

Joint CRA Board Meeting with the Cambridge Planning Board
Tuesday, September 20, 2016, 7:00pm
City Hall Annex - Second Floor
344 Broadway, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

DRAFT - MEETING MINUTES

Call

The joint public hearing meeting was called at 7:07 p.m. by H. Theodore Cohen, Chair. CRA Chair Kathleen Born noted that the CRA is recording the meeting. The other four CRA Board members introduced themselves - Margaret Drury, Christopher Bator, Conrad Crawford, and the Commonwealth representative Barry Zevin. Also present were Executive Director Tom Evans, consultants Charles Redmon and Larry Bluestone, and staff members Carlos Peralta, Ellen Shore and Jason Zogg. The planning Board members introduced themselves - Tom Sieniewicz, Steven Cohen, Hugh Russell, Ahmed Nur. City Staff members were Jeff Roberts, Iram Farooq, Susannah Bigolin.

There was an update from Community Development by Iram Farooq. This information is not included as it was not specifically related to the work of the CRA. Due to the conflicting public meeting of the City Council regarding the City Manager selection, Ms. Farooq stated that no decisions will be made tonight so that those who could not attend this meeting would have the ability to comment.

Ms. Born did not have other CRA business to discuss other than that which was scheduled.

Mr. Cohen started the joint hearing on the special permit application case PB #315 for the property located at Kendall Center, at various street addresses including 145 Broadway, 250 Binney Street and 255 Main Street for which the applicant is Boston Properties Limited Partnership seeking special permits pursuant to Section 14.32.2, approval of Infill Development Concept Plan in the Mixed Use Development (MXD) District in Kendall Center for a proposal to Increase the Aggregate Gross Floor Area (GFA) in the district from 3,330,000 square feet to 4,273,000 square feet. This will involve constructing two new commercial buildings and two new residential buildings, demolishing two existing commercial buildings, and converting the use of floor area in some existing buildings in a manner that affects whether or not it is included in the calculation of GFA, and associated sites in public space improvements.

Ms. Born noted that the CRA goal is to assess the adequacy of the submission in meeting the objectives and criteria of the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan (KSURP), which the CRA just amended.

Mr. Michael Cantalupa of Boston Properties agrees to go forward with the hearing although only five Planning Board members were present. Mr. Roberts gave an overview of the case as this is the first time that the Infill Development Concept Plan (IDCP) for the MXD zoning district is being considered by the Planning Board. This hearing is proceeding as noted in the new zoning as interagency design review, a process held jointly by the CRA Board and the Planning Board. Under the Planning Board's jurisdiction, the application is for a planned additional development within the district beyond the base zoning limitations of the district. The base is currently three million square feet of development, whereas the IDCP authorizes development above that figure. There are similar criteria to that of a planned unit development review but the procedures are somewhat different. A project review special permit under Article 19 zoning is still required. The CRA has jurisdiction under the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan to approve the IDCP in accordance with the zoning adopted in December 2015. The approvals are separate as the roles and decision making of the CRA Board and the Planning Board are different.

Mr. Evans noted that the first public meeting he attended with the CRA Board was also a joint meeting with the Planning Board to discuss the strategic planning process of the CRA. He is pleased to now be discussing the evolution of the CRA's role and governance in the design review process which has been

reflected through the zoning process to date. The urban renewal plan, amended in 2015, required a long process outside the zoning which involved state and MEPA review and approval. This IDCP project has gone through an evolution via City zoning and state and MEPA review. This is not the same massing configuration initially in the MEPA process but it is approximately the same square footage. He also noted that the intent for further growth is intended to have a stringent public review forum before both the CRA and the Planning Board. For the past two years, there has been considerable outreach done through community engagement and the MEPA process and this plan reflects this.

