

APPROVED MINUTES

Joint CRA Board and Cambridge Planning Board Meeting

Tuesday, February 26, 2019, 8:00pm.
City Hall Annex – Second Floor, 344 Broadway, Cambridge, MA

Call

At 9:05pm, Hugh Russell, a Planning Board member filling in as Chair, called the Planning Board meeting back to order. Mr. Russell explained he resumed the responsibility of Chair as he was the longest serving member on the Board, because the Chair was out of town, and the Vice-Chair was unable to sit due to conflicts of interest.

At 9:07pm CRA Chair Kathleen Born called the CRA Board meeting to order to discuss the 325 Main Street building design. CRA Board members present included 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 noted that this was Jason Zogg's last day at the CRA, as he has taken a job in Detroit at the Fort Motor Company.

Ms. Born explained the CRA typically takes public comment at the beginning of their meetings, but following the Planning Board's standard procedures, public comment will be offered after the applicant's presentation. Ms. Born also acknowledged that the CRA's Design Consultant, Chuck Redmon, was present at the meeting.

Meeting Presentation by Boston Properties (BxP) and Architect Pickard Chilton

Melissa Schrock, Vice President of Development at Boston Properties (BxP) introduced herself. She acknowledged the 325 Main Street Design Project had evolved through the design review process, and that there were a lot of questions on the building when BxP first began. Comments included that the building was too big, too squat, too broad and that it did not fit on the site. Both Boards requested smaller floor plates, for it to feel more vertical and have a better relationship with 355 Main Street. She agreed they were right. Ms. Schrock explained BxP is a developer, a landlord and a property manager, and that they create products for clients, but that they also are part of the Cambridge community, so their building needs to fit in the neighborhood and with Cambridge's desires. Ms. Schrock presented the public review timeline and outreach conducted with the community, City and CRA. She noted that through the review process BxP believes 325 Main Street is a better building, and that their client agrees. She explained architect Pickard Chilton scrapped the first building design after public comment and that she believes the building is in a much better place.

Ms. Schrock noted that Ms. Born asked to see net public benefits from the building due to the relocation of gross floor area from 250 Binney to 325 Binney in the Infill Development Concept Plan Amendment approved in December, 2018. Ms. Schrock presented a chart of public benefits of the three phases of the Infill Development Concept Plan and explained BxP's work to provide additional public benefits from the GFA shift that would not have been realized with the 250 Binney building. The benefits listed included the vertical connection of the plaza to the roof garden, two public spaces that have not had a relationship together before, a second level terrace, and making improvements to the roof garden through new planning, planting, and programming. She explained the roof garden will be activated and have public art, and lighting to extend hours of use in the summertime, that BxP

is looking at trellis upgrades on the Marriott building and that there will be MBTA headhouse improvements. The 325 Main Street building will also have public restrooms, the Google Connector will be improved and become a double height space, there will be public Wi-Fi, and the public realm along Main Street will be significantly improved with new activity and retail square footage. Ms. Schrock introduced Tony Markese, Architect from Pickard Chilton and Christian Lemon the Landscape Architect from Lemon Brook. She noted specific open space improvements will not be reviewed in the presentation, but that Mr. Lemon would be available to answer questions in the comment/question period. Ms. Schrock explained that BxP would like the Boards to grant approval of the design so they can move forward with the project, subject to further review by staff.

Mr. Markese began the 325 Main Street presentation by reviewing the material covered during the last CRA Design Review committee and Joint CRA/Planning Board meeting, and explained the presentation agenda, which included reviewing the Infill Development Concept Plan, 325 Main Street building massing, the connection from the ground level of Main Street and the Kendall Plaza to the roof garden, the building enclosure and façade color palette. He presented an image showing a table of building model iterations and explained the current massing scheme made the building narrower with smaller floorplates and a little bit taller. He noted the gasket joining 325 Main (3CC) and 355 Main (5CC) was continually worked on to create a better connection joining the two buildings. Mr. Markese showed a slide comparing the building's massing, floorplates and gasket as first presented and the building as it is planned today. He explained the current building form adds apertures and terraces to create a visual path up the building and to add interest to the façade, and that the cascading terracing façade on the plaza side of the 325 Main Street building also creates a grander two-floor public space. He noted the 3CC-5CC gasket was reduced to create a cleaner break between the two buildings.

Mr. Markese explained the building's success relates to its proportion to 5CC, its neighbors across the street, the plaza, and the roof garden. He noted two Design Review meetings focused on refining the roof garden and Main Street stair, the elevator location, and the space between the headhouse and the base of the building. Mr. Markese reviewed the existing condition of Kendall Plaza and the MBTA headhouse, contrasting with the newer building design. He explained the apertures in the current building design help to soften the building's façade, and that a series of smaller soffits help define the building. Mr. Markese clarified that the first iteration of a stair plan connecting the ground to the roof garden had a smaller first level stair, a second level stair that stuck out from the building and a path to the roof garden that was obscured. Current iterations he said have widened the first level stair and turned the stairs on an east-west axis to allow users to trace how they can get up to the garden from the ground level. He explained gaps created in the second level stairs will allow for greenery to grow in between the rises and for look out positions to be placed on each stair platform. The new design he noted allows the stairs to be more graceful, open and for more seating to exist. Presenting a slide of a view of the building along Main Street, Mr. Markese explained the second level retail space of the building will be open and transparent. Mr. Markese also reviewed a sketch of the second level building façade up to the roof garden that embedded the elevator in the building. He stated something will be designed to highlight the location of the elevator visually, with a possibility of it being a different frit pattern on the façade.

