

## DRAFT MINUTES

### BOSTON CIVIC DESIGN COMMISSION

The meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was held on Tuesday, June 7<sup>th</sup>, 2016, starting in the BRA Board Room, 9<sup>th</sup> Floor, Boston City Hall, and beginning at 5:21 p.m.

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

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 Friday, May 19, in the BOSTON HERALD.

The first item was the approval of the May 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2016 Meeting Minutes. A motion was made, seconded, and it was duly

**VOTED: To approve the May 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2016 Boston Civic Design Commission Meeting Minutes.**

Votes were passed for signature. MD and David Manfredi (DM) were recused from the next item. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Boston College Recreation Center**. David Carlson (DAC) noted that this project had been one of the IMP projects included in the review of the 2008 BC IMP, and so review was a condition of that vote; on its own, the proposal was over the BCDC threshold at 200,000 SF. A confirmatory vote to review was recommended; it was duly moved, seconded, and

**VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for Boston College's Recreation Center Project and the associated amendment to its Institutional Master Plan, in the Allston-Brighton neighborhood.**

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **370-380 Harrison (Quinzani's site) Project**. DAC noted that this project, near several previously reviewed in the area, was well over the BCDC threshold at about 350,000 SF, and review was recommended. It was duly moved, seconded, and

**VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed 370-380 Harrison Avenue Project and PDA on the western portion of the block bounded by Traveler and East Berkeley streets, and Harrison Avenue, in the South End neighborhood.**

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Orient Heights Redevelopment Project**. DAC noted that this project was one of several being proposed by BHA as a means of revitalizing affordable housing projects using private capital and a mix of market rate units. At over 400,000 SF, the Proposed Project was well over the BCDC threshold and review was recommended. It was duly moved, seconded, and

**VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the Orient Heights Redevelopment Project in the East Boston neighborhood.**

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Back Bay / South End Gateway Project**. DAC noted that this project was also under review (as with other Turnpike Air rights parcels) by a CAC, and BCDC review would be coordinated with that process. At over 1,000,000 SF of development in three towers over the Hancock Garage and Back Bay Station, the Proposed Project was well over the threshold and on a site with significant public realm impacts. A vote to review was essentially required. It was duly moved, seconded, and

**VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed ‘The Back Bay/South End Gateway Project on the sites of the Hancock Parking Garage and Back Bay Station in the Commercial Spine area of the Back Bay neighborhood, at the edge of the South End.**

MD noted that the agenda was full tonight and encouraged expeditious presentations and actions. The next item was a report from the Design Committee on the **Haymarket Hotel / CATHT Parcel 9 Project**. Eamon O’Marah (EOM) of Harbinger Development thanked the Commission for their time and work in Design Committee. He passed out new booklets, noting that they had responded to various issues, including the amount of glass wrapping the facade. [Daniel St. Clair (DS) and David Hacin (DH) arrived, and agreed to join the earlier vote to review Boston College’s Rec Center.] Matt Pierce (MP) of Perkins + Will presented the revised design, noting the locus and a view with the revised glass extended. He noted plan changes, especially the program on the exterior terraces. He showed precedents again, noting the elevation and their work on the brick detail intended, with an accent. He showed the canopy design and precedents, suggesting they would generally use wood on the underside but feature glass at the entry. Glass guardrails would line the terraces and balconies. He showed the long elevations, noting grade changes, and then longitudinal and cross sections (which showed the Greenway and North End Park); he ended with a view from the west (*sic*, actually north).

Deneen Crosby (DC) and Kirk Sykes (KS) arrived. Bill Rawn (WR) asked for a view across the Greenway (MP shows). DC: That view is from within the Park. You should look at those more distanced views;

those terrace spaces are inhabited. EOM: The meeting spaces are adjacent to the terraces now, in terms of precedent. MD: It's what one will see from across the Park. KS: There are not many spaces like this along the Greenway; I'd encourage dynamic programming, and public art. EOM: I like the idea of public art. We had a trellis.... The hotel will want to program the upper terraces. KS: I'm thinking of the Envoy, and roofdeck activation.

