

DRAFT MINUTES

BOSTON CIVIC DESIGN COMMISSION

The meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was held on Tuesday, February 7th, 2017, starting in Room #900, Boston City Hall, and beginning at 5:19 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, and Kirk Sykes. Absent was Daniel St. Clair. Also present was David Carlson, Executive Director of the Commission. Representatives of the BSA were present. Michael Cannizzo, Raul Duverge, Elizabeth Stifel, and Lauren Shurtleff were present for the BPDA.

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, January 20, in the BOSTON HERALD.

The first item was the approval of the January 3rd, 2017 Meeting Minutes. A motion was made, seconded, and it was duly

VOTED: To approve the January 3rd, 2017 BCDC Meeting Minutes.

Votes were passed for signature. MD: We beg the indulgence of the audience and participants; we have a very full agenda tonight, and ask all due speed. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **47 LaGrange Street Project**. David Carlson (DAC) noted that this proposal was a new residential Project on a small site within the Hinge Block in the Midtown Cultural District, behind the YMCU building, and near the 45 Stuart and Kensington projects reviewed by the Commission. At 157,000 SF, the Project was over the BCDC threshold, and review was recommended. It was duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed 47 LaGrange Street Project on the small parcel at the corner of Tamworth and LaGrange streets, and bounded on the north and east by the YMCU property, in the Hinge Block area of the Midtown Cultural District.

DAC then noted that the **Whittier Street Choice Housing Project** had modified its Phase One plans in order to achieve HUD Neighborhood Choice funding. The timeline was very intense, but the changes merited being presented as an update, since the second Phase was subject to further review. This would be presented later, and *no* action was recommended, although as with other updates, the BCDC had the right to vote to reopen and affirm approval, or send to Committee if need be. But the BPDA did not deem that the changes merited opening up the Article 80 process, and no Board action was anticipated.

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **1785 Columbus Avenue Project**. DAC noted that this site was within the PLAN: JP/ROX study area, but essentially consistent with its recommendations. At about 137,000 SF, the Proposed Project was over the BCDC threshold; review was recommended. It was consequently moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed 1785 Columbus Avenue Project, at the intersection of Dimock Street, near Jackson Square in the Jamaica Plain neighborhood.

David Manfredi (DM) and Paul McDonough (PM) were recused from the next item. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **1000 Boylston Street (Turnpike Air Rights Parcel 15) Project**. DAC noted that the proposal, at well over 600,000 SF, was over the BCDC threshold; a vote to review was recommended. It was again moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed 1000 Boylston Street Project on the expanded Turnpike Air Rights Parcel 15 site in the Commercial spine area of the Back Bay neighborhood.

DM and PM returned. Andrea Leers (AL) was recused from the next item. The next item was a report from Review Committee on the **Wentworth Institute of Technology Multipurpose Academic Building and associated IMPNPC**. DAC reported that this was a modified facility at a new location on the central quad within the IMP. Although only 69,000 SF, the MpA Building Project was one of the Projects, now larger, that the BCDC had cited for review as a condition of approval of the IMP. An affirmation of review was therefore recommended. It was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the Wentworth Institute of Technology Multipurpose Academic Building Project (and the associated changes to its Institutional Master Plan) on Parker Street, in the Mission Hill neighborhood.

AL returned. David Hacin (DH), DM, and Kirk Sykes (KS) were recused from the next item. The next item was a report from Review Committee on the **115 Winthrop Square Project**. DAC noted that the Winthrop Square Project had been in the papers quite a bit, and BCDC comments would be welcome as part of *many* comments the Project would need to respond to as part of its Article 80 process. At over a million SF, review was recommended. It was quickly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed 115 Winthrop Square Project on the Winthrop Square garage site bounded by Federal and Devonshire streets in the Downtown Financial District.

KS returned. DH and DM remained recused for the next item. The next item was a report from the Design Committee on the **370-380 Harrison Avenue Project**. MD noted that most of the Committee felt that the public realm issues had been served through the meetings, even though there was still debate on the architecture. Bob Puddicombe (BP) of Related Beal introduced the changes, noting they felt the Project had been positively affected by the review. Dan Lobitz (DL) of RAMSA went quickly through the slides, noting the early criticism, and showing their responsive diagrams, and studies using axons taken from different viewpoints. DL: We simplified the massing; we used a less traditional brick to make the treatment more contemporary. (Shows a view of the project with and without trees; shows more views.) We have changed the base from the limestone we had before to a dark stone, very close in value to the brick. (Shows more views and elevations.) We are using the limestone now to frame the passageway and the columns. Shauna Gillies-Smith (SGS): We busted through the building; the edges are activated now with retail or the building lobby itself. The columns are placed and shaped to reinforce the diagonal path through the site.

