

DRAFT MINUTES

BOSTON CIVIC DESIGN COMMISSION

The meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was held on Tuesday, December 3rd, 2013, starting in the BRA Board Room, 9th Floor, Boston City Hall, beginning at 5:15 p.m.

Members in attendance were: Michael Davis (Co-Vice-Chair); Deneen Crosby, Linda Eastley, David Hacin, Andrea Leers, David Manfredi, Paul McDonough (Co-Vice-Chair), William Rawn, Daniel St. Clair, Kirk Sykes, and Lynn Wolff. None were absent. Also present was David Carlson, Executive Director of the Commission. Representatives of the BSA were present. Michael Cannizzo, John O'Brien, 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 Saturday, November 16, in the BOSTON HERALD.

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

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

Votes were passed for signature. By dint of assenting eligible signatures, the vote to review **Harvard's Chao Center** was ratified. MD asked for a report from the Review Committee. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **600 Harrison Project**. David Carlson (DAC) reported that the modestly scaled 600 Harrison Project, although located in the Harrison Albany Planning area, was not proposing a PDA. It was 193,000 SF of residential, however, well exceeding the BCDC threshold; review was recommended. It was duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed 600 Harrison Project at the corner of Malden Street in the South End neighborhood.

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **345 Harrison Avenue (Graybar Site) Project and PDA**. DAC reported that the Project *was*, in this case, taking advantage of the new Harrison Albany plan zoning and proposing a PDA. It was also sizeable; at over 569,000 SF, considerably more than the BCDC threshold. A vote to review was thus recommended; it was duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the 345 Harrison Avenue Project and PDA on the block bounded by Traveler and Washington streets, Mullins Way, and Harrison Avenue, in the South End neighborhood.

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Coppersmith Village Project**. DAC reported that the Project, located in East Boston, was near Maverick Gardens and Boston East and, although a modestly scaled affordable housing project, was about 113,000 SF, above the BCDC threshold. A vote to review was recommended; it was duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the Coppersmith Village Project on the block bounded by Border, Decatur, and Liverpool streets, and Coppersmith Way, in the East Boston neighborhood.

Lynn Wolff (LW) arrived. The next item was a presentation of the **600 Harrison Project**. Peter Roth (PR) of New Atlantic Development began the presentation, noting the locus and noting the reason that they are not applying for a PDA: the site shares some property (St. Helena's House) in the MFR zoning district and is not eligible, so any variances would be through the ZBA. (Shows aerial of the site, notes program.) PR: We have about 160 units, with retail at Harrison and underground parking on 3 levels. This is in part replacement of existing parking. There will be a mid-block connector, per the general recommendations of the Planning Study. He then introduced Michael LeBlanc (ML) of Utile, Inc.

ML started by noting the location along the Harrison Avenue Arts Corridor. ML: It's a place also where the grids shift in the South End, at the Cathedral; this site is really a part of that 'campus.' We are enlivening the corner, making it an active destination point, with restaurant seating outside, etc. (Describes general strategy.) We are creating a wider sidewalk along Malden, but still giving up the setback for a residential setback further down the street. There is a secondary entry there, and the through-block connector. We are improving St. Helena's parking lot; that's an obligation, and we are constrained by the number of spaces. The sidewalk profile at Malden shows that it's a tight Complete Street-let. (Shows elevations.) We have broken the facade up into masses, and the rhythm of window arrangements is in a scale approximating that of the townhouses on nearby streets. We have a green roof, and a PV array too. (Shows a picture, and a plan of the parking court.) David Berarducci (DB) noted the use of pavers, and tree 'fingers' meant to break up the space. DB: It will be curbless. ML: Like a sort of woonerf quality. (Shows the elevation of that area, noting areas of retail and the parking court. Shows St. Helena's Park and the connector.)

