

MEMO

Date: 11/30/2018
To: CRA Board
From: Tom Evans, Executive Director
RE: IDCP Amendment

Project Title: Infill Development Concept Plan Amendment & 325 Main Street Design Review Submission
Applicant: Boston Properties
Submission Prepared by: Sasaki / Pickard Chilton / VHB / Lemon Brooke

INTRODUCTION

The IDCP functions as the planning document for the placement of Infill GFA as defined in the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan (KSURP) and Article 14 of the Cambridge Zoning Ordinance (MXD Zoning). In January of 2017, the IDCP was approved by the CRA Board and the Planning Board. Construction of the first phase of infill development began later that year. On 9/6/2018 the Applicant submitted a proposed IDCP Amendment. In summary, the proposed IDCP Amendment features the following changes:

- The transfer of the previously approved 256,000 SF GFA from 250 Binney Streeton Parcel Two of the KSURP to Parcel Four at 325 Main Street in order to create a new building of approximately 387,000 SF GFA.
- A public vertical circulation element that links the Kendall Plaza to the Roof Garden and proposes modifications to the open space program and design.
- The substitution of a planned 650 space underground garage at 250 Binney with a managed parking and valet system at three garages in the MXD area. This makes up about half of the capacity of the previously proposed garage. The Amendment increases the bike parking supply by nearly 160 spaces.
- An increases the number of residential units by nearly 70 units while maintaining the residential GFA number by creating smaller unit sizes.
- The removal of 10,000 SF of planned retail GFA within 250 Binney Street

The Applicant has submitted a Response to Comments document addressing major issues discussed by both the CRA Board and Planning Board at the 10/2/2018 Joint Hearing. The Applicant has made significant changes to the overall massing of the 325 Main Street building and significantly expanded the scope of the Roof Garden upgrades to include the entire Roof Garden. Extensive shade, thermal comfort and horticulture studies of the Roof Garden were included along with conceptual programming and lighting plans. A thorough study of the usability of the roof space of the Blue Garage in between the two proposed residential buildings was included with the 11/2/2018 Response to Comments as well.

An updated version of the 325 Commercial Building B Schematic Design Review Submission with the revised massing has not yet been submitted. A new version of the building design review document will be prepared later pending CRA Board and Planning Board approval of the Infill Development Concept Plan (IDCP) Amendment. Therefore this staff review memo should not be considered a full review the Commercial Building B design nor the landscaping plans for the Roof Garden.

The 11/2/2018 Response to Comments included the following materials:

- A "Response to Comments" document, focusing on clarifications, revisions, or other statements related to the proposed IDCP amendment.

- A set of animated shadow analysis showing anticipated shadows throughout the day at key times of year.
- A memorandum and study related to the feasibility of providing open space on the Blue Garage.
- A memorandum to the City's Transportation Planning and Parking Department (TPT).

CRA BOARD PROCESS TO DATE

Prior (v1) IDCP Approval by CRA Board & Planning Board:	1/17/2017
CRA Board Informational Preview Presentation:	5/9/2018
Joint Planning Board / CRA Board Informational Meeting:	7/31/2018
CRA Board Informational Presentation:	8/8/2018
IDCP Amendment Phase 2 book submitted:	9/6/2018
Commercial Building B Schematic Design Review Book submitted:	9/6/2018
CRA Board Site Walking Tour:	9/12/2018
CRA Design Review Committee Presentation:	9/12/2018
Joint Planning Board / CRA Board Hearing:	10/2/2018
CRA Design Review Committee Presentation:	10/17/2018
IDCP Response to Comments Book & studies submitted:	11/2/2018
CRA Design Review Committee Presentation:	11/14/2018

The first joint hearing of the CRA Board and Planning Board was held on 10/2/2018. Significant changes to the massing in response to that hearing were presented at two subsequent public Design Review Committee meetings on 10/17/2018 and 11/14/2018. Two Planning Board members participated in these meetings. The November Design Review Committee meeting also included a presentation by Lemon Brooke regarding landscape architecture on the Roof Garden.

The first portion of this staff review memo is focused on changes to the IDCP Amendment by the 11/2/2018 Response to Comments as compared to the 9/6/2018 Submission. The recommendation in the latter portion considers conditions of approval and the next steps for the Board's review of subsequent design documents.

