

Joint CRA Board and Cambridge Planning Board Meeting

Tuesday, December 4, 2018, 6:30 p.m.
City Hall Annex – Second Floor, 344 Broadway, Cambridge, MA

APPROVED Meeting Minutes

Call

At 6:40 p.m., Theodore Cohen, Chair of the Cambridge Planning Board (PB) called the joint meeting of the Planning Board and the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority (CRA). Planning Board members in attendance were H. Theodore Cohen, Tom Sieniewicz, Mary Flynn, Hugh Russell, Steve Cohen, Louis J. Bacci, and Corrine Espinoza. CRA Chair Kathleen Born called the CRA meeting. Other CRA board members in attendance were Chris Bator, Margaret Drury, Conrad Crawford and Barry Zevin. Ms. Born noted that the meeting was being recorded by the CRA and a member of the press. It was also being televised.

After the regular PB business ended at 6:50 p.m., Mr. T. Cohen explained that this meeting is now a continuation of the joint hearing with the CRA Board that began on October 2, 2018. The applicant is seeking a special permit from the PB under Sections 14.32.2.5 and 12.37, a Major Amendment to the Infill Development Concept Plan (IDCP) in the Mixed Use Development (MXD) District in Kendall Center to relocate commercial Gross Floor Area (GFA) of Building B from 250 Binney Street to 325 Main Street; relocate retail GFA from below grade to the ground floor or above grade; reallocate some Infill GFA from 145 Broadway to 325 Main Street; and revise the vehicle parking plan by reducing the construction of new vehicle parking spaces.

Mr. Cohen noted that regardless of what action is or is not taken this evening, the PB would need an extension of the time to file their decision and asked the proponent to agree to the extension until January 31, 2019. Mr. Michael Cantalupa, from Boston Properties (BxP), agreed to the extension of time.

Mr. Michael Tilford from BxP used a PowerPoint presentation and said he would review the content of the original IDCP amendment, the key elements that were part of BxP's Responses to Comments, and assuming a favorable vote of the master plan, a review of the building's design elements. A slide in the presentation showed a picture of the approved massing and composition of the original master plan in January 2017. The amendment would move commercial GFA from 250 Binney to 325 Main Street. A slide listed the various public meetings that have occurred. A chart listed the public benefits - transportation mitigation, open space, housing, and other benefits - in all three phases of the IDCP. Regarding transportation, he singled out the payment to the KSTEP fund and the addition of Blue Bike stations and cycle tracks. Highlighting the housing benefits, he said that BxP was proud to have the highest level of affordability of all Cambridge projects, including up to 20% of home ownership units, and many three-bedroom units. Over the course of the last decade, he emphasized that BxP has made financial contributions in excess of \$800,000 to a number of important City initiatives and community organizations. He added that in concert with the CRA and the Cambridge Innovation Center, BxP is creating a workforce development center on the 8th floor of 255 Main Street for nonprofits who provide tech education to populations that are underrepresented in the technology sector. This will provide a bridge to employment opportunities in Kendall Square. This "opportunity space" will be managed by an experienced operator, the NonProfit Center. Mr. Tilford showed a draft floor plan of the layout for classrooms, conference/event spaces, and open offices. He introduced Sean Manning from VHB, who spoke about the parking and transportation strategy. Mr. Manning showed a map comparing the parking supply in the original IDCP and in the proposed amendment. While 650 spaces are lost without the building at 250 Binney, restriping in the other garages would result in a loss of only 372 spaces. According to his chart of future parking demand during a peak month, and assuming that the entire KSURP/MXD district is leased/occupied, Mr. Manning explained that managed (valet) parking options could be an

option to handle the shortage at peak hours of the year. He added that the trends suggest that office parking utilization is decreasing.

Mr. Tilford then spoke about the thermal comfort study, which includes temperature and humidity, in addition to shade. The Response to Comments document contains full shadow studies for traditional dates and other dates as well as slider bar studies so that the shadow on individual days can be seen. A chart in his presentation showed that with the proposed amendment, there are fewer hours of comfort in April through May and in October through December, but more hours of comfort from June through September. He introduced Christian Lemon, from Lemon Brooke Landscape Architects, who spoke about the roof garden redesign and programming. Mr. Lemon showed a map of the current roof garden, which is composed of a series of walkways, a fair amount of grass, shrub plantings, perimeter planters, two headhouses for stair and elevator access, and a connection to the Marriott hotel. He said that the roof garden is a retreat for the community and the goal is to keep its garden-like character. The current sun-shade diagram for the planting season of April to October showed most of the garden in full sun (6+ hours of sun/day). With the proposed building massing, one third of the garden has only partial sun (4-6 hours of sun/day), 1/3 is partially shaded (2-4 hours sun/day), and 1/3 is in full shade (0-2 hours sun/day). The plantings will be shifted to accommodate this reduction in sunlight. Regarding the activation and programming, passive use is the most predominant activity. In the proposed analysis, more activation would be brought to the shaded areas and morning activities would be brought to the areas that get morning sun. A new welcoming area would be created when the southeast corner is opened-up. Mr. Lemon said that the overall character of the roof garden would not change. Two new access points are being added (joining it to tenant space in 325 Main Street and to a new public stair and elevator at the northwest corner of Kendall Plaza.) One path is being removed to create a larger green area for programming. He showed existing and proposed views looking east and looking south. The percentage of paving and raised planters remains the same. The percentage of lawn area slightly decreases but is offset by a slight increase in planting beds. A landscape plan and planting palette showed the trees, shrubs, and perennials to accommodate the reduced sunlight on the roof garden. Mr. Lemon spoke about some programming to attract people to the rooftop - more dining spaces, pop-up food stands, coffee carts, movable seating, movie nights with a screen on the side of the Marriott building, a fire pit, exercise classes, areas for celebratory events with or without tents, moveable furniture, and various night lighting and other technology.

