

Joint Meeting of the
Cambridge Redevelopment Authority Board and the
City of Cambridge Planning Board

Tuesday, January 17, 2017, 8:00pm
City Hall Annex, Second Floor Conference Room
344 Broadway
Cambridge, Massachusetts

FINAL Minutes

Ted Cohen, Chairperson of the Planning Board (PB), called the meeting at 8:08 p.m. He explained that this was a continuation of the hearing PB #315 on December 20 for property located at Kendall Center, at various street addresses including 145 Broadway, 250 Binney Street and 255 Main Street for which the applicant Boston Properties Limited Partnership (BP) is seeking special permits pursuant to Section 14.32.2, approval of Infill Development Concept Plan (IDCP) in the Mixed Use Development (MXD) District: Kendall Center, and to Section 14.73 Inter-Agency Design Review 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 by 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.

Under the terms of the MXD district and the recent amendment to the zoning, there is a requirement to have one joint meeting of the CRA and Planning Boards, which is occurring tonight. Each Board will open and close its own hearings and each Board will take its own votes. In addition to the IDCP hearing there will also be a review of the schematic design of 145 Broadway.

Besides Mr. Cohen, other members of the PB present were Steven Cohen, Louis Bacci, Hugh Russell and Mary Flynn. Jeff Roberts, Iram Farooq, and Susanne Rasmussen from the City staff were also in attendance.

Ms. Kathleen Born, CRA Chair, called the CRA meeting and introduced the other CRA Board members, Barry Zevin and Conrad Crawford. Although Margaret Drury and Christopher Bator were absent, Ms. Born noted that three of five members constitute a quorum for the CRA Board. The CRA staff present was Tom Evan, Jason Zogg, Carlos Peralta and Ellen Shore.

James Rafferty, attorney for BP, introduced himself, Michael Cantalupa and Michael Tilford from BP. He stated that similar to a PUD where the PB would issue a special permit, the master plan of this project is the Infill Development Concept Plan (IDCP). The second part of the special permit involves findings under Article 19 which are typically associated with a project review special permit. This project has had a considerable amount of CRA review. Before it was an application, it was the subject of a zoning petition that was informed by a high level of collaboration. That led to the adoption of the zoning by the City Council that allows the application to be brought forward tonight.

Both Boards have seen the IDCP. For reasons of quorum, the joint meeting of the Boards in September did not satisfy the technical requirements for a joint meeting. Mr. Rafferty emphasized that information given at that time should not be ignored. The presentations in September are part of the record. On December 20, there was an extensive presentation of the IDCP to the PB. Tonight will be an update since then. BP is hoping that at the end of that discussion, a determination can be made with respect to the IDCP. The design review of 145 Broadway would follow that.

Since December 20, BP has worked with City staff from Community Development (CDD), Traffic, Parking and Transportation (TPT) and Public Works (PW), as well as CRA staff, to resolve the issues. Letters from these groups outline the work that has been done including the numerous mitigation elements, as well as resolutions that need further study. He pointed out that this is a multi-phased project. The issue regarding the usage of the rooftop garage can be resolved during the design review of that phase. During phase 1, a resolution to the Sixth Street connector and its bike path, pedestrian, and tree health issue will be informed by the City arborist and the CRA which owns the path. Mr. Rafferty urged the PB to look at the IDCP like a PUD and recognize that there are significant public benefits to the IDCP.

In response to Mr. T. Cohen, Mr. Tilford explained that KSTEP was conceived as part of the MEPA process. It is a \$6 million payment that is governed by a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), executed by multiple parties. Its intention is to alleviate both long and short term transportation congestion but also to invest into the future. The distribution is governed by the MOU. Two-thirds is earmarked for future to-be-determined improvements and one third is dedicated to shorter term improvements.

Mr. Evans of the CRA added that KSTEP grew out of MEPA discussions as mitigation in order for the State to approve the amendment to the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan. It was developed to handle transit improvements that were yet to be identified as BP and the CRA needed more discussions with the MBTA. It also grew out of the Kendall Square Mobility Task Force assembled by the governor's administration, initially led by the State, to look at transit capacity of Kendall Square. Since that time, the State has run out of money so the Task Force is under the City. The CRA and BP are also members. The Task Force will come forth with recommendations sometime in the spring of this year to be approved by the CRA, the City and the State. This is a mechanism to create a process to define a funding pathway. Hopefully the \$6 million is incentive for others to participate. As stated in the MOU, the CRA Board makes the final disbursement of funds with approval from the City Manager. The KSTEP is part of the IDCP mitigation package. Part of the CRA-BP development agreement states that financing would be shared. There are mitigations that go beyond the KSTEP program. The State focused on improvements made to the Red Line and transit capacity in the area as part of the first commercial building phase. The MOU states the timeline for the definition of the short term improvements. This is referenced in the TPT memo for the special permit.