Deneen Crosby (DC): The spaces are very successful as pass-through spaces, less so as destinations. I love the columns being shaped by the landscape - continue to develop that further. KS: I like the scale of the 2-story base. Is there an intermediate scale? DL: The signage, and canopies with their metalwork details, will provide that, but they are not visible on the drawings. KS: Having a more articulated scale would benefit the Project. Bill Rawn (WR): I'm still more than a little concerned that it feels like a facadectomy of 20 years ago, but feel that I'm overruled. KS then moved to approve with his recommendation of working on the intermediate scale. With that, and hearing no public comments, it was seconded and (with WR abstaining)

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

The next item was a presentation of the **47 LaGrange Street Project**. MD reminded the Proponent to strive for no more than a 15-minute presentation. BK Boley (BK) of Stantech introduced their team: Erin Hodges (EH), John Matteson (JM, the developer), James Gray (JG). He indicated the model, and noted the Project's process status, and showed site photos, a locus map, and a view from the Common. BK: We were looking at how we could fit our building in that array of buildings. John Copley (JC) of the Copley Wolff Design Group showed the block plan: Our intent was to make this feel more like a City environment, with lighting, etc. to make the scene more appealing. WR asked about the massing inset and the exact location. Others asked about the building 'in front' - the Touraine Building (about 12 stories, owned by the Hamilton Company) running along Tremont and Tamworth streets. BK then showed some views of handsome buildings nearby where good detail comes all the way to the ground. BK: We want the same, we want to bring that sense into us.

EH presented the design. EH: We expect the building will greatly improve the existing condition. We have two facades with bays to catch the light (BK noted that they were 8 to 14 inches deep, enough to produce angled glints of light. EH: We are using curved glass at the

corners; it lessens the [building] profile. The lower part of the facade going around the mechanicals is a little more opaque. We have tilted the top, with the higher mechanicals toward the back; they shouldn't be visible. (Notes the scale of the ground floor and the transparency.) BK: The BPDA asked us to address the loading off of LaGrange, and suggested no lights in the street material itself. JC noted the notion of the lanterns, and the paving patterns. DH asked about the [YMCU] buildings next door. BK gave a brief background on the YMCU buildings and project: It was a buildable lot; they were at the beginning of their proposal, which may be up to 14+ stories. We have planned our building around that as a backup, with a party wall condition about 3-5' off the lot line. They are in a PDA there. We have modified the plan since talking to the BPDA, with loading removed to Lowell Court, and the plan adjusted so that there are no windows to the east. We will also tweak our edges with the other proponent. We are proposing metal and OKO in a curtainwall system with depth.

MD asked about the paving. JG: We are backing away from some of that; BTB does not like tabled conditions. DH: If tabled streets are a no-go, then can the sidewalk be shifted? At least on the stretch from Tamworth to Tremont (sic). JC: We can look at that, with bollards on one side. DH: The tabling seems really nice on Tamworth. I'm less convinced about LaGrange; that could be more a working street. JG: This is outside the BID.... KS asked further about the tabling issue with BTB. BK: It wasn't a firm no.

MD: We will send this to Committee - for you to catch up your drawings, and firm up the public realm. AL: As you go up, you need to be careful about the treatment of opacity, etc. I like the changes to LaGrange; I like David's idea. DC: Do check regarding shadow on the Common. DH: Two things are important: the extension of the curtainwall around the mechanicals, and the rounded corners. Do NOT value engineer those out. DM: The model is beautiful. The renderings look more complex; I love the simplicity of the model. WR asked about the shadow as well. JG: We are in the Midtown Cultural District, and compliant with the stricture that shadows do not last more than two hours. Linda Eastley (LE): It's important to understand the progression as you approach...how do you know you're coming to this place, from the fabric around the site? PM asked about the timing of their neighbor's project. JM: Likely about two years; their first phase starts in May. We are working to coordinate with them. DH: If we could just get a sense of how they might fit, their massing. WR asked about the phasing - clarify that, and show us more about the proximity to 45 Stuart. Michael Cannizzo (MC): We met with both teams within the last two weeks. We will try to get them to work together, and also work with other [City] agencies on LaGrange. With that, the 47 LaGrange Street Project was sent to Design Committee.

The next item was a presentation of the updated **Whittier Choice Housing Project**. MD noted that the BCDC could treat this as informational, