

DRAFT MINUTES
BOSTON CIVIC DESIGN COMMISSION

The meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was held on Tuesday, March 5th, 2013, starting in the BRA Board Room, 9th Floor, Boston City Hall, beginning at 5:26 p.m.

Members in attendance were: Michael Davis, Co-Vice-Chair; Linda Eastley, Andrea Leers, Paul McDonough (Co-Vice-Chair), William Rawn, Kirk Sykes, and Lynn Wolff. Absent were: Deneen Crosby, David Hacin, David Manfredi, and Daniel St. Clair. Also present was David Carlson, Executive Director of the Commission. Representatives of the BSA were present. Heather Campisano was present for the BRA.

The Co-Vice-Chair, Michael Davis (MD), announced that this was the meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission that normally 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 Wednesday, February 20, in the BOSTON HERALD.

The first item was the approval of the February 5th, 2013 Meeting Minutes. A motion was made, seconded, and it was duly

VOTED: To approve the February 5th, 2013 Boston Civic Design Commission Meeting Minutes.

Votes and the sign-up sheet were passed for signature. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **327-337 Summer Street and 319 A Street Project**. David Carlson (DAC) reported that the Commission had reviewed two other immediately adjacent Projects here, both under construction and one across at 316-322 Summer that was similar in nature to that proposed here. DAC: 319 A Street is a simple rehab, but 327-337 Summer has both horizontal and rooftop additions in glass. At about 140,000 SF, the Project exceeds the 100,000 SF BCDC threshold, and even though it is under review by the local Fort Point Channel Landmark District Commission, the BCDC can work with such commissions and bring a broader point of view. Review was recommended. It was duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed 327-337 Summer Street and 319 A Street Project in the 100-Acre Plan area of the Innovation District.

Bill Rawn (WR) was recused from the next item. The next item was a report from the Design Committee on the **Barry's Corner Residential Commons Project**. DAC noted that, after one Design Committee meeting, the Project had thought they might have extra time to complete work in that venue; everyone (including BCDC staff) found out too late that this was not the case, and so response materials were solicited and emailed to Commissioners. It was anticipated that the presentation tonight for a vote would include both initial and further responses, which included treatment of the north building entry along North Harvard, the facade composition primarily of the lower building, and the relationships to Smith Park and future IMP parks and pathways.

MD asked team members to identify themselves before speaking. John Martin (JM) of Elkus/Manfredi did so, and showed the recent modifications to the plan, including the residential lobby connection now to both Grove Street and the Market Square plaza area along North Harvard. He also pointed out changes to facades using a birds-eye view, here noting the bolder use of elongated bays in the brick section. A Market Square view showed the new residential entry with retail and seating to the side. The residential entry on the Western plaza was now celebrated by a cornice, and was shifted/recessed out of plane using a darker metal color. JM: The Smith Field view (shows this) hasn't changed a lot, but we've used material (metal) colors and window expressions to highlight the tower along that side. (Returns to a slide showing a view of the south building corner at the North Harvard plaza area.) We have more glass at the corner here, which was Lynn's idea. We've also changed the proportion of the brick facade material. JM then showed the Grove facade, and went through a series of elevations around the building, including the interior roof courtyard.

Andrea Leers (AL): This was a big topic of discussion. The change is very good; I appreciate your work in responding. I hadn't noted that the taller building had brick before, but you are bringing more balance; it's much better overall, simpler. Kirk Sykes (KS): It's interesting you said, 'simpler.' There are still a lot of materials here, but I will defer to the Committee. Lynn Wolff (LW): Deneen and I had some comments on Grove Street. What is your responsibility? JM: The responsibility of the Project is the south side only; the north side of Grove will be done by others. LW: It's important that the pedestrian connection be celebrated there, as an entry to the Park. KS: I'll make my point about the materials again. But my second question - is the roof activated? JM: No, it's a passive space for residents to view. KS: But is there anything in the public realm? It would be interesting to know what it is, if it would be visible. JM: There could be shrubs or trees toward the edge. KS: I'm not telling you, I'm just saying you should think about it.

