



---

CITY OF CAMBRIDGE  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

---

IRAM FAROOQ  
Assistant City Manager for  
Community Development

To: Planning Board  
From: CDD Staff  
Date: September 14, 2016  
Re: **PB #315 – MXD Infill Development Concept Plan**

### **Background**

In December of last year, the City Council adopted amendments to Article 14.000 of the Zoning Ordinance, which regulates development in the “Mixed Use Development District: Kendall Center” (or MXD District). These amendments included a number of changes, among which was an increase of approximately one million square feet in allowed aggregate development in the district, allocated “60/40” between commercial and residential uses, and subject to a set of requirements based largely on the recommendations of the city’s 2013 Kendall Square (“K2”) Study.

One of the requirements in the new MXD zoning is that the Planning Board must grant a special permit to authorize development of that additional floor area in the form of an “Infill Development Concept Plan,” which would include a summary of the existing conditions within the district, identify how the additional development is planned to be allocated, and describe how the development will meet the zoning requirements and the City’s broader planning goals for Kendall Square.

### **Infill Development Concept Plan Review**

While the “Infill Development Concept Plan” is a unique special permit created specifically for the MXD District, it is based on the master plan approval process used in Planned Unit Development (PUD) zoning districts and some other zoning districts (such as Special District 4A, the site of the Cambridge Discovery Park development on Route 2). It allows the Planning Board to grant a single special permit to approve the master plan in concept form and to establish an ongoing process for review and permitting of individual buildings, spaces and other components of the plan. The criteria for approval are the same as for a PUD / Project Review Special Permit, with the 2013 K2 Study and Kendall Square Design Guidelines establishing the main goals and objectives. Unlike a PUD special permit, the Planning Board is not required to make a “Preliminary Determination” and hold an additional hearing prior to making a final decision.

One way in which this special permit is unique is that it involves coordination with the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority (CRA), which has jurisdiction over the project as it is part of the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan. While the special permit is solely within the Planning Board’s jurisdiction to grant or deny, the review process will happen jointly with the CRA Board to ensure compatibility between the special permit and the urban renewal plan, and the ongoing review and implementation of the special permit is also expected to occur through a coordinated process.

**Special Permit Approval Criteria for MXD Infill Development Concept Plan  
(Section 14.32.2, referencing Section 12.35.3 and Section 19.25)**

<b>Requested Action</b>	<b>Required Findings (Summarized)</b> (see appendix for zoning text excerpts)
Approval of a PUD Final Development Plan (Section 12.35.3)	<p>The Development Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conforms with general PUD development controls and district development controls (in this case, requirements of Article 14.000).</li> <li>• Conforms with adopted policy plans or development guidelines for that portion of the city (<i>see attached Kendall Square Design Guidelines</i>).</li> <li>• Provides benefits to the city which outweigh its adverse effects, considering: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ quality of site design</li> <li>○ traffic flow and safety</li> <li>○ adequacy of utilities and other public works</li> <li>○ impact on existing public facilities</li> <li>○ potential fiscal impact</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Project Review Special Permit (Section 19.25)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project will 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.</li> <li>• The project is consistent with the urban design objectives of the City as set forth in Section 19.30 (<i>see details in appendix</i>).</li> </ul>
General special permit criteria (Section 10.43)	Special permits will be normally granted if the zoning requirements are met, unless it is found not to be in the public interest due to one of the criteria enumerated in Section 10.43 ( <i>see details in appendix</i> ).

### **Special Permit Conditions for a Conceptual Development Plan**

When a special permit is granted for development at a conceptual or master plan level (such as a PUD special permit, or the special permit for development at Cambridge Discovery Park), the conditions of the special permit contain requirements for how the development is authorized to proceed, as well as phased or targeted requirements for mitigation and public improvements consistent with zoning requirements and other city standards. Some of the typical conditions for a master plan development approval are summarized below.

There will be future discussions between the Applicant, City departments, and the CRA to arrive at a set of recommended conditions for this particular concept plan proposal.