IDCP AMENDMENT RESPONSE TO COMMENTS DISCUSSION

Density and Land Use

The total development square footage allocation in the 11/2/2018 Response to Comments document is unchanged. The GFA of the old 325 Main Street and the previously approved 250 Binney are combined with the unused GFA from the 145 Broadway project.

- Placement of Density: The CRA staff supports the placement of density at this location due to the transit access and the opportunity it provides to redevelop the retail elements on the site. Comprehensive square footage (development GFA, and open space square footage) information tables were provided in the 9/6/2018 Submission. These tables should continue to be updated and provided to the CRA by the Applicant in the final record copy of the IDCP Amendment, as well as Commercial Building B and South Residential Building Design Review submissions.

-

325 Main Street Massing

The massing and bulk of the building proposed for 325 Main Street has been reduced in the 11/2/2018 Response to Comments when compared to the 9/6/2018 Submission and the concepts reviewed before the submission. To compensate for usable square footage loss from reducing the building floor plates, the floor-to-floor heights in the proposal have been reduced in order to fit an additional floor within the height limit. The new parallelogram design of the building is aligned in a manner that shifts massing away from the Marriott and the Plaza to allow a larger gap between the two buildings for light and air into the Roof Garden. The upper floors of the 325 Main Street building have been pulled back from the adjacent 355 Main Street building, and the terraced element on floors 1-4 of the adjacent 355 Main Street building has been preserved and integrated into the design.

- General massing and connection between 355 Main Street and new 325 Main Street: CRA staff find the changes in building placement, massing, and bulk to be responsive to staff and Board comments. Early concepts regarding façade cut-outs to make the massing more interesting were explored at the 11/14/2018 CRA Design Review Committee meeting. CRA staff looks forward to reviewing further refinements to the building architecture during the Commercial Building B Schematic Design Review process. CRA staff appreciate the provision of occupiable terraces, as such terraces provide occupants outdoor opportunities throughout the building, create a humanizing scale to the exterior, and break up the building façade.
- In order for the next Commercial Building B Schematic Design Review submission to provide the CRA with a complete picture of the building proposal the following items should be included:
 - o A GFA programmatic summary memo including GFA calculation, open space requirements, FAR, parking program, and schedule. This document should be modeled after the Applicant's Commercial Building A numerical compliance summary letters dated 5/19/2017 and 2/8/2017.
 - o A materials sample board with annotated façade
 - o Rendering views of the 325 Main Street building as seen from the Roof Garden and the middle of the Plaza.
 - o Total floorplate square footage labeled on each of the floor plate plan-view pages, as well as floorplate dimensions for length and width – all of which varies by floor.
 - o Zoomed-in axonometric and/or perspective views to help understand the ground plane, retail, and canopies along Main Street
 - o As the connection between 325 and 355 Main are so critical to this project:
 - Sections that include more of the 355 Main Street building in the view frame including detailed connections between the floors and the proposed terrace space.
 - Elevations along the full block of Main Street from the plaza to Ames Street.
 - Detailed elevation of the 'connector's' façade area between 325 and 355 Main.
 - are needed to fully review the building proposal. This should include the proposed building, the garage, hotel and plaza at ground floor level, second level, and level of the roof top garden, and depending on the perspective, the street and currently under construction MIT buildings across Main Street.
 - Illustrated axonometric views through the north-south pedestrian connection between 325 and 355 Main Street.
 - o Illustrative architectural lighting plans
 - o Locations on the façade and the ground plane identified for tenant and retail signage with precedent images of signage typologies fitting for this architecture

- A basement plan showing the access to the loading dock area
- Spaces for new outdoor seating
- A site plan that includes property boundaries and proposed changes in the block's parcelization

Open Space & Landscaping

One of the key public amenity improvements of the IDCP Amendment remains the connection to the Rooftop Garden from the Plaza. The Response to Comments explores new designs and alternatives for how these vertical circulation and open space amenity is designed. As described in Section 702 of the KSURP, the CRA is supportive of the "redevelopment of MBTA facilities in such a way as to make them more convenient, attractive and efficient."

In the 11/2/2018 Response to Comments, the limit of work for the Roof Garden has been expanded to cover the entire open space. The shadow study has provided extensive data to assist in understanding hours of sunlight in order to adjust the program schedule and planting palette to the new climate conditions. The expanded scope includes well-designed lighting upgrades to the Roof Garden that will extend the hours of the Roof Garden. The activity test-to-fit analysis within the 11/2/2018 Response to Comments provides key information that supports an expanded seasonal programming commitment made by the Applicant. As outlined in the original IDCP, landscape architecture details for each open space will be expected to accompany each individual building's Design Review submission with comparable levels detail between the buildings and the associated open spaces.