Mr. Markese noted that the headhouse is in design negotiation with the MBTA. He reviewed three potential headhouse designs with each alternate design adding complexity, and the most elegant and best suited design as the design that adds an elevator and seating on top of the headhouse. Ms. Schrock added that BxP received a letter from the MBTA that design with a new elevator and occupied roof (the most elaborate design) is preferred. Mr. Markese reviewed an updated view of the look of the plaza and terrace retail plan, showing how the stair connections interface together, how the retail space is designed for the public, and areas designated for planting. He reviewed ground floorplans of 3CC and explained the entire ground floor block is intended to be retail, and identified the entrances of the retail space and elevator connections to the roof garden. He reviewed the stacked floorplans, with publicly accessible retail spaces shown in red and tenant spaces shown in blue. The retail vision showed 42,300 sf of retail space on two levels. Mr. Markese explained the ground floor and possibly the second

floor will have a free-flowing market area, with the potential to have an elevator taking you between the two levels. He noted there will be public toilets on the ground floor. He explained it is hard to know the design of the retail area until tenants are finalized. He also explained the retail space will feed out onto the second level.

Mr. Markese noted the existing connection from Main Street to Pioneer way (mid-block access way) will be maintained. He explained the space currently exists as a one-story passageway feeding the retail tenants and restaurant storefronts. The new condition he noted will be a two-story space, and that the seating will remain as well the operable folding door fronting Main Street. Structurally, he explained four columns are needed in the connector area to support the new building and that they will be shaped with the same sensibility of the building architecture, with an angled cut/faceted form. Similarly, he noted an aperture on Main Street will open the entrance to the connector area and have frit on the sloping glass of the opening. He detailed that the ceiling inside the connector will have a waved sloped wood form, a glowing light feature will help train the eye from front to back, that there will be an open retail space on the second floor that overlooks the connector, and that the space will be more transparent than the current condition. He acknowledged there were comments in previous meetings asking to have a canopy between the connector and the Green Garage. After study, Mr. Markese explained he does not believe a canopy is needed, as the upper building structure and soffit above creates a pocket of space that will allow users to stay dry. As of now they are not planning on creating a canopy in that area because it is nestled into the building.

Looking at the whole structure, Mr. Markese explained the building façade reinforces the design guideline concept of a bottom base, a middle and top building sections. The top and bottom areas he explained has a horizontal frit pattern marking each of the floors, and that the middle building area is more taught, simple and glassier. The top of the apertures he noted have a distinct feel, as does the storefronts along the base of the building. Mr. Markese showed a photo realistic image of the building façade to illustrate the design. At the base of the building he explained the glass has been changed to have a different, more transparent, coating than the upper floors of the building. To have a sense of that effect, he noted 145 Broadway has a similar transparent glass at the retail level while upper levels have a solar coating. For the façade color, Mr. Markese explained he wanted the building to have a bit of a hue which he described as a deep venetian red or oxblood red. He expressed he believes the color acknowledges the brick prevalent in Kendall Square and the deep anodized bronze of MITIMCO's new buildings across the street. He noted the building will have a touch of color to inspire its own personality, but also fit in the context of the neighborhood. In some indoor lights it looks black but in other lights he explained, it catches the light and shows a deeper dark red, not a scarlet red. The finish he further noted will have a metallic shine to it which he believes will give it depth. The horizontal bands of the building and the frit glass he explained will have this color. The frit he noted is a ceramic coating fired on the interior of the glass. He noted it is a very hard and in different lights it will either go almost invisible, or you will see the shadow of that frit pattern cast onto the second surface of the glass. This he explained will add a depth of shadow to the building, giving it a changing look or feel depending on how the light hits the glass and if it is getting direct light.

Mr. Markese stated BxP will build a mockup of the building façade so the public can see the glass and color of the building materials, and observe the shadowing effects. This he noted will help the Boards get a better idea of the coloration of the building, and how it will fit in the context of the neighborhood. He explained the terracotta at the base of the building will have a more neutral color, and that the soffits will have a brushed aluminum silver color, which when they catch the light will give them a luminous quality. Mr. Markese showed slides of other buildings that used similar glass to the type desired for 325 Main Street. He explained the selected glass performs well with heat gain and is an improved technology from the glass used at 145 Broadway, allowing it to be much less reflective, more transparent, less blue, and more greyed-green. He stated he believes the glass will be a nice match with the value of the red and terracotta.

Using slide images, Mr. Markese explained the curtain wall units, soffit areas, and the horizontal frit pattern within the spandrel. He noted they are looking at a pattern that might alternate between thicker lines and narrower lines,

and a slightly denser pattern as you get closer to the surface of the aperture itself. As the floors around the aperture will be occupied, he explained they will need to space the frit pattern so people can still see through it. The color he said will peek through where the columns of the structure are exposed. Mr. Markese reviewed a rendering of the ground floor of Main Street, showing how the terracotta band ties the building to the base and anchors the building to the wall. He reviewed axonometric drawings that showed the 3CC-5CC gasket connection, and main entrance aperture. He explained he decided to cut back the existing façade on its module where the new building meets, and to replace that facade with a new glass curtainwall. Earlier scenarios he noted included maintaining the sawtooth designs. He stated the current gasket iteration allows for a clean break, and will follow the 5CC floor spacing but be the same language as 3CC.

For building lighting, Mr. Markese explained each aperture will be up-lit, and that lights on the terrace will also shine up and catch the frit. In the soffit he noted there will be a linear light, and that second-floor terrace lighting will follow the glass railing to map the outline of the second-floor retail area. The whole base he stated will also glow from interior retail lighting. Mr. Markese recognized there is a split decision between lighting. He noted he would like to highlight the basics of the architecture, but do it in a simple, subtle way, with all lights dimmable so once they are installed they can be fine-tuned so they are not overly obtrusive. Mr. Markese thanked the Boards for their patience, for their desire to work with him and BxP and to work toward a better building for the site and for the city.

Mr. Russell initiated public testimony and explained the procedure for speaking, including the 3-minute time limit.