- **Overall Development.** Approves the development concept as a whole, including the extents of the development parcel, aggregate Gross Floor Area (GFA), mix of uses, and amount of open space.
- **Component Development.** 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.
- **Site Plan.** Authorizes basic site design parameters as set forth in the Final Development Plan such as 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.
- **Ongoing Detailed Design Review.** Because development is permitted as a multi-site phased master plan, there is expected to be a process for ongoing review of the detailed design for each site. Final designs will be subject to future Planning Board and CRA approval according to a process to be jointly determined and set forth in the special permit. Different procedures could be applied to different component sites, and additional review could be required if future design changes are proposed. The conditions might also identify particular aspects of the designs that require ongoing review, including (but not limited to) façade materials, screening of mechanical systems, sustainable design elements and landscaping.
- **Parking.** Total authorized minimum and maximum accessory parking for the development, including any off-site parking. May include more detailed conditions on how the parking may be used, such as the assignment of spaces to different uses, including off-site uses (if allowed).
- **Transportation Management/Mitigation.** Measures that are required to mitigate the transportation impacts of the project, including public improvements to improve transportation systems in the area as well as programmatic requirements incorporated into the project itself, would be specified and could be targeted to particular phases of the development. Requirements may also include monitoring and reporting of transportation impacts over the course of the project.
- **Infrastructure.** The special permit may specify necessary public infrastructure improvements and connect them to particular phases of the project.

- **Other Mitigation or Public Improvements.** There may be conditions related to other topics such as noise and wind mitigation, retail and open space programming, or other issues depending on the requirements in the zoning, the particular characteristics of the project and issues that were raised during the public hearing.
- **Phasing.** Because the development will not occur all at once, the special permit would establish requirements for the overall phasing of the development. The intent is not to specify the exact timing of each stage of development, though a total timeframe for project completion is usually set (which could be “renewed” by the Planning Board in the event that the pace of development slows due to unforeseen circumstances). The intent is to specify an overall framework by which residential and commercial development, mitigation measures and public improvements will be tied together into a predictable development sequence. Phasing could be established based on the completion of development sites or based on other “milestones” such as the amount of total development or development of particular uses. Alternative phasing options could be approved in the conditions, and future changes to the phasing could be authorized as Minor Amendments (see below).
- **Amendments.** The zoning allows for modification of the development plan over time by approval of Major or Minor Amendments, similar to the process for PUDs. This is crucial because it is typical for long-term developments to be amended many times over the course of development. Minor Amendments may be approved by a written determination of the Planning Board (without requiring a new special permit), while Major Amendments require a new special permit process. The conditions of the special permit may specify a range of modifications that could be approved as Minor Amendments.

### **Proposed Infill Development Concept Plan – Staff Comments**

At this stage of review, the primary focus is the Infill Development Concept Plan as a whole. More detailed review of the design of Building A (145 Broadway) will be provided later in the process; however, reviewing the proposed design for 145 Broadway helps to illustrate how the broader urban design plan informs the design of individual buildings and sites.

The submitted Infill Development Concept Plan is a well-organized document that describes the existing development in the MXD District (along with the historical context) and the additional infill development that is proposed. Reflecting the requirements in the recently adopted zoning, it contains sections detailing the anticipated residential and non-residential development program, the plan for open space improvements, retail strategies, transportation considerations (including traffic impacts, transit, parking, bicycle parking and loading), environmental impacts (including wind, shadow, noise and air quality) sustainability measures, project phasing, and design guidelines for buildings and spaces.

This memo from CDD staff addresses key urban design considerations including overall site design and circulation, open space and public realm, and building massing and activated edges. Comments on sustainability and retail strategies are also included. Issues related to transportation and infrastructure are addressed, respectively, in accompanying memos from the Traffic, Parking and Transportation Department (TP&T) and Department of Public Works (DPW).

## **K2 Study**

As part of the initial review of the application, it is important to revisit the vision and goals established for Kendall Square through the K2 Study and Design Guidelines. This helps to provide an understanding of the MXD District context, as well as the key urban planning and design considerations that form the basis of the initial review of the application.

### ***Vision***

A dynamic public realm connecting diverse choices for living, working, learning, and playing to inspire continued success of Cambridge's sustainable, globally-significant innovation community.