- Roof Garden: CRA staff appreciates the acknowledgement of the importance of the Roof Garden in relation to the proposed building. Staff believe that the hardscape, softscape and planting modifications to the Roof Garden will accommodate a large variety of programs which are expected to enhance the sense of place, add usable hours of activity in the evening, and further solidify this area as a vital resource to Kendall Square. To serve this, it is suggested that a larger variety of comfortable, movable and semi-movable furniture be utilized. Additionally, trees and other vegetation visible from the Plaza to draw people up should be considered.
- Shadow: CRA staff appreciates the extensive effort put into the shadow and thermal comfort study for the 11/2/2018 Response to Comments. Based on this information, CRA staff believes that the extended evening hours of the Roof Garden as well as the radically improved access directly from the Plaza, plus the improved comfort during hot summer days when shade is a benefit, combined make up for the shade impacts of the new 325 Main Street building. The revised Roof Garden programming and horticulture strategy takes this shadow and thermal comfort study into account.
- Plaza to Roof Garden Connection: The CRA staff remains highly supportive of the new connection between the Plaza and Roof Garden. The design provides the opportunity to draw people up to the Roof Garden and provides a sense of discovery through the abstract switchback shapes, and has the potential to become a distinctive public space in Kendall Square. CRA Staff believes the switchbacks in the original submission between levels 1-2 and 2-5 provide opportunities for visitors to pause, gather, and view the plaza below. At the same time, it is acknowledged that there is a desire to make a strong visual connection from Main Street to the Roof Garden. The staircase to the Roof Garden should carry material that signifies this as a distinctly civic amenity. The edges and underside of the stairs and switchbacks are an opportunity for vegetation or art, to draw curiosity and exploration. Signage, wayfinding and environmental graphics related to the destinations associated with the staircase at each level and public elevator system are expected to be part of the Commercial Building B Schematic Design Review process.
- Rooftop of west headhouse: the CRA is supportive of utilizing the roof of the west headhouse and extending the headhouse elevator by one floor, pending approval from the MBTA. Utilizing this large

rooftop directly adjacent to the new building and within the Plaza for elevated open space offers a better use of roof space. In approving this IDCP Amendment, the CRA is approving it with the MBTA rooftop improvements as generally presented. Specific implementation plans of how a commitment for this public improvement can be made will need to be worked out between the Applicant, the MBTA, the City, and the CRA.

- Plaza: No design changes are proposed for the Plaza and in the proposed amendment document, the Marriott trellis structure is fully retained. CRA staff suggests that the section of trellis structure immediately adjacent to the new Roof Garden staircase and within the diagonal indentation in the Plaza be revisited in the Commercial Building B schematic design submission. The manner in which the retail level pulls back diagonally northwest in combination with the large brick columns could create an awkward dark corner situation. Staff believe this open space area could be more inviting if a portion of the trellis is removed. If the trellis structure is fully or largely retained, CRA staff suggests the applicant consider how the grid could be considered as a structure for PV solar and/or a canvas for public art in the long-term future.
- Main Street Restoration: It is CRA's understanding that the area of Main Street utilized by the 325 Main Street construction project will be restored to the existing condition. The CRA is open to discuss any redesigns that are considered by the City and will cooperate with the Applicant and the City in the utilization of the CRA owned property along the Main Street right-of-way.
- Public Restrooms: CRA staff appreciates the commitment to provide a public restroom solution for the Plaza that is integrated into the new building. Appropriate signage for the public restrooms should be included in the Commercial Building B Schematic Design Review process. Access to the public restrooms should be included in any revision to the Pioneer Way easement.

