

DRAFT MINUTES

BOSTON CIVIC DESIGN COMMISSION

The meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was held on Tuesday, November 4th, 2014, starting in the BRA Board Room, 9th Floor, Boston City Hall, and beginning (due to a room clock malfunction) at 5:20 p.m.

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

The Co-Vice-Chair, Paul McDonough (PM), 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 and giving up an election evening to the betterment of the City and its Public Realm. This hearing was duly advertised on Sunday, October 19, in the BOSTON HERALD.

PM asked the first team to present; the next item was a report from Design Committee on the **3521-3529 Washington Street Project**. Bill Rawn (WR) suggested that this was unusual, in that the minutes and votes to review normally preceded any presentation. David Carlson (DAC) noted that indeed that was the norm, but a report from Design Committee did not require a vote beforehand, only after; the Commission could run through its usual procedures after this first item. A representative from the Development Team (DT) started by showing an aerial photo simulation with their Project in the company of other projects proposed in the area. Kyle Zick (KZ) of Kyle Zick Landscape Architecture showed the landscape/site plan. KZ: The idea very deliberately was to have three different buildings with the one at the corner featuring retail at the base and residential above. There are connections to the future Greenway/bike trail on this side of the tracks, responding to a request from the community (as at the Commons at Forest Hills project). (Goes through the changes to the site plan made pursuant to comments, showing the prior plan for comparison.) We have made the park more open to the public; we have added trees to the parking lot median and moved the storage building to allow a row of trees on that side as well. Lynn Wolff (LW): Did you consider a different location for the garage entry? KZ: Yes, but we had to avoid the area of contaminated soil - that was the constraint. (Shows an enlarged parking lot plan, noting the reconfiguration, median and additional trees provided.) The Park design (shows detail) has a direct connection to the bikeway, but also the building-related plaza is now closer to the building, and on a spur, so that the park is more public generally. (Notes a small garden area.) LW asked about the grade of the bikeway; KZ stated that it was fairly level, but changing. The connection is easy at several points. Deneen Crosby (DC) asked about a bike path along Washington. KZ: There's a 15-foot sidewalk; the bicycles are in the road here.

Andy of BL Inc. noted that an issue (on the corner building) was that it was too broken up.

Andy: We have reduced the balconies, simplified the cornices and colors...(shows view of rear as well)...and simplified the rear and side, which relates it to the whole. We have shifted the facilities at the rear against the building, which allowed the greening of the parking lot; the two-sided retail is not needed there. (Shows prior and new elevations, noting the shortcomings of the prior.) On the storage building, there was strong push-back from the community on its simplification; they did NOT want a simple industrial form. But there is more meaning in the intermediary tower now (where the building was shifted), since it allows for the trees in the lot. Josh Slater of Cube3 showed the residential building, noting the changes were primarily in color, and minimal otherwise.

Linda Eastley (LE): How important is the pedestrian crossing from McBride to Burnett? Andy: This is intended as a walkable site; the storage facility is a very low-level car use. David Williams: The community felt it was *very* important. LE: If it's so important, you haven't done enough; you should strengthen it. Kirk Sykes (KS): The storage building has a blank wall; is there anything being done to animate or light it? DT: It has very low occupancy. KS: I mean more for security, light levels on the site. No place for people to hide. Andy: we have planned it as though it's a street edge. There will be residential eyes from the corner building; we'll look more carefully at the lighting. DC: The lighting - and to Linda's point - should feel safe. WR: The smaller residential building has a nice combination of balance. Don't change the blue. It's ordered, but not bound.... Andrea Leers (AL): The treatment of the corner building has evolved in a very good way. I appreciate your responses to the parking. The far residential building started out good and remains so. On the storage, you ignored our comments. The housing buildings work well together, and then out of nowhere, you have a building with strange, civic gestures. There are all kinds of ways of modulating the building without resorting to gables and brick. I encourage you to continue your work, and not just stop because it's easier.