Public Testimony

Heather Hoffman, 213 Hurley Street - Ms. Hoffman stated she likes having stairs, but that beyond that she believes the building completes the destruction of the roof top garden that Google started a few years ago. She noted BxP never wanted that garden there, that they were forced to do it, and that it was great when it lasted. She noted the one slide that shows the garden will have sunlight is a lie, and that the public knows it will be a shade garden. She explained the City of Cambridge is pretty much seeing a clearcutting of its forest, and that so many big old trees have been cut down. She asked why are we taking nice trees in Kendall Square and destroy them too? She noted that to suggest getting rid of the sunlight is good is something everyone in this room knows is ridiculous. She said [BxP] can say it as many times as they want, that they can try to make her believe it, but that she does not believe it, that no one believes it and it is a lie so Google can get another building because Google doesn't care, BxP doesn't care, but that some of [the public] does care. She explained she knows nothing she says will change this, but the idea of putting a wall to block the only sun from the only park of any size in Kendall Square should give [the Boards] pause. She suggested they could do this to the rest of the parks in Cambridge, that they'd have to get pretty high to block all the sun from Danehy Park, that they could take Leland Cheung's tower and put it all around Danehy Park. She stated it is really sad, we had a nice thing.

Mr. Russell asked if anyone else wanted to give comments. Seeing no one, Mr. Russell closed public comment.

Board Discussions

Ms. Born mentioned the memos from the CRA staff, the CRA design consultant, and CDD staff were extensive and included 40 to 50 design points. Ms. Born noted that a number of issues raised in the memos have already been discussed. She explained some of the issues have been simplified from the presentation, and some points have raised more complex questions. Assuming the boards have read through at least their respective staff memos. Ms. Born asked for the respective members to identify which topics the group feels should be discussed tonight, and which items they would feel by default should be allow for staff to resolve? She noted that is a big task, so Ms. Born suggested alternating comments between the boards. Mr. Russell agreed to alternate comments, as that was what had been done in the past. Ms. Born asked for the members of the boards to pick a

few items to discuss, and noted that if the discussion got too complex, that each person should indicate if this is something staff could solve or if it is a real sticking point. Mr. Russell's stated his assumption, since he spent more time reviewing these materials than any other project ever on the Planning Board, was that there were many substantive questions remaining, some of which could be discussed in future CRA Design Review meetings, which Planning Board staff could participate in, but that tonight's goal might be to get a list of items that should be further discussed.

Tom Sieniewicz, a member of the Planning Board asked what the group sees success looking like tonight given how late the night is? He stated the proponent would like them to issue a special permit, but given the myriad of issues raised in the memos and the recent presentation, he wonders what success should look like when they finished? Mr. Sieniewicz noted success to him would be to daylight issues of the building given the scale and importance of the building to the community.

Ms. Born pointed out the boards have a different approval vote, as they have a different design review process going forward. The CRA board, she explained, has more of a role in review as the project moves through the design phases that follow the approval of the project, and that there is the possibility they could continue in the format of a design review meeting, if the Design Review committee from the Planning Board are willing and interested to participate with CDD staff.

Jason Zogg pointed out the CRA has a process map of the CRA's design review steps on the last page of the CRA's staff memo. Ms. Born noted the group is halfway through the steps.

Mr. Russell suggested going around the table to hear what each board member has to say, and stated that that process might take the whole hour so they should figure out the next steps after. Mr. Russell noted Iram Farooq, Assistant City Manager for Community Development explained earlier in their meeting that the Planning Board does not have an agenda for the next two meetings. Mr. Russell expressed that he does not know availability of the CRA, but suggested that this discussion could be continued in the next few weeks to get to where they want to get. He also noted he recognized there will be work they will ask Mr. Markese to do, and that he does not know the timeline needed for those changes. Mr. Russell explained he saw elements in the presentation tonight that shows further thinking and development of the design from the document submitted initially for their review in January, which looked good to him. Mr. Russell noted that Mr. Markese is not stopping, and that he is addressing items the Planning Board thinks is most important.

Mary Flynn, Planning Board member, noted she felt overwhelmed with all the information. She noted the work done on the building was tremendous, that there was a lot of follow up, and that she saw additional changes in the presentation. She explained she spent a lot of time reviewing the material, but that she still doesn't feel like she has a handle on the project. Ms. Flynn asked CDD staff to highlight priorities they felt they need Planning Board assistance on, and noted she would feel OK to let go of the other design elements because she believes the project is headed in a beautiful direction. She asked if there are big issues staff feel they need like the Planning Board to weigh in on. Ms. Born asked if the boards will get an answer for that, or if they should keep going? Mr. Russell asked if that is the sense of the other board members before they go around to room? Ms. Born noted that that group has the two staff memos, but explained that Ms. Flynn is asking for a point of emphasis. Ms. Flynn noted that that is her request, as there were 40+ items listed on the reports.

Mr. Russell noted that when he looked at the CRA's memo and was surprised there were more things to look at. He explained that was partly because the CRA looks at more details than the Planning Board does, such as management issues. He also noted the Planning Board should keep in mind that there are more meetings the CRA will have, but that he also finds it difficult to dismiss any issues as not being worth of discussion, at least at the staff level. He explained he met with Susannah for two hours earlier that day, so he has a sense of the more difficult problems to be address and ones that need to be addressed sooner rather than later. Mr. Russell listed

