

## DRAFT MINUTES

### BOSTON CIVIC DESIGN COMMISSION

The meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was held on Tuesday, August 4<sup>th</sup>, 2015, starting in the BRA Board Room, 9<sup>th</sup> Floor, Boston City Hall, and beginning at 5:37 p.m.

Members in attendance were: Michael Davis (Co-Vice-Chair); Deneen Crosby, Linda Eastley, David Hacin, William Rawn, and Lynn Wolff. Absent were Andrea Leers, David Manfredi, Paul McDonough (Co-Vice-Chair), Daniel St. Clair, and Kirk Sykes. Also present was David Carlson, Executive Director of the Commission. Representatives of the BSA were present. Michael Cannizzo, Phil Cohen, and Jun Jeong Ju were present for the BRA. Ted Landmark (BRA Board Member) appeared as well.

The Co-Vice-Chair, Mike Davis (MD), announced that this was the meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission that meets the first Tuesday of every month and welcomed all persons interested in attending. He added thanks to the Commissioners for the contribution of their time to the betterment of the City and its Public Realm. This hearing was duly advertised on Sunday, July 19, in the BOSTON HERALD. MD noted that the meeting would begin without a quorum but a Commissioner was due in shortly.

The first item was the approval of the July 7<sup>th</sup>, 2015 Meeting Minutes. A motion was made, seconded, and it was duly

**VOTED: To approve the July 7<sup>th</sup>, 2015 Boston Civic Design Commission Meeting Minutes.**

This vote would be affirmed (as well as the call to order itself) coincident with the first action. Votes were passed for signature. MD noted that, because of the quorum issue, the Commission would start with reports from Design Committee and would defer reports from Review Committee. The next item thus became a report from the Design Committee on the **Artists For Humanity Expansion Project**. Andrew Motta of AFH began to describe the overall Project; Bill Rawn (WR) suggested that they focus instead on a presentation of the design changes discussed in Committee. Jill Kaehler (JK) of Behnisch Architekten showed slides of the building facades, then the site plan, and described the landscaping treatment, including the relationship to the Park and the grading along A Street. JK: Part of the landscape idea is to work with artists both engaged with AFH and in the community. The double curb line (describes, shows) retains the ability to have the all of the sidewalk (elements) intact when A Street is re-done. It deals with a 7-foot grade change and variations in the curb height. [Lynn Wolff (LW) arrived; David Hacin (DH) indicated he would vote affirmatively on this action and the call to order and left the room.]

WR asked for clarification regarding the sidewalk and curb. JK provided this and went through a series of diagrams showing the context and the proposed expansion's relationship, and then the facade treatment/details. Deneen Crosby (DC): There are a lot of technical issues that will have

to be addressed as this moves forward (such as ensuring the tree roots grow toward the building and not the street), both along A Street and on Second. With that, it was moved, seconded, and **VOTED: That the BCDC recommends approval of the schematic design for the Artists for Humanity Expansion Project, located at 100 West Second Street at the edge of the South Boston Waterfront District.**

MD noted that the meeting had been formally called to order with the quorum having arrived, even if currently not fully present. The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **Whittier Choice Neighborhood Project**. WR reported: Building #1 was the focus of the review. There was some discussion of the park space location, but those Commissioners present were easily convinced of the merits. Does the BRA staff agree? Michael Cannizzo (MC): Yes. WR: The location of the garage ramp in Building #4 was to be moved away from the street. Regarding the street going through - Hampshire, we were convinced by the connection to the street that may be a part of the Project next door, as well as the history and easements. On the building mass, some separation as a design consideration was suggested by Andrea.