David Hacin (DH): The corner building is much more legible. I agree with the comments. I can't help but wonder if there can't be a sustainable agenda on those roofs; this neighborhood is *also* committed to sustainability. Perhaps rethink the storage with that in mind. DT: We will think about that further (brief discussion with DH). WR: Is there a phasing plan? DT: The corner first. There are a series of buildings to be demolished, and contamination; we will work toward the back. AL: The public garden is good. DH: I suggest we approve it with the comments about the self storage building and the walkway noted. A motion was thus made, seconded, and it was

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the proposed 3521-3529 Washington Street Project at the corner of Burnett and McBride streets in the Jamaica Plain neighborhood, with the condition that the Proponent continue to work on the expression of the storage building (consider also integrating sustainable treatments) and the lighting and street-like promenade along its edge.

PM recaptured the usual order, and so the next item was the approval of the October 7th, 2014 Meeting Minutes. A motion was made, seconded, and it was duly

VOTED: To approve the October 7th, 2014 Boston Civic Design Commission Meeting Minutes.

Votes were passed for signature. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Wentworth New Sweeney Field Project**. DAC noted that this Project, similar to New Balance Field at Boston University, was being reviewed not necessarily because of size (although it met that criterion if one included the parking) but because review was a condition of approval of the Wentworth IMP. A vote affirming review was recommended. It was duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design of the Wentworth Institute of Technology New Sweeney Field Athletic Complex Project at 600 Parker Street within the Wentworth IMP in the Mission Hill neighborhood.

DAC noted that the **West End Apartments or Garden Garage Project** did not require a vote; like the one acted on earlier (3521) review had been voted over three years ago and the Project was technically in Design Committee. What was being presented for all Commissioners was a project update coincident with an NPC. The next item requiring a vote was a report from the Review Committee on the **Bayside Doubletree Hotel Expansion Project**. DAC noted that this was an addition to a Project reviewed by the Commission 17 years ago. DAC: Although the addition itself is less than the BCDC threshold, there are proposed modifications to the site, the site itself is significant in the master plan for the area, and the total square footage including the existing building (which will have some changes) is over the threshold. A vote to review is recommended. It was duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed Bayside Doubletree Hotel Expansion in the Columbia Point area of the Dorchester neighborhood.

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Haymarket Hotel Project on CA/T Parcel 9**. DAC noted that this long-awaited Project is in a very visible location but was, at 140,000 SF, over the BCDC review threshold and review was recommended. It was duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed Haymarket Hotel Project on CA/T Parcel 9, bounded by the Greenway and North, Blackstone, and Hanover streets in Boston's Market District.

The next item was a report from the Design Committee on the proposed **135 Bremen Street Project**. Linda Neshampkin (LN) showed the changes. LN: The courtyard is now down at street level, with the restaurant in the wing, and stretching along Porter Street to the rear, with a

patio on the (East Boston) Greenway. (Shows a series of existing conditions photos to remind the Commissioners.) The WPA wall will be perhaps partially reused. (Shows view of the courtyard.) LE: Is that (courtyard) facing south? LN: It's facing northwest. We had a meeting with the neighborhood and abutters, who *strongly* wanted the courtyard on that side. (Shows an elevation.) The courtyard is actually four steps up, and will have a wall with parking behind it at its back; we will try to make that a lively wall. (Shows lower level plans, noting the subway below.) The parking is less now. The building is pulled back from Bremen, with a 6' sidewalk and an 8-foot pullover lane intended. On Porter, we have an 8-foot sidewalk, the wall, and then a 5-foot setback, so the building is about 14' from the curb. KS asked where the back of sidewalk - the property line - was. LN: It's about 2' in the public way. The total setback here is also about 14'. We are waiting for the City to respond to a plan for a one-way Bremen. There is NO sidewalk on the adjacent property, used for parking.

WR asked to see more of the Project. LN pulled out more views, noting the modulation at the rear. LN: It's not quite an 'H' plan. We will meet with the Greenway later this week. There is an entry at the Greenway level. KS asked to see the entry elevation. LN: (Shows.) WE still have an entry at Porter, but the plan shows the ability to enter from the courtyard - and the adjacent fitness area. PM: Do you need Porter as a second means of egress? LN: I think we do. DH: We thought originally that the basic organization made sense. The restaurant and courtyard change are *very* positive, and the more generous entry sequence is good. You have addressed the issue of the logic of the building and its entries. DC: I agree. The Greenway entry is welcome. LW: I agree it's better. I'm confused about the section. LN rummaged through the drawings and showed the plans, but no section, just a sense from a side elevation. AL: We discussed this in Committee; it wasn't resolved then. There is some work still to do. The restaurant is not level with the courtyard. Commissioners nevertheless moved to approve; this was seconded and it was

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the proposed 135 Bremen Street Project at the corner of Porter Street in the East Boston neighborhood.