David Hacin (DH) and Daniel St. Clair (DS) arrived. Kirk Sykes (KS): Are there windows on that (park) side? ML: Yes (shows elevation again). LW: What is the distance from the St. Helena's building? ML: About...40', closer (about 20') at their low outbuilding. Deneen Crosby (DC) asked about the retaining wall; ML explained about the end condition and the parking ramp slope. MD asked about the uses adjacent to the ramp. ML: There is loading, service, and trash there. KS asked about the green roof. ML explained about the precedent ideas, using simple patterned areas. Linda Eastley (LE): I'm curious to know if there's enough

space. And also about the cars in the parking court adjacent to your double high space. It seems like an odd relationship. PR: They are elderly - they did not want to give up their parking. Also, it's a HUD Section 202. LE: So, maybe just a different treatment. DB: We're trying to get a foot or so more, to get the space to have taller plantings. LE: Did you try reversing the orientation? PR: The trustees didn't like that; we tried. Also, the parking should be associated with St. Helena's House, *not* the retail; that was a concern.

LW asked about the open space relationship between the properties, and for more context and elevations. LW: What's in the low building? PR: The space between is now split; we are trying to convince St. Helena's House it should be green. The building has an old workhouse kitchen; it's now used as storage and a library. LW: I would prefer a 9-foot sidewalk instead of planting against the building along Malden. ML: That meets with Complete Streets guidelines and the area plan. DC: You could deal with the privacy just with windows.... KS: On the elevations, more context would help. The space at the rear, over the Park - that's a change - what is that relationship? How do you make the space between the buildings light, comfortable, and safe? DC: Do you have the ability to ramp down faster, and deck it over? That would increase the space at the Park. ML: Right now, the Park has cars right up against the fence. This is a better condition. PR: It's a tight envelope. DC: The retaining wall - you need to be realistic about the construction impacts. ML: We are talking about that, about the trees near that edge; we will bring in an arborist. DB: The Park was originally going to be an alley; now, it's a clump of London Plane trees. DH: Does the Cathedral have any larger plans they are implementing? Union Park Street seems like more the dividing line. PR: *We* developed some ideas. But anything will take time; the Church moves slowly. They are looking to get income from this, first. Andrea Leers (AL): There is a lot of nice things about this Project. I wonder about the quality of life on the first floor; it's very close to the sidewalk. There's a real study to be done there, between the window and the street. A section. For privacy, what are the elements? Especially if it's *not* a raised planter. With that, the 600 Harrison Project was sent to Design Committee.

LW was recused from the next item. The next item was a presentation of the **345 Harrison Avenue (Graybar Site) Project and PDA**. Og Hunnewell (OH) introduced the Project and team, noting the locus and the fact that they were also the owners of 1000 Washington (the old Teradyne Building) across Mullins Way, now 95% leased. OH: This has been in this condition for many years, since Urban Renewal. We will conform to the new zoning; we are across from the Ink Block. OH noted working with the BRA and neighbors, and incorporating many ideas from the Harrison Albany Plan. Chris Hill (CH) of CBT Inc. presented the design, showing a small model. CH: We are working within the context (shows approved Projects in the area). It's open to the south, allowing light in. There are two intertwined L-shaped buildings; the public realm is slightly over 20% of the site, required. The passage through the block under the buildings is 20-45' high, and 40' wide. There are vegetated roofs, some public. (Notes parking and loading location.) All else is retail. (Shows ground floor/site plan, shows upper floor plans, notes precedents for portals and pass-throughs.)

KS: Could you repeat the lower floors. CH showed several plan views. CH: The materiality - is precast, metal and glass, and brick. DS asked about the parking. CH: It's above grade, 4

stories. There are two ramps, at 5% grade. Parking ratio is 0.4. DS: Does that conform to zoning? CH: The zoning calls for 0.5, but 0.4 is supported (by the City). John Copley (JC) described the site plan briefly. JC: The star is the pedestrian passageway. We have patterned it - it's a recall of the old New York Streets. DC: Are the passageways called for in the Plan? JC: Yes. A nice thing is the relationship to the Ink Block's entry into the Whole Foods court. LE: I have a piggyback question about the space from Traveler Street. CH: We are trying to open it up. LE: The space is open; it can be more of a public space. The portals feel more private.