### ***Goals***

1. Nurture Kendall's Innovation Culture
  - Expand opportunities for Kendall Square knowledge economy to continue to grow.
  - Foster a strong connection between the MIT campus and the rest of Kendall Square. Enable MIT to develop in a manner consistent with its academic and research mission, so that it continues to be a magnet attracting innovative businesses to the area.
  - Support a vibrant environment for creative interaction.
2. Create Great Places
  - Support open space and recreation needs of a growing neighborhood.
  - Create lively, walkable streets.
  - Expand opportunities for Kendall's diverse community to interact.
  - Development and public place improvements must happen in tandem.
3. Promote Environmental Sustainability
  - Expand convenient, affordable transportation and access choices.
  - Enhance streets as public places.
  - Create a healthier natural environment.
  - Reduce resource consumption, waste and emissions.
  - Leverage the environmental and economic benefits of compact development.
4. Mix Living, Working, Learning, And Playing
  - Leverage community and innovation benefits of mixed-use environment.
  - Focus intensity around transit.
  - Minimize development pressures on traditional neighborhoods.
  - Continue to support city and state economic development.

## ***K2 Design Guidelines***

The K2 Design Guidelines aim to:

- Create a positive mixed use district where tall buildings with large floorplates can be good neighbors to public spaces, smaller existing buildings, and adjacent residential neighborhoods.
- Sensitively manage the impacts of building bulk and height, and animate major streets and public spaces through encouraging active ground floors.
- Enhance the quality of public street and park spaces.

These design guidelines focus heavily on relationships between private buildings/open spaces and public streets/parks. Buildings and private open spaces adjacent to streets and parks have significant impacts on adjacent public spaces through their physical design and internal uses, particularly at ground level.

## **Comments – Overall Land Use Plan**

The proposed land use reflects the rezoning agreement that was recommended by the Planning Board and adopted by the City Council in December of last year. By including a mix of residential, commercial, retail and innovation space, the plan helps to support the overall goals of the K2 study.

As presented, the plan proposes to concentrate nearly all of the approximately 1 million square feet of additional allowed development within the northernmost block of the MXD District. Only a small amount of converted GFA is proposed in the Broad Institute building at 75 Ames Street. Also, the zoning requirement for Innovation Space is proposed to be met through a conversion of existing office space within One Cambridge Center.

The proposal to concentrate most new development on the northern block has merit, given that it is the least intensively developed of the blocks and has the greatest potential for improving and enlivening the public realm. It also interfaces with current or future redevelopment areas, such as Alexandria Center and the Volpe Site. Additionally, this scheme minimizes the impact that new development might have closer to Broadway, where there has been recent investment in improving the streetscape promoting retail use, and avoids further impacting the public rooftop garden adjacent to the Marriott.

However, some of the effects of concentrating development on one block warrant greater attention. One effect is that the additional development (along with the retained above-grade garage) results in significant building bulk on the block, which will need to be mitigated through sensitive urban design.

Another effect of this approach is that it leaves out other portions of the MXD district that might have potential for future improvement. Although the proposed development on other blocks is modest, the Board might consider whether some public improvements should be explored. For instance, the infill proposed at the Broad Institute might prompt a review of surrounding public spaces (including Danny Lewin Park) to assess how they might be improved. (Improvements on that block will also be considered as part of any future expansion of the Whitehead Institute, which, according to the zoning, would require a separate permitting process). Similarly, while locating Innovation Space at the corner of Broadway and Main Street could positively transform that location, the plan could go further in envisioning public improvements at the ground floor that would enhance such a transformation.

### **Comments – Urban Design**

Staff has met with the Applicant on a few occasions over the summer, and has collaborated with the City's recently appointed urban design consultants, Over, Under, to review the application materials. Based on that work, detailed comments, organized by topic, are provided on the following pages.

#### *Site Design and Circulation*

As the overall urban structure is established, the creation of as much pedestrian and bicyclist connectivity as possible within the district, and enhancement of the pedestrian environment, are key urban design objectives. These should include east-west connections from the Volpe Site and points east to Galileo Galilei Way, as well as north-south connections from Broadway to Binney Street.

- The proposed improvements to the Sixth Street Connector, between Broadway and Binney Street, are a positive and important addition to the District.
- Other north-south connections have not been as well defined. The Applicant should consider upgrading the service roads flanking the Blue Garage, which should include:
  - Clearly defining the characters of these roads.
  - A widened sidewalk, especially on the eastern service road.
  - A uniform paving treatment throughout both roads, to enhance the shared road concept.
  - An upgraded façade treatment or screening for the long sides of the parking structure.
- East-west connections are also highly desirable given the dimensions of the block, which exceed the block size recommended in the K2 Design Guidelines due to the obstacle formed by the parking garage. Improvements to the Concept Plan should include the following:
  - A more direct pedestrian connection along the northern edge of the reconfigured Broadway Street Park linking the open space between 10 and 12 Cambridge Center, and the open space between 11 Cambridge (145 Broadway) and 15 Cambridge Center. It is highly desirable that the segments of this pedestrian pathway be as visually connected as possible, thereby clearly connecting the Volpe site and Galileo Galilei Way.
  - An enhanced pedestrian connection through the parking structure to align with east-west open space between buildings 12 and 14 Cambridge Center. With minimal intervention, a new, more direct, pedestrian connection could be made to the north of the existing vehicular entrances, or the existing pedestrian path could be more clearly identified.