The next item was a presentation of the **Wentworth New Sweeney Field Project**. Yanni Tsipis (YT) noted the team members: Sandy Pasquale, Mark Pelletier (MP) of CDM Smith, Ed King (representing Wentworth). He then noted that the field would meet NCAA regulations; the Vienna Brewery buildings were landmarked. He noted CDM Smith's expertise as a company, the context, the connections to Parcel 25 and Roxbury Crossing, and pedestrian connections. He showed historic aerials, noting the site. YT: After the 1970s photo, the sites were largely cleared for the highway. The Brewery was landmarked in 1998. (Notes the block location and the Alice Taylor Homes.) The site slopes; it's at grade at Station and Parker streets, and a story below that at the opposite side. WE are focusing the program along Station, with the Brewery buildings. LE asked where the keggery wall was. YT pointed it out. DC asked about the grade along Parker. YT then showed an elevational view along that block that demonstrated the grade, noting the monumental stairs entry at the corner, and the press box and spectator support structure in the middle. YT: There is a linear park along the edge, similar to the one near

Liberty Mutual, with eddies of pedestrian seating; we tried to break up the length of the building.

WR: So those openings (in the base) are not for cars? YT: The openings into the garage will have iron grilles. (Shows a view along Parker.) There is an opportunity here for canopy trees. (Shows a view from further up Parker, at Horadan, noting more stairs up, park screens, and the wrought iron railing between brick piers.) AL: Is the field continually fenced? YT: Yes, it's a continuous net. David Manfredi (DM): A mesh. What's it made of? MP: Vinyl, a black mesh, not very visible, 20-30' high. YT noted that the field lighting would be off by 11:00pm as required in a residential area, then pointed out that the brick cladding wraps around the field/garage. He showed landscape precedents. YT: We are using columnar trees on more narrow sidewalks, but Parker is wider. The brick color is stronger than the typical Wentworth buff, possibly with a texture. There is a pier-and-spandrel precast precedent in the Fort Point area. The two buildings at the Brewery (notes the site) will be restored. (Shows the keggery wall remnant.) Part of the wall must go, and rather than go through heroics to keep the remnant, the thought was instead a pedestrian plaza area with interpretive elements, and maybe hops plantings. Daniel St. Clair (DS): How are the buildings being reused? YT: that's not in this plan. That will be tackled in the future, perhaps for a nonprofit or office user. KS: I don't have a real sense of what it feels like to walk along this. YT then showed a series of eye-level views, ending in one at Prentiss and Parker.

KS: The scale of that wall.... MP: The height is 24', it tapers down. The brick wall is about 18'. KS: I'm concerned about the wall. The linear park is nice. You should consider pedestrian points of view as you move forward. DC: There is a connection to Tremont along Parker. 20' is larger than most, but what you show as sidewalk is not wide enough. There is a lot of pedestrian traffic. Also, the space at the Brewery feels too enclosed. It should be more open, flexible. LE: This will be a good project. The least interesting corner is where you have the monumental wall. The Brewery is very interesting. And the other corner, level, is more gracious. Here, it's monolithic. Maybe it should be more park-like. I'm surprised that wall goes up even higher...peel it back a little, make it more generous and inviting. YT: Maybe an interpretive element. DH: I agree with the comments. When the (keggery) wall is removed, it's a little bit of a disembodied context. There may be a way of using a portion, or elements of the wall, and that could inform the plaza - that creates a stronger historical context. At the other corner, that may be an opportunity for art or history, but it could be much nicer. I'd like to hear from the architect and landscape architect when you're doing the presentation.... WR: I agree with David's comments.

MP noted that the site would be cut-and-fill, and will have a floor raised from certain points. So there is a 5-foot edge for NCAA standards, then three feet for structure, then eight feet clear, then up to two feet to the sidewalk. WR: Is there any way to have a sense of more action on the field? LW: More transparency. MP: There's an opportunity on the spectator side, so we do that there. WR: Can that extend the whole length? MP: We can look; it's higher on the other end. And there's the NCAA. YT noted a general concern about modesty, as at Winsor. AL: One thing. The entry around the new buildings and the Brewery is convincing. The press box...You're setting up something in the middle that celebrates itself, but it's not an entry. At the corner, perhaps a canopy? The corner here is *under*-marked; the middle is *over*-marked. Maybe the corner entry should be enhanced and the middle thing diminished. The historic

treatment, and the opportunity to do interesting lighting, will add to its defensibility. With that, the Wentworth New Sweeney Field Project was sent to Design Committee.