In response to Mr. T. Cohen, Mr. Rafferty said that the amount of affordable housing, middle income housing and home-ownership units in the IDCP complies with the approved zoning ordinance for the district. This is not a negotiated issue. The stated requirement is for twenty percent affordable housing plus another five percent middle income. Twenty percent of the residential will be dedicated to home ownership and five percent of the home ownership is dedicated to affordable and middle income housing.

In response to Mr. Russell, Mr. Cantalupa of BP added that the project is organized so that the percent of affordable and middle income will go into each of the two phases of the housing on the garage. The first phase of housing is consciously sized to contain all the home ownership housing. Since the two pieces of open space on the garage, currently called North and South Park, will come in the next phase, there is no high level design submitted yet. The Sixth Street connector is the open space portion of Phase 1.

Public Comment

Ms. Heather Hoffman reminded the Boards of the letter from ECPT that urges as much open space as possible be created and the need for a recreation area. The letter suggested using the area between the two towers in a way similar to that done on the top of the Carlton Garage of the Charles River Park. She emphasized that the IDCP needs to stand on its own regarding open space and no reference to Volpe should be made as a substitute. With respect to redoing Binney Street, she urged the Board to keep the mature flowering crabapple trees. Replacing them with saplings will be unacceptable. She added that the current drawings do not show any floral arrangements like those currently on Broadway.

There were no other comments offered by the public.

Planning Board Reviews Findings

Mr. T. Cohen referenced the January 11th CDD memo. Under Section 12.35.3, for approval of a PUD Final Development, the PB needs to find that it conforms with general PUD development controls and district development controls (requirements of Article 14.000), that it conforms with adopted policy plans or development guidelines for that portion of the City (Kendall Square Design Guidelines), and that it provides benefits to the city which outweigh its adverse effects (quality of site design, traffic flow and safety, adequacy of utilities and other public works, impact on existing public facilities, and potential fiscal impact).

Mr. Rafferty's memo to the PB outlined the potential benefits to the City. The PB members agreed that there are sufficient benefits to outweigh negative aspects of the project.

With regards to the project review special permit, Section 19.25, the project should have no substantial adverse impact on city traffic within the study area upon review of the traffic impact indicators analyzed in the Transportation Impact Study and mitigation efforts proposed. Two memos were received from TPT which reviewed all the traffic impacts and recommended mitigations were agreed to by Boston Properties, as stated by Mr. Rafferty. The project needs to be consistent with the urban design objectives of the City as set forth in Section 19.30. Mr. T. Cohen noted that plans have been reviewed in detail in the past but are still under discussion with CDD staff (acknowledged by Ms. Farooq) but that BP will adhere to those guidelines (acknowledged by Ms. Rasmussen).

Finally, the general special permit criteria, Section 10.43, states that special permits will be granted if zoning requirements are met, unless found not to be in the public interest due to one of the criteria enumerated in Section 10.43. The PB has gone through the requirements, understands the criteria, and feels that they will be met.

Regarding special conditions for a conceptual development plan, a master plan, or in this case the IDCP, there are general categories of conditions. As for the overall development condition, BP has given presentations of the overall development as a whole, including the extents of the development parcel, aggregate Gross Floor Area (GFA), mix of uses, and amount of open space.

The component development condition approves the arrangement of individual building sites (including open space and parking) within the development parcel, with the authorized uses, GFA, height, setbacks, and open space on each. The design review of 145 Broadway will occur tonight and the other buildings will go through a similar process. There would be joint CDD and CRA staff design reviews and ultimately a joint CRA Board and PB hearing for each phase.

Mr. Jeff Roberts explained that the approval is similar to PUD approvals but has an additional element. The approval of the schematic design would occur with a joint CRA Board and PB meeting. However, the CRA has a more iterative design review process with a CRA Design Committee composed of some CRA Board members, CRA staff, and consultants. It was recommended that representatives of the Planning Board join that group. This would occur before the individual building comes before the full Boards for final schematic approval. This would be incorporated into the Special Permit decision.