Tony Markese, design principal from Pickard Chilton, said that the last two months have been spent developing the massing and design of the building, responding to feedback from the two design review meetings which included members of both the PB and the CRA Board as well as staff from the City and the CRA. He emphasized the difficulty in separating the master plan from the building design. The design review from the first work session focused on the massing and the refinement of the form within the urban context. The second meeting addressed the articulation of the building, the fenestration, and the connection of the building to the garden, to Main Street, and to Pioneer Way. Mr. Markese summarized the issues from the first joint meeting – the building was too big for the site, it needed to be thinner and more vertical, it was too close to 355 Main, it had too much mass, and the eastern façade leaned over the plaza. There had been suggestions to go beyond the height limit and/or reduce the floor-to-floor height so that the floor plates could be smaller while adding a floor to keep the same total area. The Boards had liked the connection from the plaza to the garden, and the notion of public and private exterior terraces. Mr. Markese used the site model from the previous joint meeting to explain his thoughts, citing site forces that acknowledge the connection back through the MIT space up to the garden to set up a geometry that allows the building to fit within the urban landscape. By adding another floor, the floor plates could be decreased making the building narrower. The gaps between the buildings are refined, as is the overall bulk of the building, using setbacks in the façade and recalling the massing of 355 Main in an offset “stacking” at 325 Main.. The cascading terracing down to the plaza remains. Although the reduced floor plates are smaller than what tech companies favor, their geometry is simpler and thus acceptable to the tenant. The lengths of the building in the east-west axis are where the changes have occurred. The core of the building and the elevators are staying the same. The reason for the joined buildings is the desire to connect floorplates. The public lobby at Main Street will be reworked from a single height space to a double height space for a more open connection between Main Street and Pioneer Way. The existing retail space at the first floor and basement will be replaced with retail at the first and second floors.

The addition of public restrooms is planned. Except for a small lobby, the first floor will have active public use. Entrances will be off Main Street, the plaza, and Pioneer Way. There is retail on the first and second floors with

transparency to the 2nd level public terrace. The massing of the building also produces exterior terraces for the tenant. BxP hopes for an open market feel and possibly entertainment in the retail space. The glass shed above the MBTA headhouse would be removed. This project will transform this space. Images and diagrams of ideas for the stair terracing, greenery, and circulation from the plaza to the roof garden were shown. BxP is working with the MBTA about the possibility of creating public open space on the roof of the headhouse. Mr. Markese shows various renderings of the building and the plaza from the street and the roof garden. He said that the BxP and the tenant are happy with the building.

Mr. T. Cohen asked for comments from the PB design staff.