DM: What about signage along the elevation? Will we be looking at multiple signs in the upper gray area? EOM indicated that the plans had some note regarding entries and signage...they didn't know how many. DM: They'll be distinct stores. EOM: There's a debate about that. They'll be market-related, but it's unclear. DH: This is a logical place for the Public Market to expand, if that could happen. EOM: This is the third leg of the 'Market District.' We can't *compete* due to the lease, but we can be complementary...dining, or a food-related use. That's the next step. DH: I'm happy to see the roof screen, and glass all around. KS: Was the treatment of the street discussed? EOM: We talked about that in Committee. The Haymarket stalls are located, the Asaroton relocated. We are working on the canopy there. KS: We talked about solutions, a canopy maybe for the whole street, the delineation of stalls. EOM: We'll work with the BPA (Pushcart Association), the City, and the State to establish that. That work will set the foundation for how the space gets used. With that, and hearing no public comment, it was duly moved, seconded, and

**VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the revised schematic design for the proposed Haymarket Hotel Project on CATHT 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 **Indigo Block Project**. Cliff Boehmer (CB) of Davis Square Architects first noted the Project schedule, then showed the prior site plans, describing the evolution. CB: Comments there focused on improving the streetscape; we smoothed the pathway out, leaving it still accessible, with plantings along the side, and a secondary path - an improved connection. (Shows a view from East Cottage Street.) There were comments from three Commissioners that, while we were responding to the neighborhood context, there was not enough connection in our own buildings. (Shows changes; shows the revised view of the large residential building, then a view down the internal street.) We looked at moving the building access ramp structure to the other side but it didn't work. (Shows a view looking up to the MBTA access path.) We introduced stronger wayfinding, a simple sign. And we have introduced related materials into the 9 ownership townhouses. They are now less a replication, more a part of the complex, but still at a neighborhood scale. CB then did a dynamic SketchUp walk-through, noting the changes, the industrial referents, the path, the entry, the pathways, the landscape...zooming in and out.

Andrea Leers (AL): The townhouse units had entries on both sides. Did that change? CB: They still do. AL: And their addresses? CB: We haven't decided. With that, and hearing no public comment, it was moved, seconded, and

**VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the proposed Indigo Block Redevelopment Project off of East Cottage Street and interfacing with Beckwith, Harrow, Hillsboro and Groom streets, along the MBTA Fairmount Line tracks, in the Uphams Corner area of Dorchester.**

DM was recused from the next item. The next item was a report from the Design Committee on the **Boston Landing Parcel C1 Project** at the corner of Guest and Life streets in the (New Balance) PDA area. Keith Craig (CK) of New Balance noted the building would be in part a Celtics lease and training facility. After some difficulty setting up, Christian Galvao (CG) of Elkus/Manfredi presented the changes, noting quickly the overall site plan, the C1 site, and going quickly through plans and elevations along Guest and Life streets. CG: The retail turns the corner, then there's the tenant entry, and then the garage, decorated with perforated metal panels. (Shows a view down Life, then one closer to the intersection.) We have made space for the retail to have tables on the sidewalk. On Life, the textured [garage] wall is colorful. A little more fun.... (A view looking east shows the effect of the building's twist.) At the end of Life Street, what can we do? (Shows a series of figures, artwork, something responsive to trains, scrim on the fence, a street improvement vocabulary. Shows a board with a full length elevation along Guest, indicating a linking retail datum.)