Michael Liu (ML) of The Architectural Team: That was a good summary. (Shows and describes details of the garage ramp issue, including plan and width constraints. Shows an updated site plan and view studies. Notes the street location, and discusses the difficulties of an actual massing break on #4. ML: Instead, we hope to work on the notion of showing the joint as two buildings meeting with a party wall condition. (Shows a variation in this direction.) DC asked about the nature of the courtyards - were they fenced, or open? ML: The intent is that they are unfenced and open. A discussion of the nature of the courtyard ensued. [DH returned, and Linda Eastley (LE) arrived.] WR: I prefer the first massing study shown. LW: I prefer the latter. MD: We will discuss that when the future phase returns to us. Our vote tonight is for the Master Plan and the first phase. WR suggested a vote along the lines suggested in the informational memo. DC: And it should mention attention to the courtyard in the vote. It was then seconded, and

**VOTED: That the BCDC recommends approval of the Overall Plan and the schematic design for Phase One of the Whittier Choice Neighborhood Project on the block bounded by Tremont, Ruggles, Cabot, and Whittier streets in the Roxbury neighborhood, with the condition that any future phase(s) returns for review and approval, addressing the issues of garage ramp location within Building #4, as well as that building's configuration - providing a sense of separation between its primary massings - and, the nature of the courtyard space.**

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **180 Telford (Charlesview Phase 3) Project**. David Carlson (DAC) noted that the 180 Telford Project had been originally approved as part of the Charlesview Project, but had been sold and was in the process of an NPC. The architect had changed as well. DAC: 180 Telford alone, at about 81,000 SF, is somewhat below the BCDC SF threshold. But it is still a significant portion of the larger Charlesview PDA and review is recommended. It was then moved, seconded, and

**VOTED: That the BCDC review the revised schematic design for the Charlesview Phase 3 Project at 180 Telford Street between Western Avenue and Soldiers Field Road in the North Allston neighborhood.**

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **89 Brighton Avenue Project**. DAC noted that the site was not far away from other buildings seen in the ‘Eco-District.’ DAC: The proposal is about 124,000 SF, over the BCDC threshold, and review is recommended. It was quickly moved, seconded, and

**VOTED: That the BCDC review the schematic design for the proposed 89 Brighton Avenue Project in the Allston Village neighborhood.**

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **171 Tremont Street Project**. DAC: This is a straightforward glass tower at the edge of the Common on the site of the Millennium tower offices and showroom building. At 85,000 SF, it is slightly below the threshold, but at this height on the edge of the Common, it is potentially a significant impact on the public realm. Review is recommended. A motion was made, seconded, and it was

**VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed 171 Tremont Street Project at the corner of Avery Street in the Midtown Cultural District.**

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Pier 4 Phase 3 Residential Project**. DAC: This is the final Project in the Pier 4 PDA, and is modified in design from that approved originally. Both as a condition of the BCDC’s votes on earlier phases, and because the SF alone is over 200,000 SF on the Harbor’s edge, review is recommended. A motion was made, seconded, and it was

**VOTED: That the Commission review the revised schematic design for Phase 3 of the Pier 4 PDA Project in the South Boston Waterfront (Innovation) District.**

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Boston Garden Phase One Project**. DAC noted that the vote on the overall Boston Garden or North Station Project was conditioned on seeing each Phase and interim condition. This Phase alone was noted to be over 400,000 SF, and a affirmation of review was recommended via a vote. A motion was made, seconded, and it was

**VOTED: That the Commission review the revised and more developed schematic design for Phase One (podium) of the proposed Boston Garden Project at 80 Causeway Street to the south of TD Bank Garden in the North Station Economic Development Area.**

DH left. The next item was a presentation of the **180 Telford (Charlesview Phase 3) Project**. Stephen Davis (SD) of The Davis Companies introduced the team. Brian O'Connor (BOC) of Cube 3 Studio presented the design, first noting the locus. BOC: We are excited to be completing the redevelopment of the [Charlesview] area. (Shows area photos, and talks about the area using an aerial view.) The building mass runs along Soldiers Field Road (SFR) for views, then there is an element along Telford which acts as a 'back porch' to the neighborhood. He noted the upper courtyard in the rear, and the plaza area in front. Bob of Stantech (showing the park at Western): This is a space for the building and the neighborhood; it will be privately built and maintained, but it is a public space. The site design includes a 10' sidewalk; we are giving about 6' from our property. (Notes relationship to the building edge and base.) The idea is a series of small spaces created with walls and plantings. We are looking at community artists to provide art for the space; it also features stormwater retention and permeable paving. There is a 'branding wall' along Western, but it is also a privacy screen. (Shows views.) LE: Are we seeing the existing context? BOC: Newer buildings came later. Bob continued with more views in the park, showing the nature of the walls and the plantings working to shape the space.