135 Broadway Residential Program

Although not a primary element of the IDCP Amendment or the Response to Comment, the residential element of Phase Two is valuable element of the overall MXD infill development program. While the KSURP and MXD Zoning track housing entitlement by GFA not unit count, the IDCP Amendment documents show conflicting information. The 9/6/2018 Submission does not include an updated unit count projection as outlined in the TPT response memo or the presentation shown at the 8/8/2018 CRA Board meeting, both of which illustrate an increase number of units. The Applicant should be commended for an exceptionally thorough study of the Blue Garage roof. While the study showed the use of the space between the expansion joints G8 and G15 is ultimately infeasible, the housing associated with the Blue Garage is vitally important to the long-term success of this district. CRA looks forward to reviewing the residential open spaces dedicated to the building tenants during the South Residential Schematic Design Review process

- Residential Program: The GFA and residential unit count tables on pages 28-29 of the 9/6/2018 Submission should be updated and included in the final record copy IDCP Amendment book and carried into the South Residential Building Schematic Design Review submission.
- Phasing: CRA staff are supportive of the modifications to the phasing schedule including associated open space outlined in the 11/2/2018 Response to Comments. As described, CRA staff looks forward to the South Residential Building Schematic Design Review submission shortly after concluding the design review for Commercial Building B in 2019. The phasing plan should also be updated to reflect the more extensive commitment to improvements to the Roof Garden.
- South Park on Broadway: The Applicant responded to CRA's request to reconsider the preservation of a few of the existing trees within South Park on Broadway by indicating that the tree removal plan for Broadway Park is necessary for the implementation of the previously approved plan. CRA would still like to take a second look at the possible preservation of certain trees during the South Residential Building

Schematic Design Review in the future, and is open to changing the prior Broadway Park landscape design if necessary for tree preservation.

Transportation and Circulation

The Application provided a separate response memo to TPT addressing their technical comments related to the VHB Transportation memo submitted with the IDCP Amendment. While the CRA defers to TPT to analyze the adequacy of the transportation studies, the CRA staff has noted a couple issues to be resolved in future planning.

Additional pedestrian circulation diagrams were provided in the 11/2/2018 Response to Comments, although they do not show all the prevalent desire lines that exist today out of the MBTA Red Line subway through the Marriott lobby and the Green Garage to Broadway. Community members have consistently expressed concern about the look and feel of public pedestrian connections, and how those spaces will be perceived as public amenities and not simply part of a building lobby.

- Visitor Parking (autos): More detailed information should be given regarding the accommodation of visitor parking within the MXD, especially during peak hours when the garages will be open only to monthly passes. CRA staff would like the Applicant to work with the Traffic Parking and Transportation Department (TPT), Community Development Department (CDD) and the CRA to conceptualize installation of a public information system on City streets that helps direct drivers to garages with real time information on whether or not visitor parking is available. This will reduce the prevalence of circling around Kendall Square looking for visitor parking in off-street garages.
- Bike Parking: CRA data on existing short-term and long-term bicycle parking shows significantly more bike parking than shown on the 9/6/2018 Submission Table 5-1 *Required Bike Parking* (page 201 of the 9/6/2018 Submission). CRA will work with the Applicant in the future to create and maintain an existing bike parking inventory that will be published in the CRA's annual Transportation Data Report. CRA staff have concerns about the ease of access to the basement bike parking location as proposed, and will work with the Applicant during the Commercial Building B Schematic Design Review process to address this. The CRA staff is open to the concept of doing a study of a full-service bike station as mentioned in the 9/6/2018 Submission.
- Pioneer Way Pedestrian Easement: The CRA staff is committed to preserving a path of travel connecting Ames Street and Pioneer Way to the Plaza through an interesting and active retail environment. Any modification the public easement will need to be relatively direct and intuitiveness. The hours of availability of a proposed pathway related to the design of the retail operations will need to accommodate the public pedestrian utility of the easement.
- Broadway Connection: The CRA has advocated for many years to make an enhanced, more direct pedestrian connection from the Red Line head house to Broadway and destinations to the north. Clear commitments to complete the Applicant's ongoing study of this connection and implement improvements must be administratively linked to the delivery of the Commercial building rather than in response to another development. Any enhanced pathway shall compliment but not replace the pedestrian easement through the Marriott lobby.
- Google Connector Ground Level Easement to Garage, Pioneer Way and Roof Garden: The CRA is supportive of the proposed idea to make this a two-floor space rather than the current one-floor volume. The double-height area should be further emphasized on the Main Street façade in the next Commercial Building B Schematic Design Review submission. To maintain a strong visual and wayfinding cue that leads people to the Roof Garden from Main Street. It is expected that these issues will be covered in the Commercial Building B Schematic Design Review submission. CRA staff also encourages the Applicant

to investigate the feasibility of salvaging and reusing the ceiling art lighting feature in the current connector.