KS: what happens where it skews? Is that active? CG: It's not accessible to the public, but it's an option for the tenant. DH: That's puzzling. AL: Why *wouldn't* you do that? Mark Sardegna (MS): We think the tenant will embrace it; the building is set up to do that. We have brackets and stanchions. But it's up to the tenant to install (exterior improvements). DH: This is an unusual mix of program. On the upper terrace, where it looks down onto an unoccupied terrace - but could look out - it seems like a missed opportunity. MS: Actually, that *is* occupied by those tenants. Not the roof, but the balcony above. The building has a deep truss structure there, so they are seven feet above the roof. KS: I encourage you to think about the whole composition.

AL: This is a very different building, a particular form, articulated for its use, turned onto a really different streetscape. I welcome that. It seems like you have *created* spaces to *be* occupied, so occupants are welcome. I think it's going to be an interesting street, with one very active side. You've done a great job, I hope it is active. Follow through on the terraces. DH: The question is how to make these moves *more* meaningful. Even the brace could come down. Pump up the moves so they are more expressed. Amping it up, more exuberant. KS: And look at the lighting, since this is a highway view, 70 mph. MS: We are still working on that, trying to take advantage of the building strategy to use in lighting the building. KS: The signage? A giant shamrock? DS: The penthouse appears to be kind of heavy. DH: Being on the terrace (view from the east), looking up at the volume...it could be neat. MD: It's worth noting that the inventive forms here are themselves a public benefit. With that, and hearing no public comment, it was moved, seconded, and

**VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the proposed 40 Guest Street (Parcel C1) Project in the Boston Landing PDA Master Plan area in the Allston/Brighton neighborhood.**

DH left. MD and DM were recused from the next item. The next item was a presentation of the **Boston College Recreation Center Project**. Colleen McKenna (CM) of CannonDesign introduced the Project, noting the site. Landscape architect Glen showed an aerial view of the context, then the site itself, noting the MWRA easement. He showed diagrams of pedestrian corridors, noting that this was a 2-sided building, with more pedestrians on the campus side. Along St. Thomas More Drive, red oaks would continue the treatment and character of the street. CM: The large volumes, layered on top of each other, creates a space in the middle to look over them all. There are four stories, and one more below grade...pools, courts, exercise rooms, lockers, etc. (Shows plans, starting at the basement and going up first to the main floor...) The natatorium, lockers, the 2-court space. There are support spaces above, and a substation. On the third floor, there are courts on both sides, and views out to the cemetery. On the fourth, a track, with additional spaces between the 2-story spaces. Roland Lemke (RL) noted the BC campus context as precedent...how to apply? Precedent included more recent buildings on the campus. RL: Scale and proportion...the gables identify the primary entrances and corners. (Shows sketches, elevations.) On the elevations, we are trying to express the identity of the different spaces. The building is brick, set on a rusticated precast base. The pilasters are actually structure, which frees up the interior - and also holds HVAC connections. (Shows views around focused on the building. Shows a night view.) You'd be able to see activities at night. (Shows a view of the loading dock on the north, and then another of the main building entry from the campus.)

A question was raised about the IMP: When the Flynn Center goes down, there will be a green space, a quad? Tom Keady (TK) of BC: There will be a student center, and green space. (Shows locus on the Master Plan.) -It would be helpful to update that plan to show the future green space. DS: I understand the campus vocabulary, but I'm not sure why there are gables in some places. If there's a hierarchy, demonstrate it. Larger at the entry, say. WR: Can you show this? DS: It seems like the (main) entry could have more prominence. I could be convinced, but I'm looking for a rationale. The tall windows make sense to me, but they're 3-over-1 on the outside, 2-over-2 inside...? KS: This is a modern program with a traditional skin. The windows could be interpreted, pushed, pulled...this shows that you stayed in your lane. I'm challenging you a little bit. The base could be more inviting; it puts you off a little bit.