Suzannah Bigolin said that she and Jeff Roberts, both from CDD, are generally pleased with the massing changes made in BxP's Response to Comments document. The building has more of a vertical feel due to the reduced floorplate and additional height. The straightening of the façade that loomed over the plaza and the additional separation between the building and the Marriot are significant improvements. Reducing the façade length on Main Street has created more consistency with the K2 design guidelines. Staff is impressed with the work that has taken place to analyze changes to the roof garden. Staff is supportive of the range of improvements proposed including increased hours of use and additional programming. The plans for replanting are good but the use of synthetic lawn in the southeast corner was questioned. Some canopy trees should be provided in this area as that is the main visual connection between the plaza and the garden. Although the stair connection has improved as it now faces Main Street, there is still more work to be done on the stairs or stepping down to the plaza which is assumed to be part of a design review. She suggested further review of the staircase width and its many turns with the goal of it being a public asset and not just a simple connection. Its landing at the sidewalk should have more space as it seemed too abrupt at the sidewalk edge. The connection from the plaza to Pioneer Way as a "market retail" concept is exciting but there needs to be some degree of certainty regarding what areas will be available for public access, ensuring that it is welcoming to the general public, and does not feel like a customer-only space. There should be a provision for a direct east-west pedestrian connection through the retail, rather than the meandering paths depicted in some of the diagrams. There should be a definite commitment to multiple entrances on Main Street. Staff would like assurance that a north-south connection between the plaza and Broadway connecting through to Volpe along the eastern edge of the "Green Garage" would be pursued as an option in the future. At the last joint CRA and Planning Board meeting, there were comments about the need to provide more public amenities and public engagement at the ground floor. While the retail and public restrooms proposed are positives, there are more opportunities for public programming and other non-retail amenities. She suggested that perhaps this could come at the second stage of the design review or be part of the design guidelines. There were no additional improvements proposed to the plaza. Staff would also like to further study the sectional views of the building from the roof garden. The special permit conditions should include options for the MBTA headhouse if in case it is excluded from the proposal. Staff remains concerned about the wind impacts north of Broadway. The new massing is unlikely to change the wind study seen in the original document, but further study is needed in some areas of the north parcel. The shadow study remains relatively unchanged. Although the climate comfort study shows additional comfort in the summer, the additional shading in the shoulder months has an impact. Staff requests that parameters be established to guide future design of pedestrian connections to ensure those spaces are legible, welcoming, and generous in scale. CDD staff had hoped for a broader emphasis throughout the document on existing and proposed connections, and how the massing of buildings would contribute to the plaza as a civically important space. Staff would also like further study of the ways that the built form, building programming, landscape design, and programming interreact and relate to the circulation systems.

Jeff Roberts reiterated that the additional materials were very responsive to the issues and comments of the Boards. One additional component to the original special permit submission was a study to look at the northwest portion of the site and the Blue Garage as an opportunity for public open space and amenity. The report concluded that the structural work needed to accommodate a public space on top of the garage would make it infeasible. It seemed like a reasonable report but Mr. Roberts noted that the special permit also requires a review of the ground floor around that site. The comment made in the applicant's report said that a better way to focus attention would be open space improvements along the ground floor where they'd be more accessible to the public. The PB did include as a condition that they look at the area along the service drives that encircle that garage. The conditions were found to be unwelcoming as well as negatively impacting the trees. This was all covered in the Board's review last year and it is expected that the study of improvements would be included in the

design for that project. The new proposal, however, makes a commitment to have the residential building, which is part of this next phase of development along with the commercial building, come forward for design review in the first quarter of next year; this commitment should be honored. There should also be an annual check-in with staff regarding the ongoing operational plans and programming of the innovation space component and the retail tenancing. Staff encourages the applicant to coordinate with neighboring property owners regarding retail. Many of the comments can be covered in the design review process for the buildings and sites but a few should be stronger commitments in place at the special permit level. There should be ground floor access and commitments to have public entrances along Main Street and at the ends of the building. There should be an easement for a north-south connection to Broadway although that will make more sense once the plan for the Volpe site is better known. If the amendment goes into design review, it is helpful for staff to have clear guidance from the PB on what specific issues should be addressed in the design review so they can be recorded in the decision and carried through to that phase of the process.

Jason Zogg, from the CRA, said that the CRA staff memo is a comprehensive list that includes many of items mentioned by Ms. Bigolin and Mr. Roberts. The CRA feels that this is the right placement of density from an urban planning and land-use perspective. The massing has changed for the better. The roof garden scope has expanded to include the entire roof garden. The increased hours of use through the evening with the addition of lighting and increased programming commitments made tonight will make up for the issues with shadow and thermal comfort. The plaza to roof garden connection needs more refinement and detail, especially the design of the staircase. The approval process also needs some discussion since the roof garden of the west headhouse requires MBTA approval that is not guaranteed. Mr. Zogg would like to include an analysis of the section of the trellis structure immediately adjacent to the proposed roof garden staircase in the Commercial Building B schematic design submission to decide whether a portion of it should be removed or used as a structure for PV solar and/or as a canvas for public art in the long-term future. There needs to be wayfinding and signage for programs and public spaces including the proposed restrooms, the staircase itself, and the double-height space (i.e., Google connector) connecting Main Street and the roof garden via the Green Garage. The updated phasing is positive. The bike parking method for how cyclists get to and from the basement garage in 325 Main Street needs to be explored. The wording for the Pioneer Way easement needs to be modified if the path is through a retail space rather than a straight line. He agreed with Ms. Bigolin that there needs to be a study regarding the pedestrian route between the MBTA headhouse and Broadway. Expected in the design review process would be a study on protecting the subway entrances from possible flooding due to climate change. Basic construction staging principles should be provided as Main Street is already partially closed off due to construction on the other side the street. In the CRA memo, the recommendations for conditions include maintaining strong visual wayfinding and environmental graphics that lead people to and from all the public spaces promised including bike parking, retaining the architectural drama that was received in the first plan, and some additional details from the design review process.