those items as a way of starting the conversation. He explained he does not like the fact that the elevator access is tucked away in a corner that is hard to see. He noted it is an important item that needs to be addressed. He also explained that Mr. Markese did respond to comments regarding expression, and that he wants to know if the Planning Board believes if that design is in a good direction? He also noted there are more questions about the stair design, but that some of those can be pushed out to further development stages. He stated the narrow passage between the headhouse and first floor retail is too highly constrained, but he is concerned they are not going to be able to make much of a difference with that. He expressed the concern of bike access, and that the sidewalk design could be done later. He noted details on the design of the apertures needs to be resolved. He stated as the building gets better detailed like these those will be resolved. Mr. Russell asked if there was a need to have the outer-wall of the aperture located on the 5th-7th floor? He expressed his concern is that it blocks the roof garden, and asked if it should it be cut away? Mr. Russell explained he wants to defer that question to Mr. Markese. Mr. Russell ask Susannah Bigolin, CDD staff member, if that was a big or a small concern? Ms. Bigolin noted she saw there was a change in the presentation regarding that feature, so she does not think it is a big issue to discuss. Mr. Zevin noted he is concerned about birds hitting the aperture outer-wall. Mr. Russell agreed that birds fall into windows with glass on both sides. Mr. Russell noted that the elevator has been pushed out of the view, and that has made a big difference. He also raised the issue of differentiation between the podium, middle and top building zones. He explained he thinks that is something that can be developed over time, but that he would like to see a little more differentiation. Mr. Russell noted that the frit pattern on the building changed from January 7th to what they saw in the presentation today, and that that change likely makes more of a difference between the zones. Ms. Markese confirmed that the change was to tie the building more cohesively together and came from the texture of the apertures. Mr. Markese noted he understands that apertures are difficult to understand, but once built he believes they will be special moments. He explained it is unique to have the glass run free, and thinks it will be beautiful and dramatic. He also noted that having a glass outer-wall protects that apertures more, and said if you read the glass looking up from below it will be different from the rest of the building. He expressed he would hate to have the form of the building be less clear or understandable. Mr. Russell noted the biggest concern of his is the two-story retail. He noted there should be similar expression on the two-story treatment so that the second floor looks like it belongs more to the first-floor retail floor rather than the third-floor office space. He stated another concern is how you get more variation and activity as you see through the building. He noted it is a big design challenge, but that it has relatively little impact on the concept of the building. He stated the CRA could review this in later meetings, but that the Planning Board first needs to feel more comfortable this will happen correctly. He stated retail paths need to get more fleshed out, as does lighting and signage. He noted there was a lot more content on those issues in the CRA memo than CDD's memo and that those are things that are development issues not strategy issues. He expressed the CRA board has more experience addressing these issues and apparently more interest based on lines of text in their memo. Therefore, he stated, he believes those are items the Planning Board would like the CRA to continue to work on, but that he is interested in going to these design review meetings, and that Mr. Sieniewicz probably is too. He explained wind studies are another concern. He said he was in Kendall Square recently and found the wind to be so strong he had a hard time on his bicycle. He noted he knew it was a challenging corner based on wind studies, but found it far more challenging than he expected. He expressed the goal on energy is that you do best possible practices, but that you don't have to take the glass away, even if that is how you get better performance. That he stated is his opinion. He acknowledged CDD has a very competent environmental department, and on many levels, they wish the building could perform better. Mr. Russell explained BxP has to convince CDD staff that everything possible is being done. He noted BxP responded to the variable refrigerant flow question, and for climate resiliency that they responded the issues had been anticipated and that they won't be issues. He explained the curb plan and truck exit stops can be refined later by staff. Mr. Russell asked CRA staff if they would like to list additional items to discuss.

Mr. Zogg noted that Mr. Russell identified a vast majority of CRA concerns, but that there were a few items he starred. He noted his primary concern is the differentiation between the first and second floor reading as retail. He

feels both boards will need to feel confident in that design to move forward. He asked to know how many doors the boards should expect for retail on each side of the building, and that he would like to hear from the boards to know if Mr. Markese's expression of the elevator on the outside of the building is adequate. Mr. Zogg stated he personally liked that idea of expressing the elevator as shown on the power point. Mr. Zogg noted he felt the way Mr. Markese addressed the gasket connection between 3CC and 5CC was adequate, but that it was not a view that could be clearly understood in the design review documents they received but that it was clearer in the presentation. He asked if the boards agree? He noted he would like to have more information from the boards regarding the basement bike parking and if the Main street lookout is a big or small issue? Mr. Zogg said he noticed the connector between 3CC and 5CC has been fixed in a variety of ways, such as the doors on either end lining up, and that the more detailed renderings give a better feeling for the space. He asked to know if the boards agree the design is the right direction? He also noted the width between the headhouse and the retail is an issue that should be worked out. He explained both memos provided ideas on how that should be addressed, knowing that the MBTA does need to secure the headhouse while still opening up that space. He stated architectural light is something written a lot about in the CRA staff memo, since it was talked a lot about in CRA board meetings, and that they came to some general philosophical principles on that topic.

Mr Evans added that the element of the skin of the building and the tonal qualities of the façade material should be considered a topic of discussion. He explained of the big picture questions many are details that can be resolved technically, but the overall design question of coloration and how the building connects with the brick tones, as this block is all brick otherwise in important. The design of the building he noted plays homage to the surrounding brick, but asked if it should jump out and not be as neutral? He asked for those general design questions should be considered. He explained 75 Ames is a nearby example of a very glass building with a piece of brick coloration as a homage to the rest of Cambridge center. He noted it was interesting, but that it is a different approach as it is more tonal.

Mr Zevin asked to see the slide that shows the retail corner. Mr. Zevin provided a design proposal with how to deal with the corner. He suggested changing the mullion spacing on the second floor to the spacing on the first floor. He explained it is 50% wider on the first floor, and that you could adjust that without wreaking havoc on the form. On the first floor he noted, two window panes fit three on the second floor. In looking at what would happen if you sheered it back, he believes it would do violence to the building. This same issue he noted was raised with 88 Ames. Mr. Zevin noted the retail corner also brings up the question of signage, which the CRA gets left struggling with. He explained he would appreciate for the architects and BxP to make a statement about how the signage ought to be arranged and controlled. He noted the overlook of Main Street in the gasket has become a nice terrace, and that he wishes it was connected to the roof garden, but it is not. It expressed it will be a nice habitation for the workers, which is important. He noted there are more workers in Kendall than there are residents and that this building should be a decent place for them when it gets occupied. Ms. Schrock noted that BxP has committed to Google that the terrace be included in the base-building construction. She also noted that the mullions will be the same on first and second floor.

Mr. Zevin said he guesses it is nice to mark the elevator. He explained he was fascinated as a child watching the elevator mechanics in D.C., and that he would like it if the frit did not obscure the elevator mechanics. Mr. Russell asked a clarifying question, if the elevator itself will have a glass shaft, or if it is just a marking on a solid wall? Mr. Markese explained that the elevator is too far inboard to the building, and that it has beams or columns between the façade and elevator so the mechanics will not be visible. Ms. Schrock noted that the location of the elevator is where it's going to end up, and that when it was pushed inside the building the design had to change.

Mr. Zevin asked if the plantings between the second level stair to the roof garden comes from the second level? Mr. Markese answered yes. Mr. Zevin expressed that it's too bad that the space in there is just a wedge, and that if the stair projected out a bit that could be mitigated. He also asked about the trellis renovation? Ms. Schrock noted it is under study, and that they have not designed it yet, but that it is in process. She explained she does not

think planting is appropriate there, which is the way it used to be and it did not look very good. She noted their new approach is with art or lighting. Mr. Zevin stated he liked the idea of public art or lighting there, and wants to look at the possibility of having a deck on the trellis beams, as Mr. Hawkinson suggested previously. He also noted that if that was feasible, it would be important to consider the platform the stair landed on, so it could be consistent with a possible deck. Mr. Zevin stated he is also interested in sharing bike parking in Proto since it is currently underpopulated. Ms. Schrock noted that they do not disagree, but that they are trying to build infrastructure and facilities that promote more cycle trips in the City. She explained Proto is dramatically underutilized, and they are interested in assessing the evolving biking parking needs with Google, and that they might want to come to Planning Board in the future to discuss bike parking changes. She did note that Google wants to have private bike parking for security issues, so that is a consideration for the basement and possible reutilization of the Proto cage. She also explained that they are looking at different ways of access to the basement bike, and that they are jointly committed to come up with a solution that creates an easy to use facility. He noted he is worried about access through the retail lobby from the elevator and the easement. If the retail isn't closable in some manner he stated, you could have a problem during after-hours or early in the morning. He said he would like to see that issue solved before proceeding. Ms. Schrock noted that in the CRA's masterplan approval letter, there is a timeline on how that easement may evolve in the future. BxP she explained is looking for a way on the ground floor to create a corridor through the Marriott trellis zone to the elevator so that it is always available but that the marketplace can close. She noted if the market place retail doesn't come to fruition that the access easement will still be there. The garden access she explained also has limited hours, so the elevator may only operate from the ground to terrace and not up to the roof garden. Those features or designs help resolve the concern of having people floating in retail that is closed. Mr. Zevin noted that there had been previous issues of a handicap elevator. Ms. Schrock explained that the redundant elevator in the MBTA headhouse and the new elevator in 325 Main will have enough visual cues that they think they will get over that hurdle.

Louis Bacci Jr. a Planning Board member commented that he liked the stairs from the sidewalk to the second floor, but that he was unsure if the stairs from the second floor to garden were dramatic enough. He noted he felt they were narrow and choppy, and that he would like to see something a little more inviting. He expressed his disappointment that the elevator moved into the building. He stated he liked the double height retail. Mr. Bacci asked if the frit color was it really red? He sees it as eggplant and brown. Mr. Markese noted that his design intentions was to try to create a color that is darker in value that is red in tone but not scarlet red, a color that is subtler and more timeless not too bright or red. Mr. Markese is not worried about the dark value. Mr. Bacci noted that the architectural lighting image should never be blacked out. Mr. Markese noted that is true and apologized. He said the image was to give a sense on where the accent or feature lighting would be. He recognizes that the building will be glowing. Mr. Bacci asked if Mr. Markese expected any bleed-through from the inside building lighting (from tenant floors) that will affect the frit colors on the sloped sections of the apertures? Mr. Markese noted that the up-lighting will be stronger than the inside light spill, so that will not be a problem.

Conrad Crawford noted that he felt the discussion around materials was thorough enough for him, and that he would like to focus on the programming, use, community and ecology of the space, including employees of the building, and how people engage and live in the space. He also does not want to neglect the non-human, natural element of the space and how the building will affect their ability to live through this space. He stated he has been affected by the public comments since he joined the board several years ago about the importance of the roof garden. He said he feels there are opportunities to address those concerns, whether its landscaping or programming. He noted he would like to see something like a zoo or aquarium day, He explained it may be a harsh term, but that there is a sterile and commercial feel many people associate with Kendall. He noted that if that issue could be address through the plantings on the garden or programming on the plaza open space it should be explored, and that it may be a design or programming conversation. Mr. Crawford noted the importance of understanding how the space will be used by workers, the public and people coming on and off the T, and

stated there were a lot of excellent suggestions in the CRA staff memo on page 5, points 18-23, talking about the coffee cart, synthetic turn, art and sculpture and how that might be expressed through some interventions and installations. He noted his idea might be address at another time, but that he is looking forward how to accommodate and pay attention to that. He explained his first note of the night was when he first saw the building in relationship with all the brick surrounded by all the other buildings, and thought it looked out of place. He stated he liked that the color elements speak to that neighborhood character while having its own personality. He also expressed that he would continue to defer to his colleagues in the design profession and to staff to make sure the integrity of the design solutions come through. On the Main street lookout, he noted that a big issue to him was view corridors / sheds. He stated he wished that they could visually see the river somehow with a sight line, but that he knows that it is unrealistic. He expressed BxP should continue to take a look at how the plaza, the trellis and the stairs come together, as he believes it is still looking for some character. He stated they should also look at how many surfaces can really accommodate plants, and asked for BxP to be ambitious with planting everything they can like the precedent images show. Mr. Crawford noted that his last comment regarded the elevator and its relationship to pioneer way, the Main Street connection and the transparency of the double height lobby. He explained there is a parking garage on the other side of the lobby, so he does not see the double height with transparent glass looking on to the garage as a good design. He expressed getting as many attractive views from the street level and embracing the urban condition was an important concept. Mr. Crawford asked if the staircase to the garage stairs was included in the project scope? Ms. Schrock noted that it was outside the existing scope. Mr. Crawford asked if BxP envisioned the transparent glass space being more attractive, or if they were looking to cloud that view at all? Mrs. Schrock noted it will be vision glass, and that the Proto bike parking cage will be visible. She noted they could look at doing some art or environmental graphic on the garage face.

Mr. Sieniewicz noted that he needs to have confidence that the Planning Board is in the deal and that he understands what they are getting from a civic perspective. He noted he does not have an issue with the density of the project, nor does he have an issue with the tenant. He stated he is proud Cambridge can attract a tenant at this level, but that to feel comfortable with an approval he needs to see how the architecture, public realm and the garden fit together. For the public realm he noted he believes BxP has gone miles from where they started, and that he would like to feel there was a sense of consistency with the board's opinions. Mr. Sieniewicz explained he felt the civic character of the second level stair looks less like a public stair and more like an interior stair. He stated he would like to look at the character of how it is made. Mr. Sieniewicz agreed with Mr. Bacci's comments regarding the dimension of the ground level stair feeling right, and wondered if they are missing the plaza, because the first level stair just goes to Main Street? Mr. Sieniewicz asked if there was an opportunity to put one more access point into the square and up into the garden, perhaps in the location of the current trellis? He noted it is a detail, but he wondered if BxP is not addressing it properly. For comments on the architecture, he noted he made this comment before, but that he wondered if it is true that they can make the south elevation of the building the same as the north elevation? He asked if materiality with the central portion being flat glass around the whole building makes sense, and wondered if they should consider orientation of façade treatments based on south vs. north? He explained that there are very real issues with how they should protect and shade building elevations, especially since Cambridge is heading towards net zero. Mr. Sieniewicz reviewed the LEED list and noted the promise of 33 EUI was is great, but the he was not sure if that factors Google's plug load, so he would like to have the EUI reviewed with that considered. He also wondered if they were being ambitions enough with energy given the building location in the city and BxP as a developer. He explained they should be reaching as high as possible. He also asked to have additional clarity for signage. He noted he is personally liberal with what can be signed, but that he does not believe the Planning Board can leave signage up to chance. Mr. Sieniewicz explained needed to understand where the signs will go and their nature. Clarification was provided that the CRA Board has signage discretion over the MXD district. Ms. Born noted the CRA has just redone their signage guidelines. Mr. Sieniewicz asked for the CRA to look at signage carefully and to be sent the CRA's signage guidelines. He also asked if 5CC will be getting any upgrades on its façade and envelop since it is touching the building.

Margaret Drury noted that she is pleased that there are stairs connecting the plaza to the roof garden. She noted she like the sculptural aspects of the terraces and the apertures and agreed somewhat with Mr. Sieniewicz and Mr. Bacci about the look and feel of the second-floor stairs. She noted there is something insubstantial with the stairs, and suggested it might be the railings. She explained the railing on the first-floor stair was fine, but that the one going up to the roof garden looked less substantial. She also expressed plantings could help that, and that she would like to see that in the design review meetings ahead. She stated she is pleased with the progress of the building, and noted this building is special and a unique contribution to Kendall Square, and that she would be happy to leave the rest to design review.

Steve Cohen noted he was happy with the design and that given the hour and the talent of his colleagues, he had little to add in details.

Ms. Born expressed her pleasure with how far the design of the building had come. She noted that she is happy to have the elevator out of the field of vision of the staircase that connects the plaza to the roof garden. She explained she did think you could see through the wall to the elevator and see it go up and down. He stated looking at the floorplans of the building that she was a little unsure with how the elevator met the top level as it is cocked to the edge of the building. She also wondered if there was a way to have the red frit glass be a vertical element on the building wall? She also inquired about the feasibility of a light that went up and down on the facade to give you the notion of elevator movement as lighting seemed to be a theme in the building. She explained her idea might be too literal or too cutesy, but that it will give you the notion on the second-floor terrace that something is going up and down. Ms. Born inquired about the maroon/eggplant color. She asked if everything in the building was that color, or if there was a color hierarchy with some elements having a black or metallic finish? Mr. Markese noted that all colored elements will have the oxblood color, the channels, the frit and the columns. He explained the vertical mullions are fairly minimal, but hat those will have a deeper darker color. Ms. Born confirmed there was no change in the color throughout the building? Mr. Markese and Ms. Schrock confirmed it was the same, with the exception of the middle section of the building not having the frit. Ms. Born noted that she could be convinced of the color, but that in further design review sessions she would like a picture of other buildings that have this color scheme. Mr. Markese suggested she will be able to see this in a whole scale mockup. Ms. Born noted that that was true, but that she would still like to see a picture of a bigger building. Ms. Schrock suggested that they will do both. Ms. Born noted that in the design book submission, that BxP has a page that locates zones for signage, and that one of those zones was up toward the top of the building. She explained she wanted to make sure BxP was aware that the CRA is sensitive about corporate signs. She also explained the MXD is not subject to the city ordinance, but that they put a premium on creativity, and it cannot be a bland corporate sign, but rather something that is unique and lovable. Ms. Schrock noted that BxP recognizes that, and that Google recognizes that as well, and that any sign on top of the building will undergo a robust discussion. She stated that with Google as a tenant, she believes that if they were to come forward with a sign, that it would be creative. Ms. Schrock also stated that signage is somewhat of a debate within their firm regarding how much they want to announce their presence, and that they may just request a sign on the street level. Ms. Born also noted that the CRA Board loves the existing street level sign, that it broke almost every rule that CRA had, but that when the Board saw it they liked it.

Ms. Born asked about the rendering of the gasket at street level. She stated looking at the last bay of the old building and how it meets 5CC, that she wondered if there was something they could make out of it? Mr. Zevin noted it is a difficult problem, and wondered that it was the only sloping surface you can't see through? He also questioned if it should be flattened into a regular soffit? Mr. Markese explained that you can see through the soffit. Mr. Zevin noted that it looks like part of the soffit is buried in a floor sandwich. Mr. Markese explained that as it curves it bends up and curves at both ends. Chuck Redmon noted that in the renderings he saw inconsistency with what the perspective showed verse what the rendering showed. He wondered which was right? Mr. Markese noted that if he was standing in the third-floor space, that the spandrel kicks out away. Mr. Redmon noted he was

not convinced, and that it is worth a detailed discussion later. Mr. Redmon raised another point, noting that there was a need to illuminate the roof currently shown on the gasket and to bring it down one level. He urged Mr. Markese to lower the roof to the second brick spandrel from the top where it hit the existing building. He explained that design would allow Mr. Markese to separate the two buildings and allow him to use the gasket as a real gasket. Mr. Markese noted that that was an extremely tough proposition, because it would make that floor unusable. Mr. Redmon noted that an alternative could be to remove one floor and raise the floor below. Mr. Russell chimed in to note that level 10 in the new building connected to level 12 in the new building, and that level 10 was 3 feet above level 12. He suggested that by dropping the floor of the gasket to an intermediate connection you could still do what Mr. Redmon wants you to do, but make a connection by stealing ceiling height from the 9th floor. Mr. Russell noted that it was worth looking at the section to see if it was a possibility. Mr. Redmon noted there was a variety of connection types between the building, but in this floor the connection was the most extreme. Mr. Markese asked if the goal was to have the brick band run all the way through the building, because he explained in demolition it won't stay, so it would have to be rebuilt back. Ms. Schrock noted that the level on the exterior, where they are doing a terrace will allow you to see people. Mr. Zevin noted you could also push the floor back a few feet. Mr. Zevin asked about the fire zones in the building? Ms. Schrock noted there will be a fire separation wall but that it will vary at each floor. Mr. Zevin noted that in the previous Google connector project that they were cajoled into thinking that Google needed these wide-open floor spaces, when they really were separated by fire doors. Ms. Schrock noted there were good examples of the open areas being used, but Mr. Zevin noted those are only some of the floors.

Ms. Born noted that that conversation grew out of wanting to take another look at the connection between the two buildings, which is a thorny design problem. She explained the existing design did a good job, but that there was no way to make it clean and simple. Returning to the issue of street façade, Ms. Born asked Mr. Markese if this was where BxP was at for aperture design? Mr. Markese noted the in the last design meetings he was asked to make the Main Street aperture be a larger opening with an added canopy. He agreed that her statement about it being a tough problem was true because of the 5CC corner. Earlier in the design process he explained he showed images with the corner chopped out, and that certain members thought that the integrity of the existing building was jeopardized. Ms. Born noted that signage is for later, but asked if Ms. Schrock thought signage could be a solution for the entry aperture? Ms. Schrock noted that it was possible because behind the opening would be retail, and that Google would probably want their sign to be in front of their lobby space. In design review meetings Ms. Schrock also noted that there was also a strong desire for the Kendall Center sign to not say Google.

Ms. Flynn noted she had a few material comments. She stated she liked darker colors and is curious to see what the mockup will look like even though the oxblood now looks black. She also agreed with earlier comments about the stairs up to the garden. She explained she would like them to have more of a presence so it's clear they are public stairs. She expressed that signage will be needed on the ground floor of the plaza, and that it will need to announce there is a garden and programming up there. She noted she liked a point in the CRA's staff memo regarding developing a clear policy regarding private events with the developer and other users in the area. She also noted she liked the idea of coordinating with MITMCO for events.

Mr. Russell commented, in response to Mr. Zogg's earlier comments, that he was optimistic about the façade color approach. He noted that the sun is very strong and that brick buildings do not look depressing, but that many brick colors are dark. He stated sitting in a room does not allow you to appreciate what is going to happen. He also suggested a tweak to the stair as it meets Main Street, as he felt the bottom step of the stair was not parallel to the sidewalk/curb. Mr. Russell proposed that the sidewall could be bent out, so the stairs would be parallel to the street, wider at the opening and narrower going up to the first landing. That way he explained the stairs will reach out to people walking down Main Street from Galaxy Park. He also asked for the material of the stair treads and risers to be consistent all the way up to the roof garden. Mr. Russell also explained that great

monumental stairs have great monumental balustrades of substantial size. He stated he would not suggest a balustrade but rather than having a glass end with something of substantial size capping the glass. That way he noted it could make the stairs feel heavier and more substantial without making them bigger. He also stated he does not believe changing the mullion spacing will be enough to make the second-floor retail feel more like the first floor rather than the third-floor. He suggested BxP could look at the spandrel between the second and third floor, or Mr. Markese could move the terracotta, or make the foot piece more substantial. The spandrel he noted could also be changed so the public could see more of a difference. Mr. Russell also noted that he feels Mr. Markese is not done with the gasket on the first floor, and that he will continue to find a tough solution to a very challenging problem. He noted that big design moves often happen quickly, but that a ton of time can be spent refining smaller design challenges or elements. He explained that after a few more models and iterations he will come to a solution that is clever but hard. Mr. Russell, noted the time was midnight, and asked when the Boards should get together again. He recommended meeting in two weeks, and asked the group what additional information they needed to get them to a place where the Planning Board felt comfortable voting.

Mr. Zevin followed by offering dissent on stairs. He stated he thought the second set of stairs were fine the way they were, and that they were beautiful how they terrace up. He noted BxP could make a beautiful stair design from steel and keep the tread the same. He explained he thought the difference between the two runs of stairs was warranted based on their inherent difference in locations and use. He stated it is not a hillside between the terrace and the roof garden but a structure in space.

Ms. Born noted that if the discussion is continued, that she will be away on March 12th, but that Ms. Drury, Vice-Chair of the CRA was available to chair the next meeting. Mr. Russell asked about publicly announcing the meeting, and Ms. Farooq noted that if the Planning Board announced the meeting in the meeting, then the City of Cambridge did not need to advertise the meeting elsewhere.

Mr. Rafferty, BxP's lawyer offered an idea for consideration. He noted the conversation was illuminating, and that he thought the list of issues needing to be resolved would not get resolved in a week. He noted that since the Boards already approved the IDCP Major Amendment, and that design development tends to be ongoing, that he recommended the Planning Board decide consensus existed, and that there was adequate information for design approval with certain design elements left with staff to continued to work on design review meetings. Mr. Rafferty also suggested that the design review group could return to the Planning Board to receive acknowledgement and updates. He also stated that only five Planning Board members were available for the meeting that night, and that he is worried about being able to meet quorum numbers. Mr. Rafferty also noted how long it took them to get to this point in the discussion and asked if the Planning Board would be OK to make a conceptual design approval?

Mr. Russell asked CDD staff if this request seemed reasonable? Ms. Bigolin answered noting that she felt there were too many issues that were discussed in this meeting, and that to move forward they needed to get more information regarding building orientation, energy, and the second-floor terrace. She also noted that there was inconsistency with the book materials received for review and the presentation. She suggested meeting in two weeks. Mr. Sieniewicz noted that would be March 12th, and asked CDD staff if they would need a formal vote on this design approval? He also noted that one week will not give BxP enough time to respond to their concerns, so he suggested that two weeks made more sense.

Jeff Roberts, CDD Zoning and Development Director reviewed the voting process for the Planning Board for design review. He noted that the special permit for this case was already granted, and that for the MXD district the special permit authorizes the conceptual master plan, similar to PUD development, and that at some point the Planning Board needs to approve the design of the building by five votes. Like all buildings he explained, issues are subject to continuing review, but that there first needs to be clear approval of the design so staff then just works through the design details. Mr. Roberts listed the points needing further discussion: retail expression on floors one and two, stair design to the plaza and elevator access, color and skin of the building some of which will

be reviewed through the mockup, bike parking access, and information on energy performance on the building. He asked if the board could say what exactly should be done if it should be left to staff review, because without specific information it would be hard to move forward for staff.

Mr. Russell noted that this was a unique situation as they are approving this design through a brother board [CRA], and that the CRA has a different and more stringent design process. Bike parking, he explained could be one item left to the CRA with Susannah kept in the loop. Mr. Russell asked BxP how much time they would need to come back to the Boards to respond to their concerns? He also asked the CRA how they wanted to be involved? Ms. Schrock noted that a meeting in two weeks would work for them and that she noted that what she was hearing is that they needed to create greater consistency with the retail space without effecting the overall massing, clarify the building color, provide additional bike parking information, and she noted they could bring their energy design consultants to next meeting. She expressed that 33-energy rating is the lowest in BP's portfolio and that it is a very energy efficient building.

Ms. Born noted that the CRA could bring a quorum in two weeks, and that they also could have the group meet in an advisory meeting and defer their final approval to the CRA's board meeting date which is March 20th. They also explained they have a design review meeting scheduled in the afternoon of March 20th, were they planned to review 135 Broadway, but that they could discuss the 325 Main Street project, but that it seemed like scheduling the March 12th joint planning board meeting was a better alternative. Ms. Born explained she would not be able to attend the March 12th meeting, but that the CRA could have at least three members present to form a quorum. Ms. Born reviewed the issues she felt they would need to talk about. She thought color was an issue, the ground floor retail façade, detailing the stair to roof garden, development of the façade of the elevator going to the roof garden, and noted the Main Street building aperture should be worked on.

Mr. Rafferty deferred the question regarding aperture refinement, but noted that he thought she just made a realistic motion subject to completing review on those three items. He explained that BxP agreed that work needed to be done on the façade of the first and second floor retail levels, and that the Boards had heard everything, and that there was a certain logic to saying there would be little additional information given in two weeks, so that a decision can be made now. Ms. Born noted that staff members present did not agree that there was enough information to move forward with an approval. Mr. Russell noted that CRA and CDD staff should meet together to discuss a March 12th agenda quickly with BxP. He noted that until you get to the very fine details that the Boards are very much on the same level. He also stated he did not believe the entry to the arcade could make a lot of progress in two weeks, and asked Mr. Markese to do the best he could, and that further refinement could be brought to the design review committee. Mr. Russell motioned for the meeting be adjourned until March 12th with CRA board members invited. Ms. Drury asked if the Boards will vote together? Ms. Born noted they will vote separately. Ms. Drury asked what would happen if the Boards disagreed? Mr. Russell noted that the Planning Board had experience approving buildings partially in other cities and that both boards approve the building separately, and that the developer gets stuck with making it all work. Mr. Zogg noted that the CRA could continue reviewing the building in design review meetings for sticky items, and that that might be more efficient. Mr. Russell made a motion to continue the meeting, all Planning Board members agreed in favor. Ms. Born made a motion to adjourn the CRA board meeting. Ms. Drury seconded the motion and all members voted in favor. Ms. Born stated the CRA Board will next meet on March 12th at 344 Broadway, Cambridge, MA.