KS was recused from the next item. The next item was a presentation of the **Bayside Doubletree Hotel Expansion Project**. Larry Spang (LS) of Arrowstreet: The existing building was built in 1998 to support the Bayside Expo. It's a limited service Doubletree. Hilton is now phasing out that brand and wants to add services. (Notes the location, and proximity to the Red Line station.) The building is block and plank construction, six stories tall. It has a forecourt, with areas for pick-up and drop-off. The egress stairs are corner elements; there's a *porte cochere*; the lines of the guest rooms are structural walls. LS then noted the future University Place, and showed the existing then proposed forecourt plans - it would become a more public space. He noted the BRA Columbia Point planning process and Master Plan.... LS: The Mount Vernon Street extension becomes the hotel entry point. So this edge is activated. We are keeping the substantial existing trees and adding more as well as ornamental planting. The sidewalk connects to the office building. There is a Mount Vernon Street redesign effort being undertaken by the BRA, to reduce its lane profile and add cycle tracks. (Shows the ground floor plan and program.) There is a connector possibly at the rear, so we are activating both edges. (Shows the second, then a typical floor.) The overall plan is an 'L' with the lower restaurant area going out; it meshes with the existing building. (Shows an aerial, then ground views.) There are several ideas - there is a glassier feel to the restaurant, relating to the existing lobby 'greenhouse.' The building above is essentially continued. The glass at the rear is a 2-story wall; there will be some shading there, and maybe at the guest rooms. (Shows elevations, notes Project numbers.)

AL: Go back to the birds-eye view. This is a rare opportunity to go back and revisit a building you did before. It's not *necessary* to duplicate, but it's a *choice*. The green space is good. A question about the massing. It creates a narrow courtyard which diminishes views. I wonder if the addition couldn't come forward along Mount Vernon Extension. And use the roof better, because otherwise it's just not used. LS showed the plan, noting the elevator location. LS: We were constrained by property lines, and didn't want to compromise; the elevator dictates the location. DH: Let me piggyback on Andrea's comments. The Project seen earlier had a similar problem. I congratulate you on extending your uses below. I wonder if perhaps you couldn't make a longer parallel bar, and a stronger alignment to hold the future corner. The bridge could be lighter, and could be connected at the same point. DM: I agree with Andrea and David, but with a twist. UMass is building a mixed-use campus back to the water. You have nice things on the ground floor, but you are not holding the edge. The street will frame a view to the Harbor - that should be a more urban edge. LE: In a similar vein, University Place made a decision to come forward. In that sense, I would wish that the hotel expansion could come *forward*. The space seems like a fragment. University Place creates a courtyard they will use. The open space should be thought of that way; I wish it had more meaning. LS: We - and the BRA - feel that the streets will fill in, and this becomes an oasis or green space on the edge. We had reversed the plan before, and placed the loading on Mount Vernon. No one liked that. Also, bringing it to the front made the scheme more complicated.

LW: Actually, I disagree (with Linda). When you look at the district as a whole, there's a lot of connections. The open space is a relief, and acts as a gateway. You could have a sculpture or a fountain; I like what you've done with the landscape. There should be more connection along Mount Vernon to the space, and a connection to University Place. Like the Post Office Square corner. DC: If anything, when UMass develops their site, this may get *too* crowded. Mount Vernon Extension is an important spine. You could do more to extend the double tree-lined edge (along Mount Vernon Extension), bringing it to Mount Vernon. Also, the cycle track is at the sidewalk level. Coordinate with the City so that the interface is better, and takes that into account. With that, the Bayside Doubletree Hotel Expansion Project was sent to Design Committee.