Mr. Cantalupa concluded by noting that when BxP was before the Boards months ago, they were contemplating the move of the density from 250 Binney Street to the proposed site. Both Boards insisted that the project must have a net benefit to the public realm. Given the net reduction in parking, the science of increasing the comfort level in the roof park, and connecting the park to the plaza, he feels that BxP has met that challenge. The particulars would be worked through in the design review process.

Mr. T. Cohen opened the public comment portion of the meeting and explained the public speaking process to the audience.

Martin Mullins, resident of Cambridge and Vice President of the Whitehead Institute, spoke in support of the proposed amendment to the MXD IDCP. Whitehead was one of the first buildings on the north side of Main Street and there has been spectacular growth in the past decade. He explained the work done at Whitehead. He listed several of their startup companies in the area. More than 300 post-graduate students, post-doctoral fellows, graduate students, and research technicians support the Whitehead faculty. Taking a long view, attracting high caliber people is critical to its success. Over 200 Whitehead employees live in Cambridge. The proposed amendment reaffirms the commitment to deliver necessary housing. The proposed shift in massing helps to reimagine Kendall Square's western end, with new retail space and a connection from the plaza to the roof garden. There are opportunities for re-envisioning the space, programming improvements, and other open space enhancements. The Linkage program provides access between companies in the area and opportunities to

employees and individuals as they receive training. He believes BxP is providing a generous benefits package that is appropriate to the scale of the project. This initiative has the potential to spur the innovative economy throughout the City. In summary, he said that the application is grounded in the benefits it will provide to the City and to Kendall Square, additional commercial space, a commitment to deliver new housing, the reimagining of Kendall square and the rooftop garden, public transportation benefits, and open space enhancements.

Heather Hoffman, a Cambridge resident, spoke in vehement opposition to the amendment as it will further destroy the roof garden. Although she appreciates what CRA and City staff have said about the roof garden, they don't know the full history. BxP had to create a roof garden but avoided doing it for years. With constant pressure from East Cambridge citizens, they finally did it but they kept the doors locked for years. With more community pressure, they unlocked the doors. Then Google built its "connector." It's not a connector but rather a 25,000 square foot, 2-story building. The placement of that building is a result of a lie about where it needed to be. Citizens were told that residential needed to go there. She is grateful to see the 88 Ames St. residential building, but it was supposed to be across the street. When BxP moved it across the street, there wasn't enough room so it had to go partly on the roof garden. Citizens were told that there was to be 50 feet between the residential building and Google's building. That wasn't true; there is only 25 feet. They moved Google over and they built the residential building on that 25 feet. Now BxP wants to build hundred-foot walls on the south side. There are others way to provide shading. Blotting out the sun is not an improvement. This is another lie and betrayal to the East Cambridge citizens who continually give so that Kendall Square can be this economic engine for the City. This is already called the Google garden. She is happy to hear that the Marriott can no longer shut citizens out of an area they claimed.

There were no other speakers from the public.

In response to Ms. Born, Mr. T. Cohen said that with the exception of Mr. Bacci, all the PB members present tonight will be sitting on the case as they were sitting at the October 4th hearing. Mr. Bacci may participate in the discussion but would not be allowed to vote.

Mr. Russell explained that the change in the master plan is due to the existing lease at 250 Binney and a strong desire by a tenant for space at 325 Main Street. It is possible to do this. When the scheme first came to the Boards in October, he was skeptical about two hurdles. He is convinced that the landscape designs, the roof garden programming, and the cascading connection down to the plaza will result in a space that is more usable at more different times in more ways than the current space, although it will be significantly different. There was also a question of whether the amount of square footage could be composed into a building that would fit. He was amazed that Mr. Markese and his team were able to reshape the massing to solve the problem. According to the pages of documentation from City and CRA staff, the process isn't yet complete. However, he suggested approving the master plan change since the issues are finite and workable and therefore solutions are achievable.

Mr. Drury was pleased with the continuing changes to that building that have made it better. She is now focused on the terracing as it is more evident and a real addition. She is pleased with the massing changes and that there will be lighting on the public roof garden. There will be more shade which is inevitable in cities. However, the increased hours of use will ameliorate, to a certain extent, the pain of losing some of the area to shade.

Mr. Sieniewicz feels that the modification to the original master plan does increase the public benefits. BxP sufficiently explained why a taller building and a mixed-use concept were unattainable. Housing nonprofits, as well as striving kids, in a prime class-A space in Kendall Square is fantastic. From Mr. Mullins' testimony, an increased density of workers in this location creates community that is vital to the City, the region, and probably to the planet. Cambridge is fortunate economically and this tenant in this building in this place creates a density of activity and brain power that is extraordinary and the PB needs to support. He added that it is crucial that the tenant welcome the community which will be discussed in the design details of the building as well as in the design of the connection from the plaza to the roof garden. His goal is for this to be an amazing public place. He is in support of the modification to the master plan.