DC: The bridge at the end...I appreciate your widening on your side. But is there anything that can be done to make the approach and ramping better? Even tabling the street would help. SD: I agree. Harvard is working on those changes; they are funding a study to look at connections across in general. LE: Where is access for service? Is that a drive on the south? BOC: There may occasionally be a box truck there, and it provides access to the transformer. But the only driveway entry is at the garage (indicates). (Shows a view of that area.) The space fronting the park is intended to be as active as possible, with bicycles or more. (Describes the entry location, shows a view with the pedestrian bridge ghosted in. Shows plans, starting with the ground floor [mostly garage] and second floor, with the courtyard. Shows a typical floor above, and then a section through the building.) MD: So, the back and side have garage at the base? BOC: Yes. (Shows elevations.) We have an idea about metal screen art walls at the garage openings. The materials above are fiber cement, at different scales, with a finer grain at the base. It's the same on the end. All have variations, some have more aluminum highlights in the body. (Shows a sidewalk section along Telford. Then an SFR elevation, and SFR sidewalk section.) We will rebuild this entirely; it's in bad shape. (Shows a photo-inset view, then a south elevation, noting that elevation is set back about 150' from Western. Then a view from the West, with the office buildings in front. A quick series of before and after views, looking NW and then NE along Western. Another looking north from Telford; a final one taken along SR, looking SE.

MD: Comments? LE: What is the future context to the west of this Project? There is no reason for pedestrians along SFR now, but in the future? DAC: There was some planning done for that area; we can show that. MD: It would be good to have that info. Also, a model. LW: Also, I'd like to see how this continues the notion of green spaces and trees along Telford. WR: Compliments on your presentation. We all know the issue of cars, and 50% openings - it would be good to understand the treatment. Another issue: we are seeing a bevy of projects that are across the City, with parking in the base. We should take a stand on this, as we did on bridges some years ago. I think we need to press you very hard on the parking. If we don't do it now, we will see it everywhere. A third thing: this is a major artery of pedestrians going to the bridge.

Is 10' enough [for the sidewalk]? I question the allocation; I want to glorify the connection, even if the bridge is across the street. DC: But also, there is a question about the sidewalks even if the work across the street doesn't happen. About how people get to the bridge. WR: It depends on the Skating Club. LE: My observation is that people might cross where your garage is; the diagonal is the desire line now. DC: How is the traffic on Telford? BOC: It's minimal now. There is no parking. MD: I also want to suggest that there's a lot of dependence on *one* building [facade] technology. There is richness in your description, but it could slide into flatness. BOC: That could be terrible; we don't want that. LW: You have to do something more on the garage. With that, the 180 Telford Street Project was sent to Design Committee. The next item was a presentation of the **89 Brighton Avenue Project**. The team had some problems setting up their projector, and started with boards, which MD had them re-orient. David Chilinski (DChil) of PCA began with boards while Nidhi John of PCA finished the setup. DChil noted the locus and showed context photos, pointing out the International Bicycle Shop and Budget Rent-a-Car, the latter with continuous curb cuts. He showed an aerial, and another with the site plan imposed. DChil: Noting your conversation on parking, most of this is screened. There is retail fronting Brighton Avenue, and other elements, including a bike storage and repair facility along one edge. There is a low parking ratio. (Using the model and an image, DChil explained the notion of their massing strategy, stepping down into the neighborhood.) In this neighborhood, properties come out to the property lines and the sidewalks are narrow. So we are pulling the building back to allow 12' along Brighton, and 9.5' along Linden (which tapers beyond to 6'). There is room enough for columnar trees. (Shows upper floor plans; shows before and after views along Brighton and Gardner.) We are breaking the material along both sides to better relate to the context. In terms of the materials, we have different attitudes on the sides. On one, we are using a Millennium metal panel system which comes with variations and is face-fastened. That is the gray/bronze seen on the images. And then a Norman brick between these elements. We use a larger element, of porcelain, at the base. Gardner Street is a combination of Nichiha, with fiber cement panels.