AL: Go to your plan.... This is a funny site; there's a lot on it. You've got a couple of good decisions - the natatorium bar, the courts bar, the space between - an angle, reconciling between. Bring that to the outside. Let the spaces read *clearly* - let the windows go around the building. Let the volumes read, with their corners. Then look to the middle section...make it fancier. Go back to the elevations...use windows to mark volumes, the corners. Make the middle stand out. Now, it just looks like an accommodation, just pasted on. DC: Are there entries on both sides? TK: Just the campus side. DC: It seems

like the connection to the reservoir is one you'd like to make. You can see through to there. You're having (with the future building location) a green quad; there'll be a lot of students. Plan for *that*. I don't know what the MWRA spine means in terms of planting trees. Glen: It does limit the trees; we're working on that. It was then noted that the Commission totally respected BC's use of precedent. Most of the precedents shown are classroom buildings. On many campuses, there is a similar vocabulary, but often adapted for large field house volumes. You must have looked at them.... WR: One thing that concerns me a little, is the fire stair to the left of the entry. I encourage you to look for other solutions. And we'd want a model.... With that, the Boston College Recreation Center was sent to Design Committee.

MD and DM returned. The next item was a presentation of the **370-380 Harrison Avenue Project**. David Chatman of Related Beal introduced the team. Dan Lobitz (DL) of RAMSA presented the design, first using the model to show context. DL: It's important to do a building which is a transition between two neighborhood characters. We have a larger model, too.... There are three elements, stepping down, each relating to elements on either side. (Goes to slide show; notes program, then shows site plan.) We are using setbacks to form the sidewalk and the arcade and courtyard on the west. There is retail on the corners, and residential entries are in the center. (In back,) there is a through-block connector, a combination vehicular and pedestrian environment. This is taking traffic away from Harrison, and provides parking ramp access; Traveler Street is two-way. The connector handles pedestrians too, and could work with the property next door. (Shows through-lobbies for the residential programs, a typical plan, the roofdeck/roofscape. Shows a longitudinal section, noting the height and the stepping from 14 to 10 stories. Axonometrics demonstrate the idea of three connected elements. Shows the west elevation.) We haven't gotten far with the brickwork; we're working on detail, the color - perhaps a combination of variations. Distinct but interrelated vocabularies. (Shows a rear view, then elevational perspectives, starting with the west side.) The metal work would also go through the building. (Notes the view showing the 'crank' in Harrison as a 'fitting terminus.' Shows vignettes: arcade/seating looking south [preliminary]; corner of Traveler, looking east; a view along the connector, showing a double-high space; a view down East Berkeley.) DS asked about the Harrison section. DL noted that there were a variety of experiences planned along Harrison. The courtyard shown was NOT an entry courtyard.

WR: You referenced the stepping down of the building...I would have thought it would be clearer by your description. We should discuss that in Committee - do the 2-story steps work? DS and KS also ask about the stepping and Harrison treatment. AL: I walk by this site every day. If we walk past this block, the next three blocks are a series of medium-height buildings, with a good deal of continuity along Harrison. This is a misreading of that context. I would think that a building of continuous height might be more effective. Coming from the City, we pass three blocks of newer buildings, then we have [here] a throwback. The choice of brick vocabulary is not essential. And the choice of a courtyard...is an exception on Harrison. Buildings come to the street. Spaces should be a way to organize. This is a wonderful block; you're right. This would break the continuity unnecessarily. Take a step way, way back. DC: Andrea noted the courtyard. On the streets, there's a difference between the two. One connects. The trees would look odd

on only one side, so look at that.

DM: Andrea made a lot of good points. Lovejoy Wharf was extremely well done. That fits with the existing building...but I do agree with Andrea. The South End is very interesting, and has a very regular texture in *this* part. Here there is a lot of variety. This jumps up - you have to do a lot more to get into the pattern of the street. The intent of the zoning is that height goes against I-93. That's the tallest. The stepping goes *that* way, not this way. MD: I have to deliver some DH comments.... At this pivotal site, the design is relentless and bulky, the courtyard, not developed. The architecture should be reconceptualized - it does not meet the Mayor's imperative for bold new architecture. We need new, original architecture, a new architect[ural approach], before we see it again. Not just a developed brick pattern...a richer materiality. The Harrison Avenue streetscape has many styles and colors of buildings.... This should be designed to promote a culture of imagination, here at the entrance to the SOWA Arts District. KS: What we should think about, is why people want to come here. The Ink Block, Troy...think of the massing in that context. This steps down, but its so much different, and still abrupt. Look at the streetwall character - how you emulate it, how not. More context photos and street views. With that, the 370-380 Harrison Avenue Project was sent to Design Committee. MD reminded DAC that the Commission did not want to see the Project before significant progress was made.