Mr. Zevin was not happy with the plan. He agreed that this greatly improves the access to the roof garden but its quality will be diminished because of the considerable amount of shadow and blocked views. Putting density at the transit stop is fine but following this logic, one could also build on the Boston Common on top of Park Street

Station. 250 Binney is at most a five-minute walk from the T. The architects have done well given the program but part of the “gasket” between buildings could be bridge-like or even eliminated at one or two floors. He suggested adding a bit of area to the upper levels above the existing building and subtracting width from the gasket at the floors in proximity to the roof garden (#4, #5, #6) to allow light into the garden and provide views out, as the red arrow to the west of 325 Main in the presentation sketch seems to promise. That might not be enough to rescue the garden but it would help. He would like to hear more regarding the proposed Pioneer Way easement through the retail. He feels that the north-south connection through the garage is hopeless and is not convinced this is an improvement. He thinks the path through the Marriot is satisfactory because it’s lighted, heated, safe, and full of activity.

Ms. Flynn agreed that it makes sense to shift the GFA from 250 Binney. There might not be total agreement on whether this is the right solution but it is the result of many hours of work by many and it is an improvement which will get even better during the design review process. She appreciated hearing about the Innovation Space and the linkage with different Cambridge programs which will give back to the community as future job potential. She struggles with the roof garden changes. There are pluses and minuses and it will be used differently. This is not necessarily bad if everyone understands this and the promises are upheld. She said that getting color in the roof garden with furniture or art work, especially in the shaded areas where green is the predominant color, is very important. She would prefer that few private functions occur on the roof garden, including the Marriott’s use, and would like to explore how that can be enforced. She liked the extended hours, and the lighting is helpful. She would support the amendment.

Mr. Crawford thanked staff, the development team, and his respective colleagues on both Boards. He would like more thought and discussion regarding parking lots as urban spaces since they might not have the same function going into the future. This should be thought of as an urban opportunity similar to that of the ground floor retail of the First Street garage project. The goal is to improve the circulation of the MXD district. It’s possible that other spaces can be enhanced as an alternative. Seating benches and chairs are nice but bars and stools might be more helpful for viewing what remains to be seen. He agreed that art work is a good way to inject color into the space. While he appreciates the dynamic nature of the tenant, there are political and problematic issues that should not be ignored as they relate to Cambridge’s inclusiveness. A tenant’s contribution to a community should be considered. As the housing takes shape in the coming years, the qualitative experience of the residences is important to consider.

Ms. Espinoza reminded the audience what she considers a public benefit - one that benefits the 14% of Cantabridgians who are living in poverty. She said that more work is needed to ensure that those with the fewest resources have access to the public benefits, including public restrooms, the tech space, free wi-fi, and nursing pods. People who are living in public housing that is five minutes from the proposed building will not be able to afford the retail. If they feel welcomed within the building, she would consider this a public benefit. Difficulty in finding a restroom or the roof garden, or being locked out of the roof garden are not benefits. She thinks the changes will increase traffic and deteriorate the general life of the surrounding neighborhoods, especially during construction. Although 20% housing is affordable, the 80% gentrifies the neighborhood thereby increasing rents and the prices of goods. She is not in favor of the project as it is. However, if it is approved, she asked Mr. T. Cohen for commitments to restripe the parking as it was presented so that only 372 spaces are lost, to increase the roof garden’s hours and programming, to be allowed to offer specific advice for public programming and other nonretail amenities that would be more open to the public, and to be specific on what the CDD staff should check for during the annual reporting. According to the PUD special criteria, she felt that this project’s benefits do not outweigh its adverse effects.

Mr. Bator agreed that the proposal has come a long way and there are pieces to be applauded. He is concerned, however, that the long-term public benefit for such a very prominent location would be to have this building be an architectural statement for Cambridge. From an untutored eye, he said that it is still a very large mass in a relatively small space. He cautioned that the particular improvements are distracting from evaluating the ultimate result.

Mr. Bacci says that since the beginning, he has felt that this building is sited in the wrong place. The building should have been sited over the roof garden area and the garden moved to the front on the Main Street face in a lower scale building so it could remain visible. He said that the shade-shadow study and the sun diagram conflict.

He is not opposed to the building but he thinks it needs more articulation. He likes the idea of the stairs landing into the plaza with the stepped effect and the elevators. He said that it appears that an opportunity seems lost to make something special. He understands that it would be difficult to construct this over the garage but notes that another building is being proposed to go over a garage as part of this master plan. In response to his questions, Mr. Tilford explained that the tech space is not an incubator for startup companies. He added that the zoning calls for an incubator but BxP is going beyond that and the 255 Main Street 8th floor space is specifically a coworking space for nonprofits who are focusing on tech education for adults as well as kids. There are provisions and infrastructure to allow connections to be made to high school students by the nonprofits. This is not exclusively for Cambridge people.