LE asked about roof materials. DChil: Cork [on the model]. But actually, they are likely green spaces, and patios one can step out onto. WR: What is the orientation? DChil: The space in the middle will be shaded. But we felt better about that than covering it. DC: When you are coming down, and walking in, it looks dark and scary. DChil: We have worked hard to screen the parking. And we have left openings on some edges. We have a management office on Gardner, and a screened trash/maintenance enclosure adjacent to the neighbor's, along Linden. The light *does* come down into the space in places. Noah Maslan (NM): It will be well lit. And there will be a lot of activity; it's the back of the retail spaces. DChil: Also, the height is 16'. WR: What is the FAR? DChil: 3.5. WR: You presented to us a project in this area not long ago, which was very clever in fitting the mass and elements on to the site. This is a *lot* of building on this site; this is feeling very heavy. We need to hear more about the need for that. LE: I agree with Bill. We need to understand the context. It feels high, especially along Brighton. If you could show your studies.... DChil: We're happy to have that conversation. It's hit or miss in this area. MD: Maybe that's it. It doesn't seem to step down, or make the transition well. The windows, and the materials that contain them - the pastiche doesn't help us understand the stepping. It needs some work. With that, the 89 Brighton Avenue Project was sent to Design Committee.

The next item was a presentation of the **171 Tremont Street Project**. [Most Commissioners did not, it turned out, receive the email with the Project info.] Ross Cameron (RC) of Elkus Manfredi presented the design: We are proposing a 19-unit condominium building. It fronts directly on the Commons, facing the Parkman Bandstand. Unlike the other buildings butting up against each other here, we are freestanding. The public areas are glass; the more private areas are to the east side. The easement on the property is about 1,000 SF, so our building footprint is about 3,500 SF. Very tight. Our intent is to create a pocket park as an amenity. (Shows plans, starting below grade [amenity and parking spaces]. Notes the elevator parking system. Notes the entry lobby; cars and service come off Mason Street. An automated system delivers cars facing the right way. The second floor is the upper lobby, and two small units. Shows the 'great room' on upper floors; notes bay window overhangs on Mason and Avery streets.) WR: What is the room to the side? RC: The kitchen. (Shows view from the great room, and then sections.) There's a duplex at the top. (Shows an elevation.) The building is glass, but we use framing elements to break down the scale. (Notes the space to either side - the easement, and Avery. Shows a neighborhood section along Avery. Then a Mason Street view and section, followed by an easement view and section. Then an aerial.) We are using high quality materials - bronze, and real stone. (Shows a view from the Common. Then a close view along the side of the top toward the Common, day and night.) We are using triple-glazed, argon windows, very high-end. And we are looking at ways of speeding the construction, using panelization. (Shows a view from an abutter's unit; shows a view of the base along the park, taken from the Common.)

Brian Shu (BS) of Mikyoung Kim: The landscape is very simple, befitting a pocket park. LW: Is one existing there? BS: Yes; there is a planter and a tree. We have an elevated deck and a water wall, which should be attractive to people entering the park. We are tacking to the neighbor to engage them, to see if designing a whole park is possible. There will be LED lighting in the evening. DC: Did you look at designing this as one park? RC: Yes, we are reaching out to Parkside. LE: The pocket park has promise. At Paley Park, the scale is provided by a canopy of trees; you're in a canyon. So you need to design this so that people feel comfortable. LW: How wide is the sidewalk along Avery? It's narrow, so while focusing on the park, you should also look at Avery.