Mr. Michael Cantalupa of Boston Properties explained the project. Boston Properties submitted two documents – one for the IDCP and one for 145 Broadway, which is the first phase of development. The IDCP has five major elements in it – four new buildings and an existing building which will accommodate the innovation space. The bulk of development is on the north parcel at Kendall Center. Boston Properties has assembled four teams for the project. Sasaki is the masterplan architect and the designer of the innovation space proposed at 255 Main Street. Pickard Chilton is responsible for the corporate build-to-suit of the building at 145 Broadway. SCB will design the two residential buildings on the North Garage at 135 Broadway) and Perkins + Will will focus on the building at Binney Street which could be either office or laboratory space.

Under the zoning, one million square feet was allowed under the entitlement. About 600,000 of it are commercial and 400,000 are residential. The buildings here are slightly larger due to the commercial side. The two residential buildings in the middle of the parcel do total 400,000 square feet but the building on Broadway and Galileo Way is about 450,000 square feet, on an FAR basis, and the building on Binney Street is about 350,000 square feet so there is more than one million square feet and there are two reasons for that. There are two existing buildings sites that are located on the sides of the commercial building – a 80,000 square foot 4-story building at Broadway and a 70,000 square foot laboratory building. These will be demolished and their FAR reused. In addition, the approved zoning obligates that 10% of the commercial space be innovation space and a right to deliver another 10%. Boston Properties will use all of that available innovation space and locate it at One Cambridge Center (250 Main Street). They are effectively taking out office space and replacing it with innovation space. He believes this plan is fully compliant with the spirit and intent of K2 and the KSURP.

The proposed phasing is to build the corporate building on the corner of Broadway and Galileo Way in the early part of next year and then deliver a commensurate amount of open space improvements. Boston Properties will also deliver the first phase of the innovation space. The next phase is nebulous. The zoning stipulates that up to 375,000 square feet of commercial space can be delivered but then a minimum of 250,000 square feet of residential must be delivered before delivering any more commercial space. So a possible second phase might be simultaneous building on Binney Street and a residential building on Broadway. He added that the additional heights are fully compliant under the modification allowed in the zoning with 350 feet on the residential on Broadway and up to 200 feet as they approach the neighborhoods along Binney Street. Another possible second phase could provide affordable housing delivering 20% for-sale ownership space in the residential buildings by developing a mixed-use residential on Broadway via a combination of apartments and condominiums or exclusive condominium ownership in the building on Binney.

Mr. Cantalupa showed a summary of the numerous public forums held from October 2015 thru July 2016, including community groups, the CRA Board, and the Planning Board, where the IDCP or portions of it were discussed. He feels that the material has been reasonably vetted. He highlighted the various benefits of the project - 20% home ownership (about 75 units), a commitment to 3-bedroom units, the largest (20%) affordable housing percentage in the City with an additional 5% for middle income, 105,000 feet of innovation space, and enhanced open spaces. The majority of the housing is planned to be delivered in the first phase, with delivery in 2019. Creating rooftop space on top of garages is also a possibility. Tonight, Mr. Cantalupa is asking for approval of the IDCP and then to proceed with a design review of 145 Broadway. Once the IDCP is approved, Boston Properties would come back with future submission for the other buildings.

Mr. Alan Ward, a planner and landscape architect with Sasaki, spoke next. This is an opportunity to improve the public realm in this part of the Mixed Use District. The three key areas are Broadway Park, Binney Park and the Sixth Street connector. He showed maps of the parks and spoke of improvements and modifications to each of them. The Sixth Street connector will get new paving, new LED lighting, and an added bicycle path that links to the Ames Street bike path, while protecting the existing trees. The Broadway Park, currently defined by service drives, would be opened up, changing it from an inward-oriented public space into a more permeable and accessible space. There would be a community table, more programming potential, and a rainwater feature. The east-west connectors would be more visible and usable. There will be new paths and new plantings. The Binney Park, oriented to the north neighborhood, will have recreational use.