KS returned. DS was recused from the next item and left. The next item was a presentation of the **Parcel 9 Haymarket Hotel Project**. Eamon O'Marah (EOM) of Harbinger thanked the Commission and presented the development team, including Mel Schuman, Robert Brown (RB), Sandy Smith, and others. EOM: MassDOT issued an RFP for the hotel; after a 2-year process, we were awarded the designation. Pound for pound, this is one of the best development sites...one of three legs of the Market District. The others are the Public Market and the Haymarket vendors. EOM noted the Article 80 status for the Hotel, and noted there was a scoping session held the prior week. RB presented the design: It's a 225-key property, 103'. It will knit the area together. The Project area is about 50,000 SF; we are looking for a PDA. (Notes past photos, sections, the current site, connections, the 'Market District' (including the Blackstone Block), nearby retail activity.) On our teeny parcel, we have a passage through, and the parcel has a grade change. Retail areas total about 20,000 SF. We have Haymarket dumpsters, and loading, which is separate for the hotel. Blackstone Street will be raised to curb height, so there won't have to be an *ad hoc* set-up with pallets. And we will supply water and power. (Shows the layout of the vendor carts.) The building is eight feet back to allow for a fire lane; we are able to accommodate all but one of the existing carts. EOM: The Haymarket Association is over 100 years old, and multi-generational; we need to keep that character.

RB noted the drop-off along the Greenway. RB: There will be a parking arrangement with the garage. The second floor is retail and amenity spaces, and mechanical up from the lower levels. The open space here has a roof that opens up. This is a limited service hotel: rooms, rooms, and rooms. The (lower) roof is a folded plane with a skylight. (Shows section, and elevations.) On the Haymarket, the hotel and other uses are complementary, not conflicting. It's a montage of layers, and it's important to keep the corner *low*. EOM: The original idea was 55' across the site. The community wanted the building lower at the corner, and accepted that it could be higher, if that were pushed to the south. RB described the vendor support and canopy structures. EOM noted that the Blackstone treatment and support functions were all written into their MDOT agreement. RB showed more views, and explained the elements of the design. He showed longer views (one from the North End). RB: You see history, and new history in the front. Material proposed was precast, with patterns; new thinking is that it has brick embedded. The glass may have some tint, or frit, to animate it during the day - a rich and dynamic facade. The texture would be like a contemporary version of a punched window. (Shows a series of elevations, noting heights.)

PM: What is the state of the MDOT leases? Mel: A development agreement has been reached.
LE: I compliment you on all the built-in history and sensitivity. And the presentation. DH: I echo that. Maybe in Committee we could understand more about the market space. All the moves are in the right place; the facade studies are good. The brick helps (rather than a contrasting material). How signage works through the design is important. I wonder if all the corners and embedded windows are necessary; they may be weakening an exquisite expression.
LW: I have a question about the pedestrian cut-through. I want to go right to the pavilion. I'm not sure what *that's* going to. Hanover is the real connection. The pass-through won't be successful unless it's larger - it's better used as retail. RB pointed out the amount of support functions. Also, the pass-through might be needed. LW: It's okay for it to be under-shown; I'm not sure how much it'll be used. KS: Is it more a convenience for guests? RB: Not to invoke Bob Kroin, but he loved these kinds of cut-through spaces. EOM: We want you to be drawn to the pavilion, too. We want the building to be porous; we're not sure of the retail positioning. The 2-story space at the entry - we are trying to achieve it all. RB: Per David's comment, we may have too many carvings.

AL: A key thing is the contrast between the hotel and the pavilion...for that reason (it's wonderful), there's no reason to do a whole lot. That strengthens the pavilion. The retail - if I look at it across the Greenway, it looks like that retail (toward the north) belongs to the hotel.
RB: We considered a cut-through. DH: You may in danger of a disconnect. EOM discussed this point briefly. EOM: The hotel needs to come down to the street. North Street is very important. AL: The coming down is good; it's less a figural object. DM: The rendering style...I wondered about it, until you showed the detail. So much of the final outcome will be facade studies. It's incredibly important how you pull that off (notes study of red brick panels). I agree; you don't need big figural moves with all this texture. AL: The roofscape is important. It's an opportunity - some kind of crown. DH: I'm thinking of the livelier market districts. The light and shadow will play nicely. But this may be the place to introduce lighting, and play - the facade can go to that level. AL: Is there any chance for a roof program? The views.... EOM: There are a lot of opinions - and views. DH: If this were in the meatpacking district, it would be used. KS: About the cut-through - anything that detracts from moving around the building...that's the experience of the building. I agree with the others, it's really pretty neat. I would interpret the windows in a different way.