DS: This is good for the area. But it's a struggle to figure out what's going on. It looks like a different plan from above vs. what's on grade - it makes it confusing. I'm not sure what the opening relates to. DH: I'm not sure why it's open toward the South End and not covered *there*. Washington to Harrison feels like it wants to be more open. You were the architect for Rollins Square, very successful blocks. This is adding a lot of residential. The above-grade parking makes it feel like a lot of building. Maybe if the plaza were large enough to have real trees. It's a dense project in a dense neighborhood. I would almost prefer the reallocation of program higher, to allow for more open space for this dense Project. MD: Is the amenity space doing anything other than covering the garage? I question the value of the cut-through. There's a question about its value as a public space. CH: If we got rid of the amenity space.... DH: There would be more space with southern exposure. There's not enough of that in the area. You could eat your lunch there from the Whole Foods.

David Manfredi (DM): I'll go back to David's first comment. A lot of density - fine. But is there too much coverage? With the parking garage above grade, are you trying too much to hide it? On the south, amenities mask it. It may be fine to be about the pieces. I like the (portal) precedent of Baker Mills. Make the crossings more bridge-like. On the lower building - make it taller, to provide more open space. CH: We are balancing; there's a 6.5 FAR. Would you really want even more? KS: There are trade-offs. The open space at the Charles Hotel in Cambridge is very unsatisfactory. But I want to hear more on the architectural language. Where is the language and materiality coming from? DS: I couldn't help but think of One Western, which forms an open space. It works there - there's a deliberate form, and spaces. Here, it looks like you're trying to break it up. AL: You're designing buildings; we're talking open space. You have two buildings here. But you're trying very hard to show 5 or 6 buildings. So many conditions are intersecting - it's confusing. What if the east/west were more glass, and the side more open? That, plus the linked 'Ls,' and the different materials, and the south space - don't add up. DH: At Tent City, at the lobby, you see through into the courtyard to the opposite side. If the pass-throughs were big, glassy lobbies that you could see through - that might be something.

CH: The passageway for us, has been something from the BRA. They want us to link to the Ink Block, and set up a continuation. We're doing what we're being directed to do. Bill Rawn (WR): Washington and Harrison - it makes sense to have the connection. I understand why you would have made it. The Project seems very large - *huge*. The buildings are chunky, and the projections - this is an array of so many different forms. And the building with two colors...I would urge you to look at South Boston. The garage along Mullins isn't as hidden as DH suggests. The buildings seem heavy. DH: I think that Traveler will become an important street.

Harrison and Washington are boulevards. Traveler will be the charming street. CH: Traveler is in the Plan as a major connector. DH: I know. But Rollins set up the entry for Wilkes Passage, for example. Paul McDonough (PM): Have the BRA staff attend the Design Committee. You need some clarification of the open space; there is competition between the 20% and our concerns. AL: Precedents. We've talked about the passage and building; they're conflicting, and you're trying to resolve it. It's neither here nor there right now. Focus on the passage, or a C-shaped building with a courtyard. With that, the 345 Harrison Avenue Project was sent to Design Committee.

LW remained recused from the next item. The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **Northampton Square Project and PDA**. Hank Keating (HK) of Trinity reprised the process: We are back before you, with further adjustments. Ed Bradford (EB) of The Architectural Team shows the adjustments made, comparing sections cut from Albany. EB: We are responding to a comment about the bulk. (Shows an enlarged section at Albany.) There is a skew to the building; the arcade has been eliminated and the overhang raised up; this makes the pinch point wider. Per a suggestion made in Committee, we have adjusted the cantilever to follow the sidewalk. There is also a slight adjustment in the streetscape at the Miranda Creamer entry court. We have emphasized the residential entry, and re-oriented the fitness center entry so that it's entered from the west, through a small pocket park, further separating it from the residential. (Shows views with the shifted cantilever and entries. Notes the relation to Crosstown. Shows the view from Mass Ave; shows an aerial view.) Sean Sanger (SS) of CWDG noted that the corner was now more open. And the parklet at the Fitness Center entry, with street trees, and a seatwall. There are more Mass Ave improvements - more brick, and more trees, to bring down the scale. We have simplified the corner at Harrison, too.