WR: I am struck by the amount of people in the room. This is an elegantly crafted building. There is a shadow issue? DAC explained the 'Shadow Bank' and the legislation which crafted it. There is about a quarter-acre of area left in the 'Bank,' and the issue becomes what is left after any withdrawal or subtraction. This occurs when something is above base zoning. MD: So we will look at shadows in Committee. Do you have studies? RC: We do (shows an overall study and a key frame). WR: So clearly, we will want to hear more in Committee. MD: There's a tall floor-to-floor; can that be adjusted, and does the open lobby mitigate? Mark Winkler: I'm on the 2 Avery Street Board. Our concern is the height. Hardship (relief via ZBA) is only the developer's choice. The height should be 155'. With that, the 171 Tremont Project was sent to Design Committee.

The next item was a presentation of the **Pier 4 Phase 3 Project**. Russ DeMartino (RD) of Tishman Speyer introduced the team, noting that Tishman was here on Phase 2. RD: It's a 3-phase PDA; no amendments are needed, we are staying within the guidelines. For our first development in the City, we chose the Seaport neighborhood. William Sharpness (WS) of SHoP: This is an amazing site - the waterfront, the relationship to the ICA. This is all about authenticity. And texture. How it engages the public, and how the public engages around the site. (Shows an aerial, then the PDA limit plan.) The massing is stepping down to the water. It's about 100' high, not a tower. (Shows views. Shows precedents - ships, a boomerang.) WS explained how it engaged space, created relationships. WS: We are maximizing views; the building torques itself. And there is public access around and through the building. A direct connection to the ICA amphitheater, and other relationships. There will be people out on the pier 24/7. (Shows open space areas.) A lot of exposure and opportunity. There is retail in this area, part of a continuum back to the south (shows the ground floor plan). (Notes the edges.) We are looking at a material strategy [around the service area].

LE: What is the nature of the passage through? WS: It's 15' high. It's not an alley, it engages on either side. LE: It's so active? WS: I used to live on Front Street - this is not a back door, not an alley, but it is also a chance to engage, and allows residents to enter as well. On the west, like a ship, it heels. The building projects materiality and texture into the space. And there is the ha-ha element (the canopy). We have glass on the north and south, and the ha-ha that moves around, with grasses on top, and wood moving down to the retail. The residents experience it from above. On the southeast, there is an amenity breakout on the second floor. It's worth noting that cars do not enter the building, or enter the public realm. Parking is through Phase 2. LW: What are those solid doors? WS: We are working on that. It's like a ship.

Elizabeth Randall (ER) of Reed Hilderbrand presented the site plan. ER: The site is exciting - not just its location, but its history, and the history and vocabulary of the Harbor itself. We set up a series of experiences - which will allow one getting down close to the water, or up on a promontory, for nearly 360-degree views. We treat the ground as a taut skin - unifying it, but also reorganizing movement. It culminates at the end of the pier, and is also a transitional zone out to that. The Chapter 91 license has specific requirements, including a lawn, a water feature, and a wind screen on the east. We feel this meets and exceeds those requirements. Originally vehicles came in, but we are limiting that access. The water feature is now an inundated marsh [along the west edge]; we are working to engineer that. (Shows a series of plans and sections.) WR: Does that fill with water that stays? ER: It goes out with the tide. The outside edge (of the pier) is engineered to take tall ships; we are also working on tilting/stepping down. Irregularities in the seawall can allow native vegetation to flourish...there is a relationship to the ha-ha.

MD: The passage through the building moved, and now is not aligned with the ICA passage. Why? WS: That was our decision. The path connects across the cut, and places you toward the passage, but they are not aligned. MD: If I leave the [ICA] bleachers and turn right, what am I looking at? WS: Retail, or a restaurant. There is also a decision point at the 'prow.' LW: Cut

throughs in Boston are not successful, because people don't know there's another side. If it's a cut-through, you want to be able to see the other side. WR: On the same topic, your diagrams at the beginning had the passageway at the knuckle. On the other side, now what? Another example of a not-obvious pass-through is the Marriott Long Wharf. We are all proud of the ICA and what your colleagues did - but we also know there's not much 'there' there. MD: It's part of the nature of the space, part of the public realm, and not just a passage. WS: This is an iterative process. There's definitely a narrative going on. Real quickly, some material concepts.... We are using hand-made brick. And the ha-ha grasses. The window box projections are metal, zinc. They provide light and shadow, a residential scale. The loading dock area/amenity space have bollards, wood, pavers. It's NOT a back door or a mess. The landscape, architecture and form give this all a sense of place, and materiality.

DC: One thing - we haven't seen the Seaport yet fully populated. It will be interesting to see not just the ICA relationship, but the sequence of events. The connectivity. WS: A really good point. The High Line, and spaces along it, are 24/7/365. You balance the large with intimate moments. It's an interesting dialogue. The High Line is always inhabited; Harborwalk is like that. We need to talk about that narrative. LE: I'm thinking about the site, and the edges. Thank you for your landscape presentation...we need to see what one sees as a participant in the site. How you come across the Harbor. I worry about the [service] area. Continuity...there are so many elements. Moments - but how do I understand the bigger story? The passage is really key. It's just too narrow, it will always be experienced as a hallway. It should be really distinct - perhaps a change in the facade? The ha-ha is really the moment that you *don't* see. But ONLY the residents on the second floor [fully] experience that. I hope there's something like that for the public. An 'Aha!' for the ha-ha. WR: A physical model at a larger scale would help us. We need to go back to Old Northern Avenue, and the ICA, to understand the movements. Like the High Line - you get on, you get off. On wharves, you go out, then come back. An end-of-the-line aspect that you need to fight against. MD: Bill is right. We are proud of the ICA, which did such a good job of 'bending' the context. There was a collective flutter when your firm was chosen for this. You are relating to the context, but the context isn't very strong yet. Here, is this Boston? Is this more conservative? You don't forget Harborwalk, and the rest, but I would love to push you more. WR: I agree. MD: You should not feel restrained, except by your client, but why else would they hire you? WS: There is a material contrast. Detail, a reveal - the brick, playing off the very smooth, very monolithic. And on the south, V-columns that you can touch. A ship's hull is tactile. Maybe this is 'not SHoP' in terms of its formal gesture, but it is definitely, in terms of contrasts in materials. A rich material plurality - here, in Boston. With that, the Pier 4 Phase 3 project was sent to Design Committee.

LW was recused for the next item. The next item was a presentation of the **Boston Garden Phase One Project**. Kevin Sheehan (KSh) of Boston Properties reintroduced the Project: We're back, in a team that includes Delaware North. We received a [conditioned] approval in 2013, and continue to be excited. This is transit-oriented, urban, inviting...it completes North Station, and the realm around it...this is the final piece of the puzzle. We have Gensler, SEB on the residential, and Copley Wolff on the landscape. We expect to start the podium by the end of the

year, and are seeking approval on this first phase. There were three items identified in your vote: the dimensions of Champions Row, looking at the integration [strategy] of the overall composition components into the neighborhood, and the consideration of this as a gateway element coming from the north - and two, vs. three, towers. I'm sorry we're so late this evening, but it's not our fault. DAC: Yet.

Doug Gensler (DG): We are using the elements that make a great city - activity, moving through, events - giving this a dynamic quality and life. (Shows a massing diagram indicating the phasing. Shows a plan, noting the changes.) All loading is now off from Causeway - it's off of Legends Way now. This allows us to create a retail and lobby environment all along Causeway.