#### *Open Space and Public Realm*

Another important urban design objective for the Infill Development Concept Plan is the enhancement of the existing open space network throughout the MXD District.

- The two parks flanking Broadway Street, mid-block between Galileo Galilei Way and Ames Street (Danny Lewin Park on the south and the Broadway Park on the north) are examples of well positioned parks that could better serve the precinct with more intentional design.

- The proposed redesign of the Broadway Park offers a number of benefits to the community, including the removal of the fence along Broadway and the extension of a unified hardscape out towards the edges of 10 Cambridge Center and 11 Cambridge Center. Also of interest is the runnel system along the north edge of the park for rain water collection. The following are suggestions for further study:
  - Creation of a more substantial pathway along the northern edge of the park, one that affords a stronger pedestrian and visual connection between open spaces to the east and west. This would likely require a decreased depth of the new residential lobby space on the ground floor, or a redesign of the ground floor.
  - Provision of diagonal pathways through the park.
  - Potential extension of the street pavement treatment further to the north adjacent to 145 Broadway (11 Cambridge Center); in its current iteration, it appears to limit movement to the path behind loading.
  - While staff support the long sculptural “community table,” both the location and the length of the table should be reconsidered. This can occur during the detailed design review phase for this park.
- The landscaped edges around 145 Broadway (11 Cambridge Center) require further clarification:
  - It is unclear how the edges to the east, south and west sides will be landscaped.
  - The design approach and construction phasing of the east-west path to the north of the loading dock remains unclear.
- The proposed redesign of the Binney Street parklet is an improvement on the existing suburban office park landscape, offering a variety of activities including a play structure.
- Clearer articulation of the street character in the MXD district would further benefit the public realm.

#### *Building Massing and Ground Floor Activation*

From an urban design point of view, the two most crucial architectural elements are a building’s form and the way it interfaces with the ground plane. Massing should respond to the programmatic needs of the building, but also towards mitigating bulk and providing a human-scaled pedestrian environment. Similarly, the active uses and quality of a building’s street edges are crucial, and can be evaluated both by the location and quality of activated program.

- In general, the volumes of the proposed buildings are interesting and responsive to the surrounding area.
- The proposed massing of 11 Cambridge Center (145 Broadway/ Commercial Building A) is generally well-handled and is a dynamic response to the site context. Nonetheless, staff note several areas of concern:



- The sheer façade facing Galileo Galilei Way has potential to overwhelm the streetscape, and lacks any scaling elements at the pedestrian level. While the prominent corner location deserves special attention, the K2 Design Guidelines prefer a strong podium, with a setback tower, or distinct horizontal articulation at the datum height. Such design approaches should be further studied for this elevation.
- The massing also cantilevers over the service road dramatically on the Broadway Park side in two locations. While the southern cantilevers appear appropriate due to the corner location, the northernmost cantilever appears to overwhelm the public realm and also results in minimal distances between the proposed building and the residential high-rise. The resulting form appears to encroach upon the park, which is contrary to the K2 Guidelines that encourage setbacks from parks, substantial vertical articulation and monolithic massing to be minimized at sensitive interfaces.
- Overall plan dimensions and the floorplate above 125 feet exceed the K2 Guidelines, while separation distances between buildings do not meet the guidelines.
- As much as possible, the ground plane functions adjacent to the Broadway Park should be devoted to an activated edge that has affinities with the park (e.g., café). In the submitted drawings, this edge is compromised by an entrance to the parking elevator lobby, which also results in an awkward layout for the proposed active use.
- The 68% active edge along Broadway is below the 75% required by the K2 Guidelines. In addition, the landscape treatment appears to limit physical and visual access to the ground floor from the Broadway sidewalk.
- The ground plane functions adjacent to the intersection of Broadway and Galileo Galilei Way should be significant place-defining attractors that animate the street life of the area. A restaurant would be ideally suited to this location.
- The massing of the residential high-rise recessed from Broadway is promising with its slender profile facing Broadway and notched, long elevations. While tall by the standard of what exists today, both the Volpe site and the MIT Kendall Square site will include several buildings of similar height. However, the following issues should be considered:
  - The way in which the building meets the ground should be revisited, with a reduction in the space apportioned to the lobby area in favor of a clearer outdoor east-west connection, as mentioned above.
  - The double-lobby space of the residential building compromises the ground floor plane and also limits the ability to activate that edge of the open space as well as provide better east-west visual, and possibly physical connections across the site.
  - Additional improvements to the parking garage (such as screening) and the facades of the base of the residential tower where they mask the garage should be designed to address three major orientations, one toward the park, and the other two as elements that align