The next item was a presentation of the **Orient Heights Redevelopment Project**. Andre White of Trinity introduced the Proposed Project: This is a State public housing development owned and operated by BHA, with 331 units. Trinity was selected in an RFP process for their redevelopment. We went through a process with the tenants to decide on the best options.... We looked at four, and decided on the re-do. Nancy Ludwig (NL) of ICON noted the aerial photo locus map, and pointed out the wooded park at the edge of the hill along 1A that screens Orient Heights. NL: The neighborhood is exurban, with individual houses on lots. The BHA property is not. The buildings' orientation to the street is not good, and they are not in good condition. The grading is extreme. How the architects did it originally was to create large retaining walls which divide the site from top to bottom. (Shows photos.) The circulation is also difficult. The goals were to make connections, create a new image, conquer the grades, have a contemporary, leading edge design. The 331 units will be replicated; there will be 42 market rate (non-public housing) additional. We tried to balance large and small family units; older tenant units tended to be in the small range.

NL Then showed the new site plan, showing the connection to Waldemar, and noting that Faywood would become two-way. NL: We created open space, and views through the site to the north. There's a locus strategy for the new buildings, with transitional buildings at the site entries. The scale of the new buildings is broken down. (Points out the street section, and the front yards, which are needed for grade transitions.) There are small back yards, and parking courts for the townhouse units. The back yard spaces are key. (Shows site section, indicating connection through. Shows sections through units. Shows views, plans, notes strategies. Shows a series of rendered views giving a sense of the Project - along Waldemar looking to the SW, i.e.) NL

described the experiences at key points, noting why they made choices, and varied the scales: The building at Waldemar going up - 5 stories becomes 3 at the top. (Shows the view from the main open space; shows a view along Faywood.) Phase One (along Waldemar) is starting this fall.

MD: The buildings along Faywood - are they single family or duplex?  
NL: We're not sure. Parking will be along the street, not in garages.  
MD: And the retaining walls are behind the buildings - one is not confronted with them. NL: Right. We are studying the slope, and how close things can actually get. MD: They are a blight on the site. You are doing well to cover them. AL: The one break is for the road? -Yes (NL explains). DC: Can you connect between levels through the building? NL: We looked at that, but there's a security in the housing issue. If we hit the jackpot, we might do other things. But you can see through. KS: You did a good job describing this. Can you characterize the space between the midrise and the other buildings? NL: That's important - the yards. We try to privatize them as much as possible. But we also have to keep people away from the walls. KS: The spaces *between* the buildings. NL pointed these out on a view...there are shared stoops. Beyond that, landscape architect Deb Myers described the spaces more fully, noting that Trinity would maintain them. KS: They seem to be low-level spaces - 30x15' spaces don't seem like good spaces. NL: We have similar at our Washington Beech project. KS: I want to understand how it can be done well.

AL: You've done an amazing job. Existing walls, slopes, now a connected community...the midrises do what you set out to do. The sense of meandering is good. Maybe, some modulation. WR: Big picture, I agree with Andrea. It's too bad we can't get something down the hill. But you've done a wonderful job. AL asked about BRA review; NL noted they were subject to continuing review; DAC noted staff was satisfied with progress. DS: This is good, contemporary treatment. MD: Washington Beech, taken a step further. KS: The walls can't be planted away. I would think about a public art competition...with different artists. NL: We did, but we are checking what we can do. DC: Top to bottom on the view corridors, maybe that's highlighted. KS: Or offset, between the walls...more on how you get light to come in. The sidewalls don't interact...if it's comfortable, how you can make it more so. DC: There are utility corridors all along Waldemar; it's hard to do trees. NL: We think we can, we'll check.