LE: Eliminating the arcade made a huge difference. The taper is good, too. AL: I agree. One thing is still odd; the South End Fitness Center entry is still celebrated more than the residential. Why turn the corner with that? Keep the street face clean. KS: Albany Street and Mass Ave - are you controlling, or policing that? HK: It's an odd site now, behind a fence. We'll have control, and will maintain it. We understand the problems of the site all too well. KS: That's the one thing I caution you about. You've done great things. Despite all, it's still challenged, because of the volume. With that, it was moved, seconded, and then

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the proposed Northampton Square tower and PDA at the corner of Albany and Northampton streets in the Lower Roxbury neighborhood.

LW again remained recused from the next item. The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **Hotel Commonwealth Expansion Project**. Harry Wheeler (HW) of Group One presented the design changes, starting with a comparison of studies discussed in Committee. HW: We had too much, and then we went too far (in the other direction). We have strengthened the horizontality of the event space, reintroduced an articulated HVAC screen in perforated metal, and staggered the windows. It's still simple and strong at the ends. We have

extended the balcony above the event *open* space as well. On the alley side, we have added some of the rhythm of the back side, and introduced colored panels to break up the facade more. (Shows the corridor bridge treatment; shows some material precedents.)

KS: What are the materials? HW: Swiss Pearl. KS: The uses along the ground floor? HW used the elevation: A parking entry, screened parking, the event lobby, the entry. DS: And the garage is screened by.... HW: Perforated metal. This was discussed in Committee. The other side of Newbury is tough (the Turnpike). KS: What are the view corridors? HW: Really none - this looks at the back of the House of Blues. DM asked about the screening, and HW described it further. DH noted that this too was discussed in Committee. As shown then, it was too utilitarian. KS: Lighting? HW described the proposed lighting. KS: The relationship to the retaining wall/tunnel - you should work on that. With that, it was moved, seconded, and **VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the proposed Hotel Commonwealth Expansion Project at 552-628 Newbury Street in the Fenway/Kenmore neighborhood.**

LW returned. The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **Innovation Square Project (6 Tide Street)**. DM: We thought the building changes were good; there are view corridors through it. We spent a lot of time discussing the landscape. MD: The building was resolved in Committee? DM: Yes. WR: We were happy with most everything we saw. MD: Joe, you don't have to repeat the presentation. Joseph Mamayek (JM) noted the discussion points from a list, and noted a new alignment of the building and sidewalks. He started talking about the grid reconciliation.... WR: I don't think we should be going through a lot of slides. John O'Brien (JOB): Kairos asked that we shift the building toward the street to provide maximum flexibility for loading and other functions. [This provoked a lot of discussion about exactly where the building was located - since the drawings were not consistent and the architect could not easily be persuaded to give a simple answer. It became very unclear as to what the exact nature of the change was, and whether or not the positive qualities had been retained and other issues (the complexity of the Northern Avenue landscape) addressed.]

WR: I feel this is enough of a change that it would have been discussed in Design Committee. DH: You should work with BRA staff to maximize the openness and transparency toward the waterfront. DM tried a motion which asked - as the Commission had indicated - for two specific things (transparency/view corridors and the entry location). The team should make the building and site development drawings conform - because now, they do not. This was seconded, and it was (with 3 abstentions - AL, KS, LW) then

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for Innovation Square at 316-318 Northern Avenue (6 Tide Street) in the Boston Marine Industrial Park in the South Boston Waterfront District, with the condition that the view corridors and transparency toward the waterfront be maximized and that the north entry shift toward FID Kennedy Way.