Ms. Born explained that the PB is voting to approve the special permit which involves a major amendment to allow the relocation of the space from 250 Binney Street to the 325 Main Street site. Mr. T. Cohen added that this also involves the reduction in parking and some other issues regarding the relocation of retail space. The PB is not voting on building design this evening. When the vote takes place, if the application prevails, this project will be further reviewed by members of the CDD staff and the CRA staff on those items that are called out in the staff reports. Ms. Born emphasized that it is not "all over" with this vote. The concept and go-ahead are decided but the details are yet to come. There are conditions in the Urban Plan Amendment that are mentioned in the CRA staff memo and need to be worked out.

Mr. Zogg said that on pages 8, 9, and part of 10 of the CRA staff memo, there is list of recommended conditions for an approval that may happen tonight. Unless modified at tonight's meeting, all of the items listed are conditions that must be met. Some include developing more detailed versions of the bulleted points which would be put into the final approval letter while others are things that will potentially be worked out in the schematic design review process of the 325 Main Street building. If the IDCP amendment is approved tonight, BxP would then submit a 325 Main Street schematic design book. Staff recommends another joint meeting with the PB to review that book. There will also be more design review meetings as necessary. Participation by Mr. Sieniewicz and Mr. Russell is welcomed and appreciated. Ms. Born said that the CRA is voting on the amendment to the Infill Development Concept Plan of the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan (KSURP) Amendment. CRA approval requires three votes in the affirmative. The PB approval requires the five votes from the members who were also present in the October 4th hearing.

Ms. Born thanked both CDD and CRA staff members for their excellent reports. She thanked all the board members for their comments as well. She added that she likes the roof garden now and expects to like it in the future. She has faith in progress. The building will be in Cambridge longer than the tenant. It is not the Boards' role to say whether a tenant should be in Cambridge. Ms. Born wants to make the public spaces and their connectivity better. She said that the plaza can use an update. The roof garden is a lovely place. There are not a lot of people there. She would like to see Kendall Square be a welcoming place to all. Kendall Square needs more activity and the increased programming will be beneficial. She is pleased to see the public restrooms. She noted that the roof garden shade in the summer will be appreciated. In the near future, there is a need to get serious about a meaningful north-south connection from Main Street to the Volpe. When the Marriott lobby needs its next renovation, she requested that a public easement be a high priority for the design criteria. She has full confidence in BxP's experience with retail and expects them to prove their ability. If the long list of details in the staffs' conditions can be worked through, there will be a net gain to the public realm. The building design needs to be good as well. She urged Mr. Markese and BxP to add more transparency and increase the opening from the roof garden to the plaza. She suggested moving the elevator into the building. She added that the possibility of fulfilling requirements by improving open space or making parking more efficient is going to expire someday soon.

Mr. T. Cohen said that the applicant has the ability to build this amount a GFA in a different location and this is just a question of moving it. Issues about construction and whether more development is good for the City is irrelevant since that construction has already been approved. If there were no roof garden, he would have no issue with the building but the roof garden is there and it is a benefit to the City. It has changed over time due to City Council's decision. The issue now is the detriment that will occur to the roof garden with a very large building shading it although ameliorated by other things. If a building were to go there, it has to be a spectacular building. Although the building design is not being approved tonight, he will leave the design to his architect colleagues on the PB. While not the Spanish Steps, the stairway up to the roof garden is attractive. The roof garden is not well known, so by opening it up, more people will be attracted to it, so this is a public benefit. He agreed that moving

the elevator into the building and increasing the dimension of the opening would be a good thing. He did not think that providing more shade in the summer is a valid rationale for constructing the building or for claiming that it is a benefit to the roof garden. The garden will be diminished in certain respects but it will be improved by the addition of hours thereby making it more accessible to the public. Adding programming, furnishings, and new landscaping will be an improvement. He does not like the concept of artificial turf, especially in the area where people will be sitting for movie nights. In summary, he believes that the benefits to Kendall Square and to the City do exceed the detriment to the roof garden. The upgraded MBTA head house plans look great but that is not a commitment. Mr. Cantalupa replied that the plan for the MBTA headhouse is very feasible. The MBTA is actively considering this change and generally supports the improvement to the headhouse. However, the concerns are the uncertain location of an additional elevator and the timing. In response to Ms. Born, Mr. Cantalupa said that BxP will have to contribute to the cost of the head house since there's no money appropriated at the state level to improving the headhouse.