- with east-west pedestrian routes. The current proposal addresses the park (albeit insufficiently as noted above) and not the visual porosity through the lobbies.
- The design should incorporate balconies for both residential buildings.
  - While the massing of 250 Binney Street (14 Cambridge Center / Building B) appears to respond to its context with its different geometries, the overall configuration should be further studied, with regard to the following:
    - Breaking down the overall massing in appropriate locations, especially the large sheer faces along Binney Street and the Sixth Street Connector.
    - Reduction of floorplate sizes to allow greater access to natural light deeper into the building and to decrease bulk.
    - Review of the overhang along Binney Street, which as proposed, is unconvincing given the north elevation location.
    - At two stories, the height of the podium seems low; it could easily accommodate a four-story podium without overwhelming the Sixth Street Connector.
    - The project should include improvements to the pedestrian path to the south.
  - Loading and servicing is well-handled away from public streets, within the site. However, it is still important to mitigate the negative impacts of such facilities, in particular:
    - The Building B loading dock does not conform to the K2 guidelines; it is wider than 30-feet, and there does not appear to be any suggestion of architectural doors.

### *Phasing*

In general, the proposed phasing appears logical. However, the following suggestions should be considered:

- Phase two should also include the Broadway Park, as well as upgrades to the east-west pedestrian paths between 10 and 12 Cambridge Center and the east-west pedestrian path between 11 Cambridge (145 Broadway) and 15 Cambridge Center.
- Phase three should also include upgrades to both north-south access roads.

### *Wind*

A qualitative assessment has been prepared for the district; however, little information has been provided that describes the existing wind conditions that would enable a better understanding of wind mitigation issues. There is also a need for detailed wind studies and wind tunnel testing at the time of design review for individual buildings, which should be specified in the design guidelines for future buildings. Such material has not yet been submitted for 145 Broadway.

### *Design Guidelines*

As with other PUD projects, a draft set of design guidelines specific to the MXD District has been prepared as part of the Application. The purpose of these guidelines is to assist in the future design review of individual buildings and open spaces. While the draft guidelines primarily focus on building scale, height and massing, a finer level of design guidance is needed to assist with the design review of each building at a later date. As such, the guidelines should be expanded to include language, images and diagrams that address the following matters:

- Architectural character and materials.
- Ground floor design and uses.
- The character of streets and pathways, and how the project will enhance this character.

### **Comments - Sustainability**

Sustainability is a key objective of the K2 Study. Part of the justification for the allowed increase in development in Kendall Square is that new development would be expected to meet enhanced standards for sustainable design. Moreover, the city's adopted Net Zero Action Plan and ongoing climate change resiliency work have demonstrated that sustainability practices will need to evolve over time.

The Infill Development Concept Plan addresses many sustainability topics in a positive way. For example, the section on energy sustainability includes discussion of on-site renewable energy generation by employing solar-ready design and construction, considers utilizing an existing co-generation facility on site, and includes mention of pursuing other district-wide energy strategies.

However, some topics lack detail; for instance, the plan does not discuss how solar-ready design will be balanced with the utilization of green roofs (because it is not feasible to employ both within the same area), or a commitment to complete a feasibility study of using the existing co-generation facility within a particular timeframe. Staff also strongly supports considering the feasibility of on-site solar generation, which is the ultimate goal of "solar ready" design. In addition, the plan refers to Stretch Code energy performance standards but does not clarify whether the newly adopted Stretch Code is being considered, which will take effect in January.