Ms. Born noted that the CRA has held one design review meeting with CDD staff for the 145 Broadway. The meetings are less formal and open to the public. Mr. Rafferty suggested that the wording leave flexibility in the process with regards to requiring a joint Board meeting. There was a long discussion about this.

Mr. T. Cohen stated that the site plan authorizes basic site design parameters of the project as set forth in the Final Development Plan. These include circulation, access and egress for pedestrians, bicycles, and vehicles, as well as loading and access for other service functions, for each site and the development as a whole.

Mr. Roberts noted the points in the CDD memo that summarized the key elements of the decisions. It's standard to incorporate the mitigation recommendations from Traffic and Parking. Similarly, with

infrastructure, there was a memo from Public Works a month ago, outlining the different standards to be met as part of the building permit review for each phase of the project. He recommended coordination with the Economic Development Division prior to the initiation of marketing and tenanting for the active use spaces. This would allow opportunities to talk about the types of retailers looking for space and programs available to avoid potential pitfalls to leasing retail space. Although the phasing is laid out in the IDCP, some flexibility should be allowed in phases 2 and 3 if more housing could be offered earlier. He suggested adding language so that minor modifications to the IDCP wouldn't require an amendment. Other points are addressed at the end of the memo. Wind mitigation for the corner of 145 Broadway does require further review either at the staff level and/or Board level as it could be a visible physical structure. The recommendation for the Sixth Street connector is a review by the City arborist and City engineer to protect the trees. This is currently in progress. The garage rooftop could have other alternative options with greater public benefits so it is recommended to include this as part of the phase 2 design review. Any modifications involving the covenant open spaces on Binney Street would require review by the PB and it is possible that the City Council might need to be involved. Tree removal along the service drives is another issue that requires further study. Design guidelines need further detail and refinement. He added that before the special permit is filed, the materials should be consolidated into a final IDCP document for consistency. Similarly, all 145 Broadway materials should be consolidated into a final document to help make future reviews easier. As stated by Mr. Rafferty in the beginning of the meeting, BP has agreed with all the recommendations in the memo.

Mr. T. Cohen stated the motion.

The motion to adopt the findings subject to all of the conditions set forth in the CDD memo, subject to the conditions in the TPT memo, subject to the KSTEP wording, subject to the ongoing design guidelines, subject to the finalization of the procedures for review of future building designs, subject to the conditions of the DPW memo was seconded and carried unanimously.

This approves the special permit for the IDCP.

Ms. Born stated that the CRA will also vote on a motion.

The motion to approve the Infill Development Concept Plan as submitted on August 9, 2016 and revised on November 10, 2016, conditioned on the Schematic Design review of future development phases, future approval of an Innovation Space Operational Plan, and ongoing coordination of transportation, open space and public realm improvements as described in the January 14, 2017 CRA Staff Memorandum.

The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

The meeting continued with a hearing on the schematic design of the proposed building at 145 Broadway. Mr. Cantalupa began by thanking both Boards. As noted in the press, this building is being built specifically for Akamai Technologies. Pickard Chilton is the architect for the building. Mr. John Pickard said that a lot of collaboration with Cambridge Planning, the CRA and Boston Properties was done to create this building. He said that one goal for the building is to support the characteristics of Cambridge and Kendall Square. It needs to be more than just a building. The second goal is to craft a special workplace for Akamai.

Mr. Tony Markese, of Pickard Chilton, used a combination of models and renderings in a presentation. He said that the building works on an urban scale by contributing to the master plan and works for the tenant by taking advantage of natural light, views, and collaborative spaces. The model shown was updated to reflect past discussions.

Mr. Markese first spoke about the massing, fenestration and articulation of the tower. He noted the horizontal and vertical components of the façade of the tower that are knitted together. He brought out other models to show the idea in greater detail. A two-tone silver metal palate is being proposed to give richness and texture. Another component proposed is a state-of-the-art glass with a warm silver color that can balance solar heat gain, reflectivity, views in, and the views out. A warm metal color with texture that

can reflect light is proposed for the soffits. He showed pictures of existing buildings that evoke a similar character.