A move was made to approve the Project. One member of the public asked about landscape maintenance. NL: Look at Washington Beech; Trinity maintains its properties well. MD: Let the meeting notes stand as commentary for BRA staff. With that, and hearing no further public comment, the motion was seconded, and it was

**VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the Orient Heights Redevelopment Project between Waldemar and Faywood in the East Boston neighborhood.**

PM was recused from the next item and left. The next item was a presentation of the **Back Bay / South End Gateway Project**. Mike Cantalupa (MC) of Boston Properties introduced the Project while the team struggled with setup, giving some of the history. They had

considered this potential project, and approached MDOT regarding the Station, since they were already renegotiating the Hancock Garage lease. Boston Properties are not station management folks, but were willing to take that on...if the MBTA cleaned up the blue haze on the train platform. They agreed to match the cost of that up to \$5 million. MC then noted the development sites on an aerial overlay. Rafael Pelli (RP) of Pelli Clarke Pelli presented the design and project. He first introduced Jim Batchelor of Arrowstreet (working on the station design for the MBTA) and Cody Klein (CK) of The Office of James Burnett (landscape architects). RP showed a series of historic aerial views, noting earlier stations, then later views from the era of heroic highway building. As PCP precedent, he noted the transformation of the area in Bilbao they worked on, now most famous for the Gehry museum design.

RP showed a massing diagram, noting that they would be taking down about a third of the garage and the two drums. RP: The proposed buildings are where they are because of structure - where they can land program and structure. They are not touching the highway. (Shows structure, extrusions, and basic floorplates. A structural scheme as massing blocks.) The guidelines in the Stuart Street study, because of their shadow analysis, brought the tower heights down to 330', 365', 370'. They will exist at a medium scale; the Hancock will still be dominant. The office building could be massive, with large floors and rebuilt parking below. We use those datums to express levels, then we express the corners, with terraces and balconies going up. And we are carving vertically into the residential buildings. There will be intensely designed, occupiable spaces - we see that as important. (Shows a Sasaki green roof design for Boston Properties in Washington. Shows the office tower elevation in context along Dartmouth.) We have a preliminary idea about screening the garage. Resolution at the base is important. We are cutting a portion of the existing platform to connect to the corner and Stuart. (As precedent, shows a building they did between Lexington and 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue in NYC. Shows a before and after view. Notes the exaggeration of the twisting at the corner. Shows a view of the existing corner structural deck, and then the proposed condition, with retail all along the edge.) The entry to the station platform level is now from Stuart. (Shows views looking at the Clarendon side, before and after, at a distance - then closer. Goes through plans.) At the Stuart grade, we are taking down the concrete extended deck. The second level is at the level of the station off of Dartmouth, with a connection.

AL: And parking? RP: The existing ramp is still off Clarendon. For an additional adit/exit to replace the drums - In our plan, if the turnpike ramp remains open, they will need to exit onto Dartmouth. If the ramp is removed, they will exit onto Trinity. MD: And the bridge across Trinity? RP: That was requested by 40 Trinity. There is other potential. MD: You should read our position paper. MC: If it's done in any district, this is the place to do it; there are three already. AL asked about the nature of that and what could happen in that area; a discussion ensues. KS: What was the idea of pulling the residential building back from Clarendon? RP noted where the structure lands. RP: Also, we don't have the capacity to build much on that deck. DC asked about the view of the Hancock from the Southwest Corridor (it's hidden).