Victor Brogna (North End resident): I was on the advisory committee, and have a longer history than Eamon. I have a comment letter...I worked with Tad Stahl. From the beginning, this was going to be high and low. Tad showed the committee market stalls from Europe. That (image) was adopted by MDOT and the North End community. What I will have in the comment letter are the pre-schematics showing how it was conceived, with a one-story market hall. The view corridors to the historic Blackstone Block...seeing it is important to us. That is the issue I want to raise as part of the conversation. PM: Are there any other questions? No. You have anticipated many of our public realm comments; we will see you in Committee.

DM was recused from the next item. The next item was a presentation of the updated **West**

End Apartments (Garden Garage) Project. Sam Norod (SN) of Elkus/Manfredi introduced the team, which included Steve Wood (SW) from CRJA, Paul Barrett, and Louis Miller. SN: The last time we were before the Commission, we had a 2-tower scheme (shows the existing garage, then the old and new plans for comparison). We have an acre more open space. There is less impact; the neighbors are tending to agree. It's more open, making a stronger connection. We still have the same parking scheme. We have narrowed the areas where cars go, so there are less lanes for pedestrians to cross. Also, the loading is still off the existing boat section (along West End Place). The parking office is at the corner of one of the entries. (Notes the grade at the front and rear. Shows a series of views which include the other approved Projects in the vicinity. A section diagram included the Nashua Street Residences Project.) The height is necessary to accommodate the units in a single tower.

SW first noted the grade change: Lomasney Way is at elevation 17'. There, there are trees and a 10-foot sidewalk. The retail wraps to support the walkway in. That's at a slope of 5%, so there are no rails going up. This slopes up to the park entry, at elevation 33'. Behind the building, it's more resident-oriented; it becomes more public elsewhere. (Notes an existing side path, and Thoreau Path connections.) The grade moves up to a space above the garage entry/office structure; it's all a green roof system. The trees here are a visual buffer. There is active recreation to the south. (Shows views of the space, with the path moving between, and at the residential terrace; then, a view toward the 'filtered' park atop the garage.) The view is now visible through the West End Place frame. SN: A connection to the West End Place courtyard is now possible; this would make the space even more porous to the community.

DH: I think it was worth waiting for. It's got a terrific massing, and connections - obvious porosity. If we're going to meet the Mayor's goals, we have to have more housing. This pairs nicely with the North Station towers; the facades are elegant. AL: I echo that. We've looked at a number of projects that struggle to do well in clusters; this is a good example of something better as a single tower. We should keep this in mind. I look at the envelope, and wonder why this is red. This is a major departure in form and concept, and part of a group. I don't think that an attenuated frame need be in a brick color - masonry isn't needed - it doesn't have to remember the red brick of the area. This is a whole new expression, not a part of the old West End. SN: We see it as part of a panelized wall. DH: I think it can be brick. It doesn't have to be read that way. LE: the connections are good. The pathway is clear, but you need spaces that you can understand. The right balance of uses and activity. DC: There is a lot of park development in the interior...where it connects to is important. Is there Connect Historic Boston in this area? Can you shift to meet the crosswalk (across Lomasney)? SN: We can keep that in mind. LE: We talked about that on the other building.

KS: I agree with Andrea on the red brick. Is there any way to make the parking headhouse go away? Could it be more organic? LE: It *does* have a green roof. DH: Maybe if it had something which made more of that. KS: That might work. DH: Is there any way to tuck a Starbucks into it, make it a real pavilion? SN: It's dimensionally challenged. LE: On the top, is where I want it. DH: Even if a shop had a stair up. It feels like a leftover. AL: About the scale of a service entrance. LW: I wonder if there isn't something deeper in, that says - Come, see me. AL: There are a lot of trees, I wonder if you have enough soil. SW: We've allowed for

that. PM: Should we send to Committee? There's not a lot.... DH: Maybe the parking. With that, the West End Apartments Project was returned to Committee.

There being no further items for discussion, a motion was made to adjourn, and the meeting was duly adjourned at 9:04 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was scheduled for December 2, 2014. The recording of the November 4, 2014 Boston Civic Design Commission meeting was digitized and is available at the Boston Redevelopment Authority.