In permitting this concept plan, the most important step is to reach agreement on a set of sustainability standards that will be reviewed and applied as development moves forward over time. The recently approved MIT PUD plan includes such a package, which integrates the enhanced sustainability objectives of the K2 Study, the Net Zero Action Plan, and ongoing climate change resiliency work, and includes the following measures:

- Design of all buildings to a minimum Gold standard using LEED Version 4, including energy performance that is equivalent to a 10% improvement over ASHRAE-2010 baseline standards. (Note that prior versions of LEED will be unavailable after October, 2016, and therefore all projects in the permitting process are now being required to apply Version 4.)
- Assessing feasibility of a steam energy connection for each new building, as required in zoning. (For this project, a steam analysis has been provided as a supplement to the Application

Documents but has not been fully reviewed. This approach should be pursued further, as the project’s MEPA comments observed that connecting to the Veolia district steam system would be “transformational” in terms of the project’s carbon footprint.)

- Assessing feasibility of geothermal energy systems for each new building, including the feasibility of shared geothermal among different building sites.
- Considering energy storage as part of each new building design.
- Including a commissioning program for each building (following the LEED Enhanced Commissioning credit or comparable standard.)
- Analysis of “pathways to net zero,” i.e., ways in which each new building could be adapted to be carbon-neutral as technologies advance over time.
- Incorporation of resiliency strategies that are protective of building occupants, activities and systems.
- Incorporating evolving sustainability standards, as such may be established at the time that an individual building is going through the design review process.
- Tracking of greenhouse gas emissions over time.

While this development plan could pursue its own set of sustainability standards that are more appropriate to the project, staff believes that the measures outlined in the MIT special permits provide a comprehensive set of measures that best responds to the city’s sustainability goals at this point in time and for Kendall Square in particular. Continuing discussion with the Applicant is anticipated.

Transportation strategies are also integral to the project’s sustainability, including prioritization of walking, bicycling and public transportation as the primary modes of access, designing projects that emphasize and support active transportation, and creating streets and spaces are safe, accessible and appealing to people of all ages and abilities. These issues are addressed in the plan and more detailed comments are provided in the accompanying memo from TP&T. Also, additional comments on climate change resiliency are included in the accompanying memo from DPW.

### **Comments – Retail and Innovation Space**

#### *Retail*

The retail section of the plan provides a helpful assessment of retail in the area and lays out a strategy to add to the retail base. Staff appreciates that the context for the retail plan takes into account the retail proposed or already in the neighborhood. Staff also appreciates that the Applicant is proposing incentives for local retail, which would be pursued in collaboration with the CRA, as these are good ways to encourage more local businesses to come in.

Aside from the ground-floor design issues raised in the Urban Design comments section, the following issues are worthy of further consideration by the Board:

- The focus on smaller retail spaces is appreciated, such as the 1,756 square-foot space at 145 Broadway. However, to ensure local retailers are viable, spaces on other sites (such as 250 Binney Street) will have to be made smaller than 3,000 square feet, possibly by splitting into 1,500 square-foot spaces.
- There may be limited future capacity for sit-down restaurants in Kendall Square. Not only are there many cafés and restaurants existing and planned to be established in the near future, there is also more competition from corporate cafeterias as larger companies have moved into the area. A greater diversity of retail uses might be explored as possibilities for retail locations such as 145 Broadway and 250 Binney Street.
- The following types of retail, which were identified by users of the area through the city's Kendall Square intercept survey, may provide possibilities for diversifying the retail mix:
  - Dry goods: office supply, Hardware, Sporting Goods Store, Specialty Retail (e.g., gift shop)
  - Pharmacy
  - Personal services: spa, salon, barber shop
  - Nightlife venues: art gallery, music venues
  - Dry cleaning
  - Mini market
  - Quick service and ethnically diverse foods

#### *Innovation Space*

The program for Innovation Space describes where that space will be located and summarizes the standards that must be met pursuant to the zoning requirements. The idea of having that space located in the heart of Kendall Square, next to the Cambridge Innovation Center, does have the potential to contribute to the diversity and liveliness of that location.

However, the concept plan does not describe how that space will actually be programmed and operated. It is helpful to have an operational plan that summarizes how the proposed space is planned to function and a reporting process to allow for monitoring on an ongoing basis by CDD. This type of plan should be included either prior to granting the special permit or as a condition of the ongoing review process, to be submitted prior to the development of commercial space for which such Innovation Space is required.