Mr. T. Cohen said that the documents in the BxP presentation indicate that at the busiest month of the year (September) and at the busiest time of day, there would be about 85 cars that are looking for parking. He asked Joe Barr, Director of Traffic Parking and Transportation (TP&T) to speak about the reduced amount of parking, whether the proposed parking management system will sufficiently address the problem, and the status of the other numerous conditions in the TP&T memo. Mr. Barr said that after many discussions with the applicant, a compelling argument was made. There will be an occasional day where parking garages may be full. When these fill up, those being turned away would not be employees but rather visitors parking on a transient, hourly basis. He said that it makes sense to use the existing, above-ground parking garages more efficiently. Looking towards the future trends in travel behavior, the demand for full-day parking will diminish. He agrees that making an investment in a new parking garage does not make sense on a commercial basis. Rather than monthly parking payments, he would like to see an employee daily payment option, which has been shown to de-incentivize parking. He hopes to have a system which would indicate the location of available parking spaces among the garages. Mr. Cantalupa said that BxP has agreed to the conditions in the TP&T memo.

Mr. Russell said that the project consists of the addition of commercial and residential space. The commercial space is the economic driver so that the housing portion is a community benefit, particularly the affordable percentage. Mr. Cantalupa emphasized that the commercial building is subsidizing the residential building. BxP cannot build the residential on a stand-alone basis. In addition, the deal struck at the zoning level increased the number of affordable units, which was below 20% at that time, to 20% for inclusionary and 5% for middle income. There is also a commitment to a percentage of homeownership units. From a timing standpoint, he explained that according to the zoning, BxP cannot get a certificate of occupancy for the commercial building unless they have commenced the residential building with a building permit. He expects to be back in front of both Boards in the first quarter of next year to push the housing forward with detailed design review. Since cost continues to rise, BxP does not want to wait to build the residential. Ms. Born added that the sale of development rights to build commercial and residential within the KSURP, is paid to the CRA to use for public benefits projects. It's only been about 2 to 3 years, with this incarnation of the CRA, that a substantial infusion of funds has been received, namely from Ames Street and 145 Broadway. The CRA is now envisioning a process for allocating money to public benefit projects such as affordable housing, social programs, and aid to various Cambridge social service organizations who need development funds. The CRA is to financially helping Just-A-Start with one of their housing projects.

Tom Evans, the CRA Executive Director, said that there have been discussions with the nonprofit sector for financial assistance with their capital needs and infrastructure. There is not a lot of available funding for capital improvements to a nonprofit-owned structure or for long-term leases. Nonprofits face incredible pressure from rising rents. The Opportunity Space (Linkage Program) and the Foundry provide inclusionary commercial space. Mr. Cantalupa added that the CRA filed zoning that created this construct for the fees to be generated and for the housing to be delivered. The notion in the zoning to start housing before a certain amount of commercial development goes forward was already in place in agreements between the CRA and BxP for over 40 years. BxP would not have been allowed to proceed with the Akamai building if they had not delivered the Proto building. The zoning proposal allows the CRA to obtain the funding for public uses.

Mr. Zevin clarified his previous comment. The concern is not just light in the roof garden, but the views from it. He said that one view had been improved and he was grateful for that. However, other views will be blocked. He agreed with Mr. T. Cohen's skeptical analysis of the "thermal comfort" study.

In response to Ms. Spinoza, Mr. Evans said that the cost per square foot for development fees varies depending on use. There is also a discount for housing. The rates are approximately \$47 per square foot for residential and double that for commercial uses. There is a multiplier that increases annually. The fees apply wherever the development occurs within the district, beginning when construction starts. The nature of the development fee is a real estate transaction and is not specific to the urban renewal plan *per se*. The land was owned by the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority and then Boston Properties was brought on as the developer. This fee implementation regime ends in 50 years. It is not an assessment nor a tax. Mr. Cantalupa said the massing change is being made because there is no opportunity to build this GFA anywhere else within the district. The building at 250 Binney Street is committed for at least 10 years. Moving to Main Street is a good urban move and creates a business opportunity to build the commercial and also moves the housing forward. Beyond this site, which is now the COOP building, there are no other alternatives. Demolishing an income-producing building, unless it is very small, is not cost-effective. Mr. Evans said that although the CRA was the petitioner on the zoning and also amended the urban renewal plan, the entire process followed the lead of CDD and the C2K2 process. All of this is based on a planning process that dates back to 2011 which originally had higher density on this site. This is city-wide planning event.