He then spoke about the planning of the base of building. He noted the position of the building with respect to the surrounding streets, service road, and Broadway Park. He noted the active use on three sides and the lobby, and seating area. The fire control room was moved further within the building, the bike access and parking elevators were moved closer to the core, and the main entrance was moved below a main cantilever space for arrival and sheltering. Akamai plans to use the outdoor seating and lobby in dynamic collaborative ways. He showed examples of potential textured terracotta materials for the base and the first two layers of the tower. The first floor has a higher ceiling and the glass at the base will be clearer to open the lobby space. He also showed a picture of the canopy defining the entrance.

Mr. Alan Ward, from Sasaki, spoke about the landscape. Earlier presentations showed redesigning Broadway Park with its paving extending across the service road to the building at 145 Broadway. Bollards will be needed to protect the columns. There are benches near the lobby entry. The paving also extends to the south and west sides of the building within the property line. There are seating areas on the south side. There are four groups of short-term bike parking. The redesign of the east-west connector on the north side will include raising the grade, incorporating a seat wall due to an infiltration structure, trees and plenty of colorful plantings. The London Plane trees will be retained on Galileo which will be protected during construction. The trees on Broadway are not healthy and will be replaced.

In response to Mr. Zevin, Mr. Markese gave more detail of the façade make-up and the glazing. He assured Mr. Zevin that he has not heard of snow and ice accumulating on a building in Chicago with a similar design. Mr. Zevin liked the revised lobby entrance. He voiced a concern regarding security as the garage elevators are much less visible than they were previously and asked if the long wall could be partly transparent. Mr. Cantalupa said that this will be Akamai's elevator. Only the centralized garages have public access. Mr. Zevin stated that although there was a request to pave all the way to the West Service Drive, this is not a good idea because it is dangerous. It should end where the park ends. He added that the Cambridge standard sidewalk is not performing well and it should be revised. He also noted that the diagram of the bike path doesn't recognize the east-west interruptions and all points of departure need to be recognized.

Mr. Crawford spoke about sustainable plantings and stressed the need to consider the future climate and avoid plants that aren't doing well in the area. He noted that the pedestrian circulation between the Grand Junction Park and activity across the street at 145 Broadway should be considered when landscaping the west side of the property.

In response to Ms. Born, Mr. Markese said that there is also a fourth type of glass with a muted frosted look that will define that crown. He also explained the subtle shades of the metal that add to the depth of the façade. He confirmed that the geometry of the interlocking pieces was derived at the Design Review meeting. The mechanical component on the penthouse will be screened with a vocabulary that fits the façade of the rest of the building but there will be louvers.

Mr. Steve Cohen was reassured to see other buildings with similar elements to those being proposed for 145 Broadway.

In response to Mr. Bacci's concern regarding the reflectivity of the south-facing surfaces, Mr. Markese stated that the reflectivity would be less than that shown in the renderings. Most of the time, one will be able to see inside the building. Mr. Bacci requested that more plantings and color be put along the Galileo Way side of the building and that these share the space with all the bicycle parking.

Mr. Russell stated that if the area has multiple retail entrances, more seating could be added. Mr. Cantalupa said that Akamai needs to decide if they will have an alternative active use for the area. Mr. Russell noted that concrete could be bleak and although bike racks are welcomed, they are not necessarily pleasant to see. He suggested adding things of interest on that side of the building. Mr. Russell agreed with Mr. Zevin's

comments on the paving at the West Service Road, in that an indication is needed if a path is no longer pedestrian friendly. He welcomed the unique response to the building design.

Ms. Flynn also commended the design. Responding to her, Mr. Cantalupa said that Akamai hasn't decided on a plan for its lobby so connecting it to the active use entrance coming out to the patio is unknown at this time. Mr. Markese answered her question about the durability of the façade material by saying that the subtle color of the materials hold up extremely well over time.

Mr. Markese said that there will not be illumination on the roof. Pickard Chilton is looking at up-lighting the soffit pieces and strategies that accentuate the projected jenga pieces. The mechanical enclosures will not have internal lighting that would make them look occupied.

In response to Mr. T. Cohen, Mr. Tilford said that three wind study scenarios are currently being tested to decrease the wind on the corner on Galileo. The wind is lateral, not downward. There is no plan to mitigate this with something attached to the building. One recommendation by the engineers is a semi-porous structure on the sidewalk to decrease the speed by 1-2 mph. More information will be forthcoming on the size. Mr. Cantalupa explained that this can be solved with trees or art. Mr. Cohen noted that bollards are ugly.