Linda Eastley (LE): I really like the entry along Western - the relief there. Allowing a relief there to allow for your development might also be able to synchronize with development on the gas station site. Also, the visibility into Smith Field is nice there, with the stone wall. Gary Hildebrand (GH): We have met with the Parks Department regarding the road, wall, and a possible entry at Grove. We have some ideas, but none yet have been approved by them. LE asked where the entries would be on the future arena program building (on Grove). JM noted their retail diagram, which fronted primarily along North Harvard, with other uses to the sides. JM: To Lynn's point, we will have to bear in mind the pedestrian treatment. MD: There are *several* things to bear in mind with the IMP plan. KS asked about the retail datum being carried around the corner, vs. the scale of the building, on Grove. JM noted in response that there were amenity and retail space at the two corners; here, a restaurant is likely. KS: The scale might also carry across to the arena building, with its unknown scale. JM, and Joel from Samuels: The arena building will have active wrappers, and generally be in the 5-7 story range. We are not the developers of that. AL: I have a question about the lobby connection to the amenity space, which exists for the other entry but not for this. JM: There is a second-story connection. It's difficult to do that at the ground floor for both the upper buildings. AL: This will be a large, focal building in this area for some time. There are a lot of good moves - sound

things, such as the Grove connection. As you go forward, don't be afraid of the scale of the buildings; look for an unapologetic expression of a larger building. It won't overwhelm; it will be a destination. Keep doing studies that celebrate the scale. With that, AL moved, it was seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the proposed Barry's Corner Residential and Retail Commons Project at 219 Western Avenue (corner of Western Avenue and North Harvard Street) in the Allston neighborhood.

WR returned. The next item was a report from the Design Committee on the **Fan Pier Parcel C Project**. Richard Martini (RM) of The Fallon Company noted that they had presented in January, and then through reviews by BRA staff and Design Committee. We have the results here. David Hancock (DHan) of CBT showed their 'original' model and then one which was the outcome of the review. He noted the change in a 3.5 degree progressive modulation of the faceting at the edge, which would catch the light in different ways, and was comparable to the 4-degree shift at the corners of 111 Huntington Avenue. DHan: We also looked at ways of simplifying the balcony array. We looked at faceting the HVAC screen - those of you at Design Committee will recall the 10 or 11 models we had - and decided to go back to a simpler curve. The idea of the elevator material (metal) was carried up and over the screen.

AL asked about the 2-story retail expression. DHan noted their study, which concluded that a one-story reading carried around the corner would be appropriate as the building steps down to the water (from Parcel B). KS: Night lighting? DHan: It will be quietly lit. The focus is really on being quiet with the use, and instead lighting the park. KS: This is your showcase opportunity to call attention to the site, like the Courthouse. LE asked about the park lighting. RM: We had thought about some building lighting, possibly a play on the facade or a subtle glow at the top. LE: There is a seasonal change, so both opportunities and views change. RM noted that the park would return for review. KS asked about the three long balconies on the north facade. DHan: There is a structural need for those elongated balconies, and a shift in floor plans on those three floors. AL: We did talk about that. Rather than this being the exception, we talked about adding more (long) balconies, so these would not be so anomalous. DHan: We are discussing that. KS: The balconies are important in breaking down the mass. Maybe do something with the balconies at night that allows a sense of interest. LE asked about the pedestrian island at the corner. DHan: That has grown. (Shows small site plan.) The pedestrian connection is stronger, and the park paving comes up to meet the street. AL: Right now, the space at the end is a gathering point for people. There's an idea in the eddies, but you need to relate it to the whole. RM: You'll see that; we've been working on that. KS: I wonder about the Courthouse datum (on the small west facade). If there's a way of thinking about that on the end - that's my least favorite part of the building. That edge seems a bit arbitrary. With that comment, it was duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the proposed schematic design for Fan Pier Parcel C in the Boston Fan Pier PDA within the South Boston Waterfront District.

The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **75 Brainerd Road (the 'ICON') Project**. MD noted that the Design Committee *just* passed this up for a vote by the full Commission. David Chilinski (Chil) of Prellwitz/Chilinski Architects introduced himself and noted the issues of the character of Redford Street, the facade expression there, the niches on the east side, the quality of those views and treatment of those spaces, then a discussion of the Brainerd facade and introduction of the stoops. KS: There were no stoops? MD: You can thank the Design Committee. There are, now. Chil: (Uses boards to present responses.) First, Redford. Existing street lights are across the street. We can add lights to the building, at the entries. The ADA will require a variance for the stoops - we adjusted the parking to create an interior sidewalk for them - so we can do it if they agree. KS: We should write a letter. Chil: We may take you up on that. (Shows night view, with lights and entries. Shows day view.) There's an elevation change. We have a series of repetitive expressions, but we can't quite repeat it at the end. (Shows an unfolded elevation.) We've now repeated on Brainerd one of the elements along Redford. Redford now has a tripartite expression, with metal panels defining the separation, so that the scheme is true on both facades. LE: The only other thing we talked about here is the location of entries within 'bays;' they slide around a bit. MD: But...the bays 'sponsor' an entry. LW asked about the width of the sidewalk vs. street tree planting (there's only a 5-foot sidewalk, with trees in a slot). LE: It is a private street, but a wider sidewalk would allow better for the trees.