DM, PM and LW were recused from the next item. PM left. The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **Boston Garden Project and 121A**. KS noted that the discussion had focused on the agreed issues - the plinth, the relationship to the towers, the nature of Champions Way. AL: The point you brought up in Committee was good - bring the Garden into the composition. Part of this discussion is what we are acting upon. A specific architecture and urban design, or a more general one. DAC noted that the suggested vote treats it like a PDA, with all returning. KS: The vote should be more consistent with what we've seen. DAC: If the Commission likes the progress demonstrated, we can remove the suggested conditions. But several of the issues noted, through several meetings, were not resolved. This gives the BCDC the opportunity to check in on the resolution at each phase. John Martin (JM) of Elkus/Manfredi presented the design update. JM: We have resolved the Champions Way alignment, shifting it so that it's centered on Canal Street's center line. Also, we have brought the masonry down to the ground (terra cotta[?], on the office building). The lighter metals (shows the Zakim Bridge view) pick up on the metal roof of the Garden. (Shows the canopy, supported by 4 branched columns.) We have brought materials across, so the buildings are more related. The canopy is lower by 5'. We are using either a light brick or terra cotta; that's not yet decided.

DH: Arriving by train, you go right through. JM: Yes, the escalators go up in Champions Row, removed from the North Station area. Mike Cantalupa (MC) of Boston Properties: The retail space now also fronts into the station. DH: We talked about the relationship to the TD Garden, but I ask because I think of it as a gateway from the north. MD: So we would, in a future phase, be able to see the development of that treatment. KS: We also talked about the 60-foot dimension. Is it enough? I think the escalators are better together in the middle. And the four columns are better than six, but they are still there. I'm not sure. We had an epiphany in Committee, that when you turned off the color, the project got better. JM: That prompted the intentional commitment to a lighter, but masonry, color. JC: On the site plan, note that we now show the cycle track, with wide sidewalks. There are closer trees with lighting, and a softening of the pedestrian passage on the west. DH: I think - especially in light of the recent South Station renderings - *that's* a bold gesture that speaks of arrival in a great City. Given the scale of development here, I don't think there is enough here, despite much improvement I see over the first presentation. MC: We don't control the station. We would have some discussions with them; we have thoughts.

LE: I think the point was also the scale of the space. We got some feet. But not on the level of what the space outside of South Station is. AL: The issue is that the space is not really 60' wide and 90' tall. It's a canyon, hundreds of feet high. Without other points, the presence of the third tower narrows the space. It's both an oddity, and makes less of what should be ceremonial space. DS: Are there some issues that can be resolved? The third tower aside - is 60' wide enough space, to work with the pedestrian volumes and movement? JM: We are very comfortable with that working. Its comparable to the vomitoriums at many other facilities. DH: I want to echo, there are many improvements. But we looked at 345 Harrison - this is comparable. DS countered that they were two different situations. DH: This is a thoroughfare. I feel that it's not enough to function in a civic sense. DS: That's a fair point. JM: All that's shown is public; there is retail on each side. DS: But the spaces shown do not have places that are celebratory, either before or after the passage. Can that be supplied here? MD: Perhaps, if

it doesn't meet what we feel, we should not approve it. DS: Does the retail have to be like this, or can it be more open? That would be different. More open, placemaking. Enclosed, it would change things. DH: I agree. If it were enclosed, it would be more public, comfortable - if there were some eddies where you can rest.

MC: The intent is not to create a mall; it's why we *didn't* enclose it. There will be a leasing program that complements the activity at the Garden. There will be a lot of reasons for people to come - the cinema, a supermarket. DH: Another Elkus/Manfredi project that I like a lot is the Time Warner Center. It's fundamentally civic - one can imagine that here. MD: I want to suggest that it be treated like an urban design master plan. (Writes some notes.) Issues include: the scale, nature, and character of Champions Way; the podium; more, all to be furthered before the Project returns. KS: I want to include a notion about the treatment as a whole - the further integration of the whole composition, and its place as a gateway into the City. MD: And the third tower - preferring 2, rather than 3. KS: I don't think we were directing them that way. I think we directed that, if they could design the complex as a *family*, and create a civic space, that would work. WR: Amend the list. MD: So, the issues discussed include: the scale, dimensions, and civic character of Champions Row; the notion of the place as a civic one of arrival and departure, and by extension North Station; the relationship of the parts, and to the context; and, the placemaking capacity - its role as a gateway to the City.