JB talked about the Station air rights: Noted info is in your packets; station improvements are underway. For air rights over the station

itself, a 1-2 stories addition is possible. (Shows an image with a setback from Dartmouth.) Dartmouth is greener, with 20' setback. An alternative adds another floor. WR asked about its section/location. JB: That alternative spans over the station; the one-story version does not, but connects through. (JB shows a plan with terraces on the roof along Dartmouth, noting the elevators, and interior bridges across.) DM: Entrances...are these restaurants? Or entries on the street, or in the station? JB: We think there's a connection to the street, but the nature of the retail does not necessarily include a restaurant. The upper floor, at 35,000 SF, has more terraces in the front.

CK: I'll focus on different areas. We will realign and signalize the pedestrian crossing across Dartmouth at the station entry. We will use Complete Street principles. We plan to add street trees, even with the structured deck. Accessibility is tricky; it's easier at the corner. We'll have pedestrian zones on Clarendon, too.

AL: Congratulations, about figuring out how to do this. The locations and base strategy are all intelligently thought out. The concourse, the corner down to the sidewalk...are all good. Go for it, in all the new places. But leave the station alone. Adding stuff to that, when you have all the space in the world, seems superfluous. And Trinity Place needs work to resolve. At the corner, just think - how much architecture can we stand here!? But overall, it's good. DM: I agree. There are a lot of good decisions. A lot of very smart things - on Stuart, on the residential pads. I have the same question Kirk asked about the Clarendon setback; it seems like a leftover space. I struggle with even the 1-story addition on the station, and what it does to the original concept. I think you've found space elsewhere - it's thoughtful, a positive impact on the public realm.

MD: We'll want to look closely at the streetscapes. The corner is a huge benefit. Retail in the station could work better; it's not good now. That would be a huge benefit. I'm not convinced of what else you add. KS: On the station, the question is the amount of benefit. Activating that...I could get my head around a different thought...like Champions' Way. Clarendon is a messy place; your building can do a lot to resolve that. On the garage - is a screen? RP: Right, it's not enclosed. DM: But you have a new building behind it.... KS: I'm open to it being open, but don't want to lose inventive treatment. There are five levels of stuff...above that, could you set that back? MC: The building is up as much as we can to take advantage of the structure. KS: If it were tiered up differently, you could do more over the station.

WR: I agree with what everyone said about *preserving* the station. I think we have to be careful about structured parking coming above grade. The genesis of the floating boxes, the datum line.... A part of me thinks that the boxes make it heavier. I would like to see other precedents of that. RP: We have earlier studies where they weren't cranked. But it also allows terraces at each setback. And, we've done wind tunnel analysis; the cranks serve as a windbreak, and indicated improvements over existing conditions. On the north and south, it's not as dramatic. Just at the edges...the expression made it stronger. It's not intended to be tectonic. AL: One of the things working against that is the wider base. I would like to think of it with less of that. It comes to a wide base quickly. There's not enough tall part for the wide part. You have some structural flexibility.... RP explained the strategy: We tried that; we didn't think it was as effective pulling it back. [It could go down, but then the pro forma...] We didn't think of this as a tower.

The Back Bay / South End Gateway Project was sent to Design Committee. Public comments were heard. Elliot Laffer noted that the bridge across Trinity Place makes it more of an alley. And Dartmouth would be disastrous. And the garage ramp exit there, across all the pedestrians, is also bad. Melissa Shrock of Boston Properties: The other exit is still functional, but it all heads toward the South End. We can't do that. But if the current Turnpike on-ramp closes, that allows a superior solution. KS: Bring a traffic engineer to subcommittee. An Unidentified Citizen: The garage is really ugly. Whatever you can do to screen it.... On Clarendon, it really overhangs. Look at how wide these streets are! We are a city of small streets...now canyons. The trains - it's difficult to get around. The streetscape here is critical.

There being no further items for discussion, a motion was made to adjourn, and the meeting was duly adjourned at 9:18 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was scheduled for July 5, 2016. The recording of the June 7, 2016 Boston Civic Design Commission meeting was digitized and is available at the Boston Redevelopment Authority.