Retail Plan

The Response to Comments design retains the proposal for 40,000 SF of retail on the ground, and second floors and potentially in the basement. The proposal has been identified as an opportunity to create vertical layers of activation on the plaza, and Main Street. Additionally, the right mix of retail would help provide the Kendall neighborhood with additional shopping and entertainment amenities not currently present. Given the dynamic state of the retail market, a significant retail proposal should be well coordinated with retail offerings anticipated in the near future within the district.

- Coordination with MIT NoMA/SoMA: The Applicant's retail plan for the site should be informed by MIT's SoMA/NoMA retail planning. CRA is aware that initial coordination has taken place between MIT and the Applicant in order to collaborate on a collective vision for retail in the corridor, and the CRA encourages this to continue.
- Destination Retail: The Applicant's retail plan has precedents but at this time is non-specific on the precise targeted retail tenancies. The retail in this building because of its location on the Kendall Plaza and above the Red Line subway station should focus on destination retail and help diversify the retail mix in Kendall Square in order to create a more complete retail composition not so heavily focused on food. The retail plan as presented with the second-floor fold open doors on the terraces is an excellent opportunity to activate the western edge of the Plaza in distinctly urban way.
- Annual retail reporting: CRA staff will work with the Applicant to determine a final outline for annual retail reporting to the CRA, which will be included as an appendix to CRA's IDCP Amendment approval letter. The format of this report will include at minimum annually updated retail maps provided in the IDCP documentation, as well as outlines of available opportunities for "start-up" retail uses as an entrepreneurial or developmental stage of business.

Infrastructure Resiliency

The response to the issue of MBTA headhouse resiliency concerns originally flagged in the CRA's MEPA filing was that the latest model shows less risk to the headhouse than previously thought.

- MBTA Headhouse Resiliency Measures: The CRA staff will expect to see close coordination with the MBTA and the City to re-evaluate the vulnerability of this headhouse as the flood overlay comes very close to this facility. As a preventative measure the CRA supports continued exploration of improved trench drains surrounding the headhouse, on-site storage for mobile flood barriers or other resilience measure in the future design work with the MBTA.

Construction Staging

325 Main Street Construction Staging Principles: The Response to Comments does not provide any additional information on the construction phasing plans. Construction staging plans on the proposed site will be especially important to understand early-on in this project given that the south side of Main Street is already closed, and will continue to be for several years.

- The CRA requests more information about the construction staging operating principles. Full staging plans are not necessary at this point in the process. The CRA staff suggest commitments to measures that allow the daily functioning of Kendall Square to proceed as smoothly as possible such as minimizing MBTA main headhouse closures, preserving pedestrian and bike travel ways, accommodation of shuttle

buses, and approach to traffic detours. CRA staff also suggest that the Applicant explore temporary retail installations along the plaza to buffer against the construction site and set expectations for future retail offering. CRA staff expect some level of commitment to such principles be included in the next Commercial Building B Schematic Design Review submission.

IDCP AMENDMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

The CRA Staff is supportive of locating dense commercial development proximate to the MBTA station. The positioning of the commercial building atop transit, while utilizing existing parking infrastructure and management strategies, supports the sustainability goals of the City as reflected in the KSURP. The proposed IDCP Amendment provides an opportunity to enhance the open space connectivity between the Kendall Plaza and the Rooftop Garden. The Project will update the ground floor retail and should improve the interaction between the 325 Main Street building and the Plaza. Coordination with the MBTA will be critical to the success of the design concept as proposed. Overall, the evolution of the proposed project found in the 11/2/2018 Response to Comments is responsive in substantial ways by dramatically changing the massing of the building and thoroughly re-considering the scope of work of the Roof Garden.

Commercial Building B will be subject to continuing review by the CRA under the CRA's Design Review and Document Approval Procedures (DRDAP). At least one additional Joint CRA Board / Planning Board meeting will be scheduled to review Commercial Building B Schematic Design Review documents. Forthcoming Commercial Building B Schematic Design Review documents should be informed by the October and November CRA Design Review Committee meetings. A few areas of consideration are listed below for reference however this memorandum is not an exhaustive review of the new design concepts presented for 255 Main Street.