LE: Should we vote, if we are so dissatisfied with all these elements? WR: We can say - not including North Station - what needs work. MD tried to reconcile.... AL: The nature of the public realm and space - we just need to put the massing to a vote. MD: So we are accepting the notion.... WR: And Champions Row. More discussion ensued. MC: Our vision for this includes a cinema. Champions Way expanding would not allow the cinema. We wanted to have a *set* of activities. LE: I understand the reasons; it's a good explanation. You may not be able to give us the space we feel this needs. DH: We are seeing several multi-cinemas; I'm not sure they will all succeed, but that's not my business. KS: There are concessions around the scale.... AL: The process has been wrong. We have been shown responses to comments. But the basics of the Project are unchanged, they are all minor responses. If as generally described, but with two towers, I would be happy. But, we've seen nothing but incremental changes. WR: We've expressed concern about the major aspects. We should vote, and express our concerns. Have them come back. The vote below was taken, and carried 4-3-1 (LE abstained, and DC, DH, and AL voted against).

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design strategy for the proposed Boston Garden Project at 80 Causeway Street to the south of the TD Bank Garden in the North Station Economic Development Area, with the condition that each Phase and interim condition return to the Commission for further review and votes. It is recommended before *any* return that the following issues discussed be substantively furthered: the scale, dimension, placemaking quality, and civic character of 'Champions Way'; the further integration of the entire composition, including the materiality of the podium and its relationship to the context of both the Garden and the Triangle; the acknowledgment of the Project's significance

as part of a northern Gateway to the City; and, the possibility of a two-tower massing solution.

LW returned; DM remained recused for the next item. The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **Landmark Center Expansion Project and 121A**. LW reported: Everyone in Committee liked the Project. There were a number of improvements, especially removing the low structure by the T station, and more towers improved the Project. MD: Yes. It was a rare time when adding a building improved a project. Peter Sougarides (PS) of Samuels Associates: We still have some work to do on the plaza design. The Project was improved with the discussion and input from the Committees and from the Community. Chris Milne (CM) of Elkus/Manfredi presented the changes, first noting them on both a small and large model. CM: Even though the plaza was elongated, there is still the same amount of open space, so nothing was lost. The connection is much more direct through Sears (shows in plan diagrams and later, views). The views of the Sears Tower is now also defined from Kenmore Square (indicates on the smaller context model).

KS asked about access: How active are the parking approaches? CM: We think about half and half (for each approach). There are 1500 spaces total, on three levels, not much different than we have now. We connect to parking in the basement of the existing building as well. DC: What about the Park Drive intersection? CM: *Everyone* has asked about that! We can only move it 5 feet. PS: The (Park Drive) reconfiguration includes now a direct input from the Riverway, so that should increase distribution to this side. CM then reprised the program. AL: I think it's a terrific Project. I like best the language of the first three buildings. It's a really big building complex that has great scale. It would be stronger if the fourth building were also like the three - it's making such a big point. But that's just a personal thing. With that, it was moved, seconded, and then

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the Landmark Center Expansion Project in the Fenway neighborhood.

DM and WR were recused for the next item. The next item was a report from the Design Committee on the **Ruth Mulan Chu Chao Center at the Harvard Business School**. LE reported: The Committee meeting was good. We'd asked about the axial relationship - done - and the corner relationship was modified. And we asked about the portico and cornice lines. Rob Chandler (RC) of Goody Clancy: There was some concern about the scale relationship of the building pieces. We came internally (with the client) to a consensus that the scale of the portico element was important to relate to the legacy campus. (Shows the key view from Harvard Way, then other views.) Gary Hilderbrand (GH) continued with the site plan changes. He noted the particular problem of the two offsets, and the desire to connect the path from the pedestrian bridge to Harvard Way. GH: The offset is keyed by the building, even though that was shifted. I beg your indulgence, we're not there yet - but (shows as he is talking) we're working on the notion of an inverted curved path. We think we can resolve the points of

connection with further geometric adjustments. Credit goes to the Commissioners for suggesting breaking the flat geometry of the prior plan.