Ms. Espinoza wanted to know the dollar amount of the transaction fee going to the public. Mr. Evans said that the sale of development rights for the commercial building is about \$25 million and about \$12 million for the residential building. This occurs in Phase 2 and there is also another small residential section in Phase 3. Because of how the garage operates, the Phase 3 residential on the south side of the north garage needs to wait until the Phase 2 residential is completed. Mr. Evans explained that the CRA would take in \$37 million. The ultimate use of those funds is decided in an ongoing, transparent process. The public benefit possibilities that the CRA has been scoping out include the delivery of arts and education space in the Foundry building, a public art program, additional open space, transportation enhancements, and historic renovation projects. Mr. Bator clarified that the CRA revenue stream is primarily from development fees. As noted on the website, the CRA, since this iteration of the Board has existed, has been expending quite large sums of money throughout the public realm on a variety of projects in a very public and transparent process. The goal of this CRA Board is to take the wealth of Kendall Square and spread it Cambridge-wide. The record demonstrates that we are doing that and will continue to do this. Ms. Born said that since the receipt of such fees, the CRA instituted a Forward Fund program which has allocated funds to the Cambridge Community Center, the Margaret Fuller House, the O'Connell Library, the East End House, the Community Arts Center, the Moses Youth Center, and others. Mr. Evans said that funds have been for small capital projects for innovative public intervention or for public-facing nonprofit facilities. The CRA staff is presenting a proposal to the Board next month to expand the scale of the grant program. Ms. Born said that the CRA can aid the City where there might be some legal obstacles to allocating funds.

In response to Ms. Espinoza's questions, Mr. Cantalupa said that without this approval, BxP would not be required to build housing and it would not be economically feasible to build housing. Cambridge would not get 400 units of housing, of which 100 units would be affordable. Mr. Cantalupa also replied that the agencies that have received generous aid from Boston Properties, as noted in his presentation, are agencies that serve the low-income populations in Cambridge. The long history of how BxP has contributed to Cambridge is unique among developers and real estate owners. The estimated total public benefits dollar amount of \$200,000 in the presentation does not include the public benefits supplied by the CRA.

In response to Ms. Flynn, Melissa Schrock, from BxP, said that BxP manages the open space. The roof garden is open to the public during its operating hours of dusk-to-dawn. The proposal documented in the Response to Comments is to extend the hours later into the evening from June to September. Lighting would be added to safely operate the roof garden until 11pm. The programming is open to the public. She added that although tents were shown in the proposal for limited private events, the roof garden would be open to the public during such events.

At 9:50 p.m., Mr. T. Cohen called for a recess break. The meeting resumed at 10:08 p.m.

There were no further questions or comments from members of the PB or the CRA Board.

Mr. T. Cohen got an assurance from the PB members that they were ready and willing to proceed with a vote tonight. He listed the criteria that would need to be determined according to Section 12.35.3 in order to grant approval of a PUD Special Permit within the MXD IDCP. With reports received, as well as testimonies and discussions heard tonight, the members of the PB felt that they had adequate information. The PB would need to determine that there were no adverse traffic impacts within the area according to Sections 19.25.1 and Section 19.25.11. The PB would need to determine the project is consistent with the urban design objectives of the City according to Sections 19.25.2 and 19.30.

Mr. Russell added that the numerous conditions detailed in the reports by Ms. Bigolin, Mr. Roberts, and Mr. Zogg must be met for the building to get built. Mr. T. Cohen listed the conditions discussed tonight: ongoing design of the building, questions about the north-south connector, access to retail on the first and second floors, the number of entrance ways on the first and second floors, the ongoing design of the stairs from the plaza to the roof garden, the ongoing desire to continue discussions with the MBTA regarding headhouse renovations, and the need to revise the easements of the access ways.

The PB would need to determine compliance with the general criteria for issuance of a special permit as listed in Section 10.43.

He stated that since there was a determination that the findings could be made, he asked for a motion.

Mr. Roberts stated that this is an amendment to an existing special permit that has a wide array of existing special permit conditions which are not changing with this proposal. Mr. T. Cohen acknowledged that commitments and conditions that are not changing would still exist, in addition to those that are changing.

A motion to grant a special permit pursuant to Sections 14.32.2.5 and 12.37, and 10.43 which would be a major amendment to the Infill Development Concept Plan in the MXD District that would relocate the gross floor area of Building B from 250 Binney Street to 325 Main Street; relocate retail GFA from below grade to the ground floor or above grade; reallocate some Infill GFA from 145 Broadway to 325 Main Street; and revise the vehicle parking plan by reducing the construction of new vehicle parking spaces in accordance with the findings made and memos received from CDD and TP&T and subject to all the conditions noted this evening was moved and seconded.

There were 5 approvals from the voting PB members and the motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Born entertained a motion for the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority to conditionally approve the proposed amendment to the Infill Development Concept Plan as presented in the 9/6/18 submittal and revised by the 11/2/18 Response to Comments document, subject to ongoing review of building and open space designs, and the resolution of conditions as generally outlined in the 11/30/18 staff memo.

The motion was moved, seconded and a roll call was taken.

Mr. Zevin – abstain
Mr. Crawford - yes
Mr. Drury – yes
Mr. Bator – yes
Ms. Born – yes

The vote carried with four approvals and one abstention.

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

The PB continued its business.