- The double-height area with the north-south pedestrian easement leading to the Green Garage and Roof Garden elevators should be visually emphasized as a double height passage through the building when viewed from Main Street
- Maintain strong visual, wayfinding, and environmental graphics that lead people to the Roof Garden from Main Street.
- Allow the architectural distinction of Four Cambridge Center to remain distinct especially at the lower levels of the building.
- Further deliberation on the shape, configuration and landing of the staircase to the roof garden from the plaza is required.
- Access to the basement bike parking location in the proposed 325 Main Street building requires further attention and refinement.
- Retaining a sense of architectural drama gained by the exposed exterior columns in the first iteration of the building as proposed in the 9/6/2018 Submission, this may be done by other means in the updated building architecture.
- Provide concepts for the provision of dynamic architectural lighting of the proposed building as viewed from the sidewalk and plaza.
- Study the possibility for the 325 Main Street building to provide a weather protection awning that could help shield some parts of the sidewalk on Main Street, as discussed in earlier versions.
- A larger variety of comfortable movable and semi-movable furniture should be utilized and should be included in future Design Reviews for the Roof Garden

The CRA Staff believe there are a number of elements of the IDCP Amendment for the Board to consider as conditions of approval beyond the building and open space design review process. While all the technical specifications of these conditions have not been prepared, below are some topics for further review if the Board approves the proposed IDCP Amendment:

- CRA is approving the 9/6/2018 IDCP Amendment modified by the 11/2/2018 Response to Comments subject to continuing review by the CRA under the CRA's Design Review and Document Approval Procedures (DRDAP). Schematic design review will include at least one Joint CRA Board / Planning Board meeting.
- The following items will be included in the record copy of the IDCP Amendment:
 - o Revised GFA tables on pages 28-29 of the 9/6/2018 Submission
 - o Revised residential unit count numbers
 - o Reconciled open space square footage numbers with CRA's legal records
 - o Updated Phasing Plan with open space and other major public space improvement commitments.
- Detailed plans and drawings for the open spaces associated with a given building phase will be provided with the associated building design review documents as designated in an updated IDCP Amendment phasing plan.
- Any open spaces associated with an individual building project will be substantially completed with or before the occupancy date of the associated building.
- General construction staging operating principles for 325 Main Street construction will be included in the Commercial Building B Schematic Design submission.
- Any proposed draft easement terms should be included with the next Commercial Building B schematic design submission as a separate document. This easement shall include at minimum entries and exits and walking paths that function as a replacement for the direct east-west Pioneer Way connection to/from the Plaza, public restrooms, and proposed hours of operation. The terms of any proposed changes to the easement must be negotiated before construction over the pedestrian easement begins. The CRA will then work with the Applicant and future retail tenant(s) to finalize the easement language revisions before occupancy of the retail space.
- The Applicant shall complete a study of improving direct pedestrian connectivity between the MBTA Red Line subway station and the intersection of Broadway with the 5th Street alignment as part of the 325 Main Street design review process. This study should include direct observations and counts of desire lines throughout Plaza area including the number of pedestrians going between the MBTA Station / Plaza and Broadway via the Marriott lobby easement and the Green Garage pass-through and refine the alternatives presented in the IDCP Amendment. The delivery of these improvements shall be tied to the 325 Main Street project. Note that any enhanced pathway shall not replace the CRA pedestrian easement through the Marriott lobby in the former Pioneer Street.
- The Applicant will collaborate with TPT and CRA to conceptualize installation of a public information system on City streets that helps direct drivers to garages with real time information on where visitor parking is available.
- In approving this IDCP Amendment, the CRA is approving the development program with the MBTA headhouse and rooftop improvements as conceptually presented. It is recognized that the timely cooperation and approval for of the proposed new headhouse design by the MBTA cannot be guaranteed. A design with the stairway connection and draft scope of work for the MBTA station and headhouse improvements should be included in the Commercial Building B Schematic Design submission. The Applicant will propose terms for approval by the CRA and the City if the timing or scope of improvements for the headhouse are not closely aligned with the proposal as presented.

- The CRA shall review any proposed revisions to the streetscape design of Main Street impacted by the project. If for any reason the sidewalk space from the curb line to the property line of 325 Main Street is redesigned, CRA staff shall be included in the redesign process.
- If the Applicant chooses to retain some or all of the Plaza trellis structure, the Applicant shall propose a plan for creative re-use of the trellis grid.
- As the Applicant has indicated The Coop will be moved to 80 Broadway temporarily during building construction, a proposal for meeting the Innovation Space requirement related to the 75 Ames Street development shall be provided to the CRA before the tenant relocates.

