Street Design: Commercial Design Drivers" they might better understand the perspective that he is trying to bring to the discussion.

Ms. Born suggested reducing the square footage of 325 and putting that square footage in penthouse floors onto 355, that are set back from the façade. Mr. Cantalupa said that the cost for that hadn't been analyzed.

Since no one else asked to speak, Mr. Cohen suggested continuing the public hearing to a later date to give the proponent time to digest the feedback from tonight's meeting and the memos on record. It was agreed that topics

related to the building, as well as the IDCP, would be discussed at the next CRA Design Review Committee. Although it is not a requirement, both Boards wanted to continue with joint sessions. Mr. Cohen said that it was not appropriate to go into design review of the building at this time.

Mr. Cohen said that the PB had nothing more on tonight's agenda.

A motion to adjourn the CRA Board meeting carried unanimously at 10:21 p.m.