Chil then showed the revised rear court spaces (east niches) on boards and on the model. He noted a change in the plans. Chil: We moved the living rooms around, so that they, and not the common corridor, look out. And the unit windows otherwise are offset, so that one is looking directly into blank walls. The spaces are for the use of these four units. And we are architects doing landscape architecture. But the space is organized to provide privacy and to buffer views. We have also worked on materials to bounce the light around, and have corner windows.

MD: The Committee was very happy with the courtyard development. KS: My feeling is, it's up to Bruce Percelay (BP, of The Mount Vernon Company) about the views. I think stoops add to the value. What you've achieved is good. LW: I might suggest removing the trees; there's not much room. KS: Trees might be good. MD: It's terrible across the street (Chil notes the garage entries there); you need the trees. BP: The sidewalks will allow accessibility. LW: The trees will not survive in the street. They have to have soil, space, and a sidewalk to protect them. LE: There are a lot of good changes; the stoop entries are like lanterns along the street. On the courtyards, we liked the plan better than your perspective. Chil: Us dinosaurs drew the plan; computers did the perspective. AL: I think you've responded. The facades, the rhythm of the stoops that work up and down. The same with the development of the courtyards. Thank you for being so responsive on all that we've asked. With that, and no public comment offered, it was duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the proposed 75 Brainerd Road (the 'ICON') Residential Project in the Allston neighborhood.

The next item was a presentation of the **327-337 Summer Street and 319 A Street Project**. Joel Bargmann (JB) of Bargmann Hendries Archetype presented the design. JB: 319 A Street is

not being presented; since filing the PNF, it has become fully leased, and we are not changing the use. (Shows a view of the two buildings on Summer Street, noting they were separately built, but are treated as one.) These are the last two pieces of the Archon portfolio. JB then noted the property map showing an additional sliver parcel along Boston Wharf Road, and the elevational relationship of Summer to Pastene Alley. JB: The retail at Summer is expected to be service retail or a market, with access down to the restaurants or other uses facing Pastene Alley. The Fort Point Landmark District Commission review started in August; we didn't want to come here without their approval. (Shows the result of a recent submission.) We ended up here, with an addition on top, but set back slightly more. And a glass addition at the end, (approval of) which surprised everyone. There's a slight shift to the addition; it's very visible from outside the District, but not very visible from within it. That's where we are; there are no details.

KS: I like the glass addition; I would ask you to be more sculptural with it, so as to make it discrete and not part of the District. This is a 'tweener location. AL: I think the glass volume there is a much better strategy. I think that what is less appealing on the one perspective is the wedding-cake form of the penthouse. (Some discussion followed this observation.) JB: The penthouse is pulled back from the end because the Boston Wharf Road view is in the District. LW asked about pulling the floor in. AL: The main thing is to simplify. WR: How far below the street is the market? JB: That's at street level. LW: How does it meet the street? JB: The City is re-doing the street. LW: The restaurant at the Pastene Alley level - how does *that* meet the street? JB: We're not changing the building, just adding glass. MD: This is a little thin in its presentation; we would want more information. LW: How the alley is developed with the restaurant approach. How it's used. Is it a public alley? JB: It's private. We haven't been released to do the details you're asking about, because we didn't know we'd get approval. (This prompted some discussion.) KS: How does this move forward? DAC: It's in the District, so we can choose not to review it, but otherwise we would review it jointly with the FPCLDC, because the BCDC has a different set of sensibilities it brings to bear. MD, LE, and AL: Study how it meets the streets on its edges; on the lower edges, how it's encountered. Develop more views of (and study) the penthouse. With that, the 327-337 Summer Street Project was sent to Design Committee.

LE was recused from the next item. The next item was a continuation of the **D Street Residences NPC (aka D Street Development, MCCA Hotels/Garage Project)**. Tim Love (TL) of Utile: Since we last met a month ago, Commonwealth Ventures has been designated, and is working on two hotels. And we have been working hard to keep ahead on the Master Plan for the BCEC. WR: That site was the one we had approved for residential, with roads in the back. TL: Right, and that set the stage for the community process on this change. (Shows site guidelines.) We were hoping for the connections back - one between the hotels - that we discussed last time. The hotel setback provided for a kind of nuanced urbanism, across from the Event Space, which is now more developed as an idea. The retail plan (shows an illustrative diagram) focuses retail uses around the Event Space. The hotels are now split, and the center street aligns with the edge of the Event Space, and connects back to a potential garage site on E Street - and possibly all the way back to the Reserve Channel. The idea is to use Butler Street, in the middle of the (long) block, to act as the service street for all properties. We are considering the idea of a woonerf to provide a strong connection to the Event Space. (Shows a street section diagram; shows a series of axonometrics phasing in the envisioned developments in

the vicinity, with the Event Space in the center.)