The CRA staff welcome feedback from the Board and the Applicant on the scope and mechanics of the proposed conditions and will work with the City to align expectation with any Planning Board special permit approval conditions. Most previous conditions related to the IDCP approval of 1/17/2017 and conditions related to the design review process of 145 Broadway remain unchanged by the proposed amendment. CRA staff will work with the Applicant to develop a comprehensive catalogue of new and existing approval conditions and mitigations that have been committed to over the past 4 years in various documents and include it as an appendix to the IDCP Amendment approval letter. This will include current status, commitment time frame, and originating document.

It is important to note that there are significant public benefits contained within Phase Two of the IDCP. While many of those components are not the focus of the Amendment, important program elements such as the affordable housing production, open space enhancements, and active transportation streetscape improvements remain part of the discussion, as these public benefits are packaged with the proposed Commercial Building B development. It has been noted by the Applicant that the developer is leveraging the value of commercial real estate in Kendall Square in the Commercial Building B proposal in order to finance the South Residential Building.

ATTACHMENTS

Attached to this memo for the Board's reference are:

- The minutes accepted by the CRA Board of the Joint CRA and Planning Board hearing of 10/2/2018
- Document review memo from Charles Redmon, the CRA's urban design consultant, regarding the changes found in the 11/2/2018 Response to Comments

It should be noted that Review memorandum from City staff have been proved to the Board and posted on the CRA website.

Joint CRA Board and Cambridge Planning Board Meeting

Tuesday, October 2, 2018, 6:30 p.m.
City Hall Annex – Second Floor, 344 Broadway, Cambridge, MA

APPROVED Meeting Minutes

Call

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Charles Redmon, FAIA/Urban Design

DESIGN REVIEW NOTES: Infill Development Concept Plan Amendment Submission to Comments November 2, 2018

Date: November 28, 2018

Specific Comments

I reviewed the Infill Development Concept Plan Amendment Response to Comments by Sasaki Associates and their consultants for Boston Properties. They were dated November 2, 2018.

In general, I found this documents to be very professional and complete. I have the following comments:

1. Building B Placement and Massing:

- The new diagrams are intriguing and provocative; however the section on page indicates no porosity though the gasket joint between 325 and 355. I still feel that more generous through-block openings are needed at the ground level and above.
- On pages 12 and 23, the October 17 plan and section should narrow the width of the gasket connector to further provide more transparency between 355 and 325.
- Ground Floor Retail on page 20; I would make two suggestions: push the vestibule at the main entrance inward to express the full width of the Active Space. Pull the toe of the exterior stair from the Terrace Level back from the Main Street sidewalk about 10 feet to avoid a potential unsafe condition between pedestrian on Main Street and people exiting the Terrace to the street.
- Terrace Level Retail: Eliminate the thin piece of floor over the former vestibule location, again, to express the full width and the two-story height of the Active Space inside. Pull the head of the exterior stair down to Main Street toward the hotel to eliminate the unsafe situation at the toe the stair; shift the terrace bridge to the roof of T head house toward the hotel to accommodate the shift of the stair.

2. Residential Blue Garage Roof:

- I agree with BP's letter regarding the difficulty of providing the awkwardness of creating a public open space of the portion of the Blue Garage roof between the two residential towers. More enhanced public open space should be developed at grade in this area.

3. Pedestrian connections to the Roof Garden of the Green Garage:

- Page 31: Circulation and Access: revise the position of the exterior stair from the Terrace Level and Main Street as described above.

4. Rooftop Garden:

- Page 41, Overall, the proposed revised layout of the Roof Garden has been very well developed and will enhance the public experience here. I would suggest adding more trees to the layout near "Rhododendron", "Cornus Alterifolia" and the upper NE "Lawn".

5. Commercial Building B Through Block Connection:

- I would stress the importance of making this through block space as a two-story volume legible from Main Street to Pioneer Way.

Charles Redmon, FAIA/Urban Design

Overall, I was impressed with the Response to Comments for the Infill Development Concept Plan Amendment, as presented; however, I recommend that the proposed massing of 325 and its context be further developed and resubmitted to address the issues outlined above.

I look forward to further discussions and review of these new and exciting residential and commercial projects planned for the Kendall Square built environment.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Charm", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Submitted by: Charles Redmon, FAIA, CR/UD