Ms. Rasmussen restated that continued review of the project is needed with respect to maintaining entrances on Broadway and the wind mitigation issue with the potential of bringing proposed solutions back to the Planning Board. There should also be a mock-up on site to review the materials and wall assemblies. Other than these, she recommended that the project move forward.

With respect to traffic and parking, Mr. Roberts spoke on behalf of Mr. Barr, and said that the issues in the TPT memo were comprehensive. TPT will ensure that the final layout conforms to the standard with respect to access, egress, loading, and bicycle parking.

Mr. Roberts explained that the Planning Board is being asked to approve the design concept, with continued review at the staff level, for this phase of the project. Future phases of the project will come forward for separate design reviews. He clarified that this design is attached to the special permit review.

Mr. Cohen opened the meeting for public comment.

Ms. Heather Hoffman noted her concern of the glass building glowing like a lantern which she emphasized is undesirable. She is strongly against a big Akamai sign, especially at the top of the building. Although the MXD district has its own regulations, she would rather it be more like Article 7. She hopes that all signage will enhance the streetscape rather than detract from it. She suggested being whimsical, artistic, and interesting with respect to bicycle parking.

Mr. Markese added that in addition to the creamy terracotta color, there will be an accent shade of terracotta near the 145 sign.

The public comment portion of the meeting was closed.

Ms. Born noted an issue, which was alluded to in the CRA staff memo, that any outdoor space on the top of the building's projections will be counted against the base floor area. Mr. Rafferty said that terraces above the third floor are counted as part of the base floor area. Therefore the outdoor space above the projection facing Galileo counts for GFA.

Mr. Evans explained that residential balconies were highly desirable in the MXD district. An exemption for residential balconies was written into the zoning petition so that their space wouldn't take space away from living units. A similar exemption for a commercial outdoor terrace or balcony was unfortunately overlooked and not written into the zoning. For various reasons, it is not probable that the exemption provided in Article 22 for functional green roofs could be used without amendments. Mr. Evans said that the area could be planted. There was a discussion of outdoor terraces under the current zoning.

Mr. Steven Cohen said that the Planning Board should get the opportunity to review the continued design of the active uses, especially on the ground floor. Mr. Roberts explained that staff will use the Planning Board's comments as guidance in the evolution of the design. The procedure to bring substantive changes before both Boards was discussed. Ms. Born made the distinction of refinement versus deviations with examples from the 88 Ames Street project. Ms. Farooq said that the design review process for this area is more robust and public than the typical design review process. The Planning Board members have the opportunity to engage to the degree that they desire. Substantive elements that were mentioned could be incorporated into approving the special permit, such as lighting (especially on the roof top) and the area adjacent to the sidewalk on the ground floor. Ms. Flynn added that the wind solutions should be seen again.

Ms. Born suggested that the wind and balcony issues could be handled in the design review process that has been set out in the CRA memo as they are additive rather than substantial changes. Ms. Farooq said that the Planning Board usually discusses what happens on public spaces. Ms. Flynn agreed that while the wind mitigation might not affect the building, it will affect the street level. Mr. Russell said that the staff brings issues back to the PB. Mr. Steve Cohen agreed and emphasized the need for decisions on the first floor uses to come back to the PB.

Mr. Roberts said that there are no specific findings that need to be made. An approval of the design is needed which is subject to continued staff review to ensure that the design remains consistent with the plan approved earlier in the evening by the PB, the Citywide guidelines, and the Kendall Square guidelines. It is understood that this is still a work in progress. Therefore, it is not a decision being issued but a design that has been reviewed and approved by the Board which makes note of the points raised in discussion. There was a consensus among the PB members to see the designs of the exterior uses of the first floor and the wind mitigation strategy.

That was put into a motion and seconded. It was unanimously approved.,

The CRA had a parallel vote.

The motion made was to approve the Schematic Design of 145 Broadway as submitted on August 9, 2016 and revised on November 22, 2016, and further revised in the presentation materials from January 17, 2017, conditioned on the ongoing review in accordance with the Design Review and Document Approval Procedure with specific review focus on the Sixth Street walkway, façade materials selection, landscaping plans, and Innovation Space design, as described in the January 14, 2017 CRA Staff Memorandum.

The motion was seconded and carried unanimously by three CRA Board members present. Mr. Bator and Ms. Drury were absent.

The meeting adjourned at 10:56 p.m.