KS: It's a great Project. Portico, no portico.... If you need to have it, at least you listened to us on the lantern. This is good. With that, it was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for Harvard's Chao Center Project in the context of the new Harvard Allston Campus IMP, in the Allston neighborhood.

DM returned. MD apologized for being an hour and a half late (behind schedule). The next item was a presentation of the **Coppersmith Village Project**. Jeff Drago (JD) introduced the Project, noting that NOAH was the (proposed) owner of the site. JD: The location is an old industrial site, underutilized, a bleak area. The components of the Project are about 3000 SF retail, 15 townhouses, and 56 rental units, about half affordable. We feel this will revitalize this corridor in East Boston. It's close to transportation and to Maverick (and Central) Square. JD then introduced David Flaschenriem (DF) of The Narrow Gate, architects. DF showed the site, noting the nearness to the Harbor. DF: There is a residential area behind, and the Boston East site is across the street, with a lower two-story structure (maritime uses) and open space. Further down, there is the Atlantic Works building and Maverick Landing (*sic*). There is a Decatur Street view corridor, and a strong pedestrian connection along it to the water. Coppersmith Way has some residences, but is really a narrow alley. (Shows views across the site.) LE asked about the space directly across Border from their Project. DF: It's parking for the maritime use related to Boston East. (Shows the ground floor plan.) We have raised the grade - the floors are raised. There is a mix of uses along the ground floor. There is also a park across Liverpool Street. The townhouses facing that way have a slightly different tactic; we are raising those buildings on a plinth, with a split sidewalk, partly raised, and a 10' setback. LW: How does the grading in the back work? DF: The garages are at grade, then you move up from the garage. It's a one-way driveway. AL: Are there spaces along the drive?

Bob Wegener (BW) of The Narrow Gate: Some, but most of the spaces are in the buildings, and there is one each in the townhouses. (Shows plans, elevations, perspectives; shows a vignette of the split sidewalk.) The rental buildings are larger in scale; facing the water, they are also more 'active.' The buildings are two pieces of 28 units each. At Decatur is the restaurant; toward the other end is a community space and NOAH offices. All are raised except for the parking and the shared entry lobby for both buildings.

MD asked about the parking and ratio. BW: 15 in the townhouses, 27 in the buildings, 10 on the driveway. The ratio is about 0.5 for/in the mid-rise buildings. (Shows views of the exterior.) KS: What are the exterior materials? BW: Fiber cement panel and brick. AL: There is a lot of nice, straightforward things here. My main concern is the space between. The large building(s) has views. But the small townhouses have no space. That's a concern, paving from building to building. LE: If the spaces could move, adding a row of planting, or trees. (Asks about parking in the area.) LW: Some bump-outs, etc. would help, and add trees. Along Liverpool - it seems

as wide as Border - you should have trees. DC: Both Border and Liverpool go from Central Square to LoPresti Park; the landscaping treatment should be similar, so that they read as the corridors they are. It looks like the lobby - and corner, offer room for trees.... DF: We can look at the corner. MD: There are a lot of good things. It's affordable. But if you can trace the uses along Border.... It's good architecture, affordable, addresses climate change. But parking, the corridor along Border - I'm not quite convinced.

LE: The building you're keeping on the site - what's to its side? DF: Parking areas, connected to the building across the street. LE: What occurs to me, is that I would like the cars to go all the way to Coppersmith, so the ell could become green. What is the green space across the street? BW: A park. DM: I agree with the comments about the space between. I love the townhouses, their playfulness. And you are working real hard to enliven Border. My comments would be to make it better in the middle. KS: We have spaces in Olmsted Green - useable space is important. LW: If you did what Linda suggested, or maybe eliminated the parking - have a double-loaded street. AL: Think of the inside as a courtyard. MD noted the BCDC process going forward. KS: Bring samples of your material precedents. And a model. With that, the Coppersmith Village 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 10:01 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission is scheduled for January 7, 2014. The recording of the December 3, 2013 Boston Civic Design Commission meeting was digitized and is available at the Boston Redevelopment Authority.