Mr. Cantalupa spoke briefly of the retail aspect of the project. The active retail uses on the north parcel are seen as an outpost as they are not connected to the rest of Kendall Square. Broadway is more vibrant with the development on Ames Street as well as activity at the Broad and the Residence Inn. The zoning provides that Broadway needs to have 75% frontage covered with retail or active uses. There will be retail at the residential building on Binney Street. What happens with Volpe will determine the success of retail along the Sixth Street walkway. Mr. Ward showed a picture with a hierarchy of walking paths including the Sixth Street connector and the importance of the east-west connections. He noted loading and service paths. He said that the north-south streets are more functional with garage parking and loading entries. The short-term bike parking requirement has been met except for one area that would have inhibited use of the park. Mr. Cantalupa added that these will be the areas for the apartment and condominium loading areas.

Mr. Chris Schaffner spoke about Boston Properties' strong commitment to achieving sustainable buildings. Highlights include targeting LEED Gold for all the buildings in the district and incorporating a master site approach for some of the key elements such as managing storm water and transportation. That being said, he noted that each building is different in its use and will have different strategies and approaches to sustainability. The focus is the triple bottom line of sustainability - the environment, social issues and economics of all the issues.

Mr. Richard Kuhn, a design principal with Perkins + Will, spoke about the proposed commercial office and laboratory building at 250 Binney Street (commercial building B). From the feedback received, an important aspect is how the building relates to Volpe. The building will be terraced or stepped back from Volpe. Two stories along the Sixth Street connector as well as around the corner to Binney provide a pedestrian connection. The building is more asymmetrical to reveal the base. The elevation along Binney reinforces pedestrian movement around the corner. Columns were also added along Binney to look like a front porch. There's a strong entry site at the corner. The loading and service doors are pushed back so they are not seen from down the street. He mentioned using glassy and lighter materials along Binney Street and the corner.

Mr. Devon Patterson with SCB spoke about the residential buildings. He said that residential buildings are organized around the apartments. The K2 plan was used as a guideline. The residential have an identifiable top. It relates well to the park on the south side. The building was pushed to the east as much as possible. It sits on top of the existing parking garage. Two bays were used for the building which allows the units to touch the ground floor with a lobby out to the plaza. The north tower is shorter and blends into the neighborhood. More corner units were created by pulling out the sides. The south side would potentially hold the condominium units. The plan gives the building two lobbies to have distinct entrances for owners and renters. Balconies and other materials are being discussed to break up the façade.

Mr. Cantalupa noted that the building summaries given thus far are sufficient for reviewing the master Infill Development Concept Plan. There is also a more detail design submitted for a review of building of 145 Broadway. He would like to do a concurrent review of both submittals.

Mr. Cohen clarified that the Planning Board role this evening is a public hearing on the concept plan. There will be a subsequent hearing at some point in time with regard to the design of 145. Any presentation tonight on 145 would be informational. There will be a vote on the concept plan which would include a

reference to a design review procedure to involve the Planning Board and the CRA. Under the MXD ordinance, the approval of the plan could specify the details of one of the buildings and exempt them from future reviews. This process is still being worked out so the hearing on the concept plan will be continued to a future date. Mr. Farooq noted that there have been instances before, specifically for PUDs, where discussions of the master plan occur followed soon by a design decision. They do not need to be separated tremendously in time. The IDCP needs to be adopted before the design review can be granted. Mr. Cohen asked Boston Properties to speak in the same details for 145 as done with the previous buildings.

Mr. Tony Parchesi, design principal with Pichard Chilton, used a 3D mode and Powerpoint presentation to explain the building details at 145 Broadway. There is a tenant for this building and much of the design collaboration has been done with this tenant. In addition to using the K2 plan and strategy, this building reflects the innovative and vibrant area. The K2 plan provides structure for the design but it's not so descriptive that it creates cookie cutter buildings. The building follows all the rules but it is not traditional. It has a clear base and top and also has an interesting silhouette with sliding and connecting forms. The building is anchored on Galileo and Broadway, it embraces the park and provides fantastic frontage on Galileo. It fits within the context of the City and fits in with the heights of other buildings. He brought out a more detailed model of the building that was lit up from beneath. He mentioned the highlights of the building with respect to the K2 plan and its relationship to the nearby park and buildings. He spoke about creating compression and release in the urban fabric. He showed a walkthrough presentation of the space in real-time to give the audience a better feel of the building at the pedestrian level at various points.

The presentation of the infill master plan concluded. There were neither Planning Board questions nor CRA Board questions at this time. The meeting was open to the public for comment.

Mr. George Cook with Alliance of Cambridge Tenants requested police call boxes to be added to the parks and in the square in general. Mr. Roberts said that a resolution to this issue would be investigated.

Mr. Alex Taylor spoke on behalf of the Cambridge Transit Advisory (CTA) committee. He stated most of what was written in the CTA letter to the Cambridge Planning Board.

Ms. Katie Friedman, a staff scientist of the Charles River Watershed Association (CRWA), said that since this project site drains directly into a segment of the Charles River, the CRWA is concerned about storm water management. The CRWA would like to see the data analysis used for the design (such as rain gardens, permeable pavement, etc.) with respect to reducing the nutrient, bacteria and phosphorous loading in compliance with the maximum daily allowable loads.

Ms. Heather Hoffman hopes to repeat the successful result of a previous joint review as each Board brings different strengths to the table. She strongly urged the two Boards to force Boston Property to make the project worthwhile and enjoyable to see. With respect to Mr. Cook's statement, there is at least one call box on the Sixth Street extension. She defers to the architects to make the buildings beautiful. She said that most people don't know that the park on Broadway is beautiful because it is surrounded by walls. It should remain an oasis so don't go overboard with programming. She said that if rentals were built more like homes, people would be less transient. Frequent turnaround is a real problem. The community wants neighbors.

There were no other members of the public who asked to speak.

Starting with comments from the CRA, Ms. Drury noted a comment written in the CRA architect review regarding whether the 145 Broadway building has enough of an appearance if it is to be a gateway into Kendall Square. Mr. Zevin said that the size of the building could make it a gateway, although it's not clear what a gateway should be. He would resist the temptation to make it special by adding elements and that this minimalist view might be more elegant. He likes the refinements that have been made. This is doing in three dimensions what the Binney Street buildings are doing with just materials.

Mr. Crawford likes the visual interest at the street level rather than having vertical canyons in greater Boston. He is focused on the sustainability and how that reflects on the ecology of the district. He liked the transit demand ideas stated by Mr. Taylor. There are intersections throughout the area that currently fail at rush hour and when it rains. He would like more detail about the sustainability plans for this district with respect to materials, storm water and a planting regimen around the open space given today's climate. This is an opportunity to talk about the issues of waste and energy usage.

Mr. Bator was pleased with the enhancements done from previous iterations.

Ms. Born said that regarding the Infill Development Concept Plan, the Board has heard feedback to consider more open space, particularly more active use of the roof on the North Garage between the two residential towers. She noted that BP has done presentations of proposed programming for that area. She said that the model of building B was helpful and there seems to be a better refinement to reflect pedestrian movement but she hopes there would be more articulation of the wall panels. Since the residential building will be the tallest building in the area and in Cambridge in general, we could benefit from renderings of massing diagrams that show what the building will look like from key vantage points both in Cambridge and across the river. With regards to Building A, 145 Broadway, which benefits from being more along in the process, Ms. Born wanted more clarification on the phrase "beautiful soffit." From a composition point of view, she appreciates the notion of it being a center anchor. She mentioned hearing public feedback from earlier presentations that the building, which faces due west, is "turning its back" on the residential neighborhood. She added that this critique is oppositional to the notion of it being an anchor. She asked the architects to think about materials or lighting that could add interesting aspects to the simpler plainer wall.

Members of the Planning Board relayed their comments.

Mr. Nur noted that there is a glare from an existing building on Binney Street as one comes down Third Street to Broadway. He would like to see data on the curtain wall, in addition to a wind study with this massing. He added that although the balconies are recessed, he would like to understand the safety measures taken. Since this is such a big massing, the deflection of ground water needs to be better understood with respect to the foundations of other buildings.

Mr. Russell noted that the comments have been temperant. He thought the community table was odd and although not against it, he would like to see more movable furniture in the parks. He would like to know if the entrance to the garage under 145 Broadway is protected against flooding and to what extent. He is skeptical about glass buildings being as sustainable as they should be. Looking at the LEED score for 145 Broadway, 80% of the LEED points do not relate to energy efficiency and the relative score within the 20% that is there is not impressive. He would like to see more done to mitigate the solar load from the western exposure. He questioned the absence of the terracotta base of the 145 Broadway in many of the renderings. He feels that more could be done with the top of the building so that the mechanical room isn't just articulated as 2 or 3 stories of building with windows like the floors below. He likes the sleekness of the building. He is somewhat suspicious of the softly presented wind study since the analysis needs more hard data, something he would expect in a detailed design of a building. With all that said, he thinks 145 Broadway is one of the most exciting buildings that have come to the Planning Board for review. As for the other buildings, he feels that the Binney Street building seems bigger than it should be. Because of its setback, it won't be at the end of a street sightline and might not feel as dramatic except for right in front of the building when on Broadway.

Mr. Cohen said that having reviewed the considerable materials, the model is very helpful but needs more time to study it before commenting. He said that 145 Broadway is a strong, smart, unique and appealing building. He would like more time to investigate the feel from the street because he doesn't want dark uncomfortable urban landscapes in Kendall Square. He noted that the aesthetic nature of a building is as important as its energy efficiency and likes glass buildings. He agrees that the building on Binney Street seems tall and massive for that setting. The 20% affordability housing and another 5% moderate is laudable and is pleased that this developer found it financially feasible. Boston Properties has set the bar high and would like that bar accepted and generalized in future development within the entire city.

Mr. Sienciez noted that a good master plan should offer flexibility for the future and reflect the values of the community. He is pleased with the plan's commitment to affordable housing. He noted that the sustainability goals should be more ambitious. Although the residential towers are proposed to have the bare minimum for a Gold standard, these tend to get whittled down for various reasons. Adding that the commercial towers are to hit 62, he is unsure if the developer will be able to realize the GOLD standards as promised. Although not bound by the zoning time table, moving towards a net zero value would be consistent with the values of the community. He noted that this is the first time that he has seen a proposal that indicates a well-being model for individuals within a building. This is exceptional forward thinking and he would like to see that happen. He asked for more clarification with respect to the two entrances to the residence building. He noted that that this community doesn't value separate entrances for affordable housing and that units should be indistinguishable. He agreed that more detail is needed regarding open space. He would also like more discussion on the tree demolition plan. He voiced concern regarding the enormous turning radius onto the driveway on Binney Street which is an increasingly pedestrian oriented street. Relative to the architecture, he likes the proportions relating to each other. An improved corner at Broadway and Galileo Way is highly desired as it is more highway-like than it should be. The height on Binney Street is hard to judge at this time without more information regarding the Volpe site.

Mr. Cantalupa clarified that the two entrances to housing only differentiate product type which is not economically determined. There will be affordable units in each product type regardless of whether they are rental or ownership.

Mr. Cohen thanked everyone for their comments and concurs with his colleagues. The issues raised need to be addressed. The buildings are exciting and will be nice additions to Kendall Square. Open space is important and something should be considered for the roof of the garage. He suggested bringing back the notion of a winter garden or an explanation of why an enclosed indoor public space is not in the plan. More information is needed on sustainability and storm water management. There have been many comments regarding bike parking including the number of spaces, the use of elevator access, and the potential for conflict with pedestrians. He is against any signage for the cutout on the Broadway side of 145 Broadway. He is concerned about the viability of retail in this area as there are many empty spaces in Harvard Square and along the strip going to Porter Square. According to an article in the New York Times, large companies that can afford high rents are providing more services to their employees which then price out smaller restaurants and retail stores.

Mr. Roberts emphasized that more time is needed to look at the materials, including the CRA's materials. With regards to the overall land use plan, he needs more insight on the proposed innovation space and the design implications on the block of the Broad Institute with respect to the proposed additional square footage.

In the application materials for 145 Broadway, Ms. Bigolin requested clarification on the materials of the overhang on the service road and the extent to which it might overwhelm the park. She also requested more discussion to increase the amount of ground floor retail versus lobby space to better enhance park edge activation, especially in 145 Broadway and the residential tower.

Mr. Bluestone agreed that the maximization of retail frontage could be accomplished by looking at lobby size. He also encouraged public use of the garage roof top.

Mr. Evans noted that the innovation space proposed at 1 Cambridge Center (255 Main Street) is an exciting element of the project. He emphasized that the CRA will be actively involved with its design and the interaction of it with Galaxy Park as well as developing the program for the 25% that is set aside at a lower cost level for entrepreneur opportunities.

Mr. Barr added that the CRA has undertaken the redesign concept for Binney Street which will address the concerns of the turning radius on Binney at the service drives and what will be expected from the developer. The Kendall Square Mobility Task Force is making good progress regarding transit capacity on the Red Line and bus service. He expects a discussion during the special permit process regarding trip-making

monitoring and required mitigations if the numbers are higher than expected. In response to a public comment, a PTDM will be a requirement for the commercial building. Similar discussions will occur for the residential buildings.

6

Ms. Drury noted that from work she has done with the Alewife Working Committee, the lack of places to meet neighbors is a problem in that area. She urged Boston Properties to make the rooftop space above the garage into a neighborhood that would, of course, be open to the public, but would foster a neighborhood community.

There were no other comments.

Mr. Cohen noted that the Planning Board would like to continue this meeting at a date to be determined with both Boards and the collective staffs. Ms. Born offered the option of the two boards meeting separately and then combining later on in the process. Mr. Cohen liked the combined meeting since the collective ideas will lead to a better project. Ms. Born stated that the economy of staff time should be considered. Mr. Evans agreed that the joint dialogue has been beneficial and he does agree that another joint meeting will be necessary. However, due to the multitude of CRA meetings for the Foundry, the development agreement, and a host of other things, it might be difficult to schedule a joint meeting but he would like the process to move ahead.

Ms. Born stated that the CRA has a practice of an open public design review meetings for individual building designs when the designs are deemed ready.

Ms. Farooq noted that there is a baseline requirement in the zoning. The two Boards function differently and will be making decisions on different criteria. An initial joint meeting was beneficial so that all thoughts could be heard but she suggested deliberating separately to allow each body to delve into topics of concern to their roles in the process. The decisions of both boards are separate. There could be a need to discuss possible touch points together in the future. She suggested that staff of the CRA and the City work together and then determine a reconvening time for the Boards. Ms. Born added that smaller meetings with CRA subgroups worked well with the Ames Street process. Ms. Farooq noted that there are no provisions for the Planning Board to have smaller groups. Ms. Drury noted that staff from CDD would attend these meetings. Ms. Born said that having a Planning Board member present during the Ames Street design discussions would be useful.

There was a long discussion on how to proceed. Ms. Farooq suggested that City and CRA staff decide on the process and report back to each Board with the recommended process. However, Mr. Evans interjected that a decision is needed tonight on whether the hearing on the Infill Development Concept Plan remains open with a 2nd joint meeting to be scheduled or whether this proposal can be now be heard separately by each Board where the Planning Board votes on a special permit and the CRA votes on consistency with the Urban Renewal Plan.

Mr. Cantalupa said that this process is analogous to the PUD process. The IDCP requires approval by both Boards. For the Planning Board, it becomes part of a larger special permit. Before getting to the design review, there are tasks specific to the Article 19 hearings that need to take place but don't involve the CRA. Similarly, the CRA has other tasks charged to them. They would come before the board again for the special permit which could include 145. Boston Properties would like an affirmation from the Boards on the IDCP. Mr. Cohen said that there are issues that need to be worked out. Mr. Cantalupa stated that if the issues regarding the joint meeting have been addressed, the process can move forward and the answers to the issues would be address in the special permit and URP consistency process. Mr. Roberts stated that the most important piece of the IDCP approval is establishing the procedures for the design review process, the transportation mitigation package, the phasing requirements, and how these all tie in together. The question is whether the Boards could do this separately. Mr. Cohen stated that City and CRA staff could create this process together and report back to each of their Boards separately. If the Boards agree, each Board can function separately. Both Boards would rely on staff to keep the Boards updated on issues.

There was an agreement that this was the only way to move forward.

Ms. Farooq requested feedback from the Boards on the phasing or the transportation elements of the IDCP. Mr. Russell understood from Mr. Barr's report that the items were known and the mitigations were workable. As for the phasing, Mr. Sienciez said that seeing alternate phasing shows a good flexible master plan. The last building will become clear when the Volpe situation is resolved. He agrees with Phase 1.

There were more discussion of the process.

Boston Properties brought two proposals together because a tenant exists for 145 who would like to move ahead so there is developmental pressure. Mr. Cantalupa noted that Boston Properties intends to do the same process with 145 as was done with the successful Ames Street building proposal.

Mr. Zevin noted that there are issues detailed in the staff's memo to the Board on the IDCP that might need to be mentioned before the vote on the IDCP. Ms. Farooq said if the issues are grave and require both Boards, they should be addressed now. If they are relatively small and can be addressed by staff then they don't need to be brought up tonight for discussion. Mr. Zevin explained that the memo calls for a reduction of floor plate sizes at 255 Binney, the last building, to let in access to natural light. However, the width of the floor plates in 145 Broadway is the same and there was no mention of this being a problem. He explained that this affects the overall floor area and program. In response to Mr. Redmon, Mr. Zevin replied that none of the issues are deal breakers to advancing the IDCP.

Mr. Zevin was asked to go through the issues. The first set of issues called for more east-west pedestrian permeability of the site. He felt that Mr. Ward made a good case in that the pedestrian circulation should eventually filter down to Broadway before it goes straight through to Galileo which would only result in frustrated pedestrians piled up against four lanes of traffic and the railroad track. There are good reasons to divert traffic past the struggling retail on Broadway. This means that the connection through the Blue Garage is unnecessary. Secondly, the notion of the sidewalk along the west service road being inadequately wide seems to be an odd assertion since they are the same width as the new sidewalks on Broadway. Thirdly, the diagonals through the park have been addressed by Sasaki but Mr. Zevin hopes that a new diagonal through the Broadway Park is not being proposed as this would wreck the useable space. The last issue is screening the garage which is not necessary. The east façade of the garage is better than most office building facades in the area, it just doesn't have windows. Moreover, screening might trigger a need for mechanical ventilation which would be a terrible environmental consequence. Let the garage be what it is. He also noted that cities have alleys so service roads are part of life. The length of the garage end-to-end is not an enormous length to ask people to go around. He takes a slight exception to Mr. Bluestone's assertion that we need to respect the 80 foot horizontal datum which he feels is mythical on this site. It does exist on the two adjacent buildings on Galileo and Broadway but doesn't exist across the street. The diagram in the design guidelines 5.14 is incoherent showing buildings stacked on top of each other with no vertical continuity and should not be emulated. This might not matter as no one brought up this topic. The claim that the west façade of 145 lacks any scaling elements at the pedestrian level is not the case. The model shows a two-story glazed section and a slight setback so it does stop before it smashes into the ground which seems proper. He is concerned about the wind studies because the wind at that corner in the winter is brutal. People are queueing up to cross the street and waiting for the EZride bus so people are not always briskly walking at this site. If this requires an alteration of the façade at the corner to shed the vortex, then that is worth doing.

Mr. Cohen said that the Planning Board will continue the hearing of PB #315 to a date to be determined. A notice will be going out to all interested parties.

There were no objections to Mr. Evans' statement that the feedback has been adequate to have the design move forward.

The CRA Board meeting was adjourned at 10:25 p.m.

The Planning Board meeting adjourned at 10:25 p.m.