Sam Norod (SN) of Elkus/Manfredi: We are very enthusiastic about working with Utile and Sasaki, and the roadway is seen as a tremendous asset. (Shows a plan drawing, then notes an 'interim turnaround,' and a service road in the back until Butler becomes available.) There is active retail along the D Street edges. (Shows upper floor plans, noting the 75' high ells; shows axonometric.) We are studying whether the Aloft tower comes to the ground. What we have here is two weeks of looking at the massing and layout. TL: On the material guidelines, we wanted everyone to know what the expectations were. We have been working with Sam.... On the sidewalk section, we are thinking a 10' passage, a 12' café zone, and a street planting zone. LW: That 10' may change to 8'. TL and Peter of Sasaki: We are working on guidelines for D Street. LW: The turnaround is suburban. TL: It's temporary. (Peter goes into more detail.) SN: I mentioned it was temporary. It's the only way to drop off on the passenger side to both hotels. KS: The future through street - if it's no longer a paper street, then there are views all around, and so people who see all the sides. Also, there are a lot of people coming here from all over. I have way different thoughts about the experience of those people. TL: It's a question of time: now, or five years from now, or ten years from now. In the spaces, you may build spaces that have fitness rooms, etc. - until retail becomes available. KS: I have a hotel in a 'tweener' location. The spaces can be difficult to activate before their time.

AL: Go back to your guideline diagram. The notion here, is that the setback allows some space across from the Event Space - at its far edges, quieting the energy of the Event Space. With a through street, a great change in energy. TL: It's better urbanism. AL: Why didn't you present it that way? TL: We had to like things suggested to us by hotel experts. So, we had to wait. If we handle this as a street, and not just a drop-off, then the City can grow around and up to it. The question might be the hotels. AL: The question might be that there is *too* much going on. SN noted the changes from the earlier diagram. WR: Can you show the build-out diagram?... Thanks. In building out the District, what kind of buildings are along D Street? And, why place a garage along D Street? It would be better a half block further on. TL: We need to show the State in permitting, the ability to hold 1350 cars. That thinking has been migrating in a direction. WR: Interim. TL: Parking for the two hotels, in the short term. We have to show we can handle 1350 cars, but we don't have to build it yet. WR: On E Street, and back? TL: That will be the Post Office back there; and trucks, along Cypher Street. The truck area goes to the Post Office and other uses. (Shows diagram with blue service traffic in that area.) LW: What about the service road? Butler seems wide. What happens when the service goes? TL: A good question. LW: The amenity spaces shown - what are they? Can they be combined? TL: We had to show it to the BRA for the PDA, indicating possible future expansion. LW: What is it, in the interim? The service road space is wide. TL: That's a good question. LW: The purple connection seems wide, against the sidewalk plan for 411 D Street.

KS: One thing about this specific project: a lot of rooms face onto this alley, close to the ground. So there is a lot of interest in making this attractive. The treatment of scrim, the facade of the garage. LW: The hotel piece... Dick Galvin (DG): We tried to allow for further development. LW and WR then talked about the nature of that space-making connection with the hotel uses. MD: Go back to the Event Space idea. TL noted the Event Space diagram: A 'Special Building' defines the space to its north, but later. We are trying to work out the nature of the Event Space. MD: It could be a unique space. More versatile and dynamic than a skating rink. TL: The

BCEC Master Plan, about 2-3 years ago, was symmetric, and perpendicular to the Vignoli axis. We don't have more detail on that. KS: You're working hard not to have a beer pub and three blank walls. It's tough. MD: How far does your scope go? For the development of the event space. TL: Howard, help! MD: We don't want a Los Angeles architect's idea of a Boston space. It's more a chicken-and egg thing. KS: I'm not convinced that two hotels and a plaza make a space. Cycles of use make the space dynamic. Think about every piece you're putting on that street. KS: We talked about that before. People have options: Why do they come here? TL defended his idea. AL: Kirk is raising good questions. You need to find a paradigm that will support that Event Space activity. SN: We are defining the uses. TL: The idea is to have both doors be equal. The Summer Street door, the D Street door. You can sell the Vignoli baseball hat, but this is for urbanism. KS: This is so like 9th Street (in Washington D.C.). You can go to a battleship hotel, and there is a residential neighborhood there. You can walk to DuPont Circle. You don't have that choice here, and so you have to *work*. TL: Finding what kind of design can work. KS: On the sides, there is nothing going on in D.C. In the back, something's going on. You have to look at a 5- or 10-year Plan.

The D Street Development PDA NPC would be continued in Design Committee.

There being no further items for discussion, a motion was made to adjourn, and the meeting was duly adjourned at 8:10 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission is scheduled for April 2, 2013. The recording of the March 5, 2013 Boston Civic Design Commission meeting was digitized and is available at the Boston Redevelopment Authority.