A second move was Champions Way, which now splays, aligning one side with Canal Street, and creating an urban room. With activity all around. We want to have an opportunity to experience history as you move around, so the paving [for example] reflects the old seat layout of the Garden. On the west walk, we have added landscaping, to make it a nice pedestrian way. (Shows the section at a neighborhood scale, through Champions Way to North Station. Shows a view looking toward Champions Way.) The idea is that of a collection of buildings. On the left, the building is a theater above, with retail below. It's glazed brick, reminiscent of the Garden. On the right, there is retail and entertainment, and an office above with large, loft-like windows. Between, there is an arrival moment. A space for people to be entertained, to move through. (Shows views into and out of Champions.) We are completing the space at Causeway. (Notes difference in the height of the podium; the view out is taken from the second floor level. Shows a movement diagram, and explains further, prompted by WR. Shows a view down Causeway, noting the scale relationship.) These are chassis, but there are moments of hacking, or intervention. LE: Examples? DG: The void breaks the rhythm at the hotel. And the mural wall. Also, the trusses as an expression - again, the notion of a collection of buildings.

DG: We have some of the honesty and grittiness of the High Line, but also translucent canopies, and exterior dining. (Shows a street section along the Causeway sidewalk.) Like the canopies in the Meat District, this gives a unique character. A note on the towers.... The podium creates a scale at that lower level. Bringing the tower down doesn't make sense. If we focus on the residential/hotel building - the hotel ell is now lower, with a green roof. The office - is more of a beacon, a marquee coming into the City. Simple, efficient, but NOT a glass box. We bring the detail of the podium up at the corners. But the sides are 'postcards' - taut sheathes, which reflect the City around them. Rock and water. The hotel and residential building is more textured (shows a view contrasting the two). (Shows views from Causeway. Then a birds-eye view including the Nashua Street building.) Stretching the glass on the office adds verticality. KSh: We are working with the T to create a below-grade connection to North Station. It's not shown, because still a work in progress.

LE: The podium feels very happy. One idea was that Champions Row was a way of stitching together in a gossamer way. Now, you have it heavy, heavy, heavy. Especially as rendered, it's dynamic, and visually overwhelming. On the ceiling, I would hope you have a stronger line, a connection with Canal. If we pitched it more.... The heaviness doesn't look like an improvement to me. DG: We are trying to have only the structure necessary to support it. When we took away the frame, it looked like a dead end. But we also don't want it to feel like

we dropped in a covering. LE: It doesn't have lightness, playfulness. DG: But it will have a lot of light due to its orientation. DC: I agree with Linda. I doesn't open up to the sky, it should be lighter. LE: A playful space. DC: The sidewalk seems too constrained to me, too divided. With the planter separation. Something more simple, more open, with trees where they can thrive, would be better.

MD: In broad terms, this is a vast improvement over the prior. It has two towers. And Champions Way as an urban room. If this phase were the end, it would relate well to the Bulfinch Triangle. The 'cage' doesn't seem like as much of an intervention. I love the second level. WR: The second level - we didn't have before. I'm very worried that it begins to fill in that space. It's low, as you enter the City. At Grand Central Station - at that second level, there are restaurants, but they fail regularly. There's no movement. So I question that. The sense of a portal is taken away. And the use - doesn't seem to work. DG: The access doesn't work well there at Grand Central. You are well into the space before you experience those. Also, we are looking at glass block on the platform, and a major anchor will activate the space. WR: The Grand Central second level actually *does* connect. MD: A model of Champions Way - simple, a wireframe - will help us to understand, and you to address our points. WR: Another thing - on the podiums, can you show us some podiums that are *successful*? DG: Atlantic Wharf. WR: I think that works, but it's less so. The Meatpacking District analogy with buildings there...maybe. And we will need to understand the glass, when the towers come in for approval. With that, and as a request rather than as a quorum-backed requirement, the Boston Garden Phase One Project was sent to Design Committee.

There being no further items for discussion, a motion was made to adjourn, and the meeting was duly adjourned at 9:28 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was scheduled for September 1, 2015. The recording of the August 4, 2015 Boston Civic Design Commission meeting was digitized and is available at the Boston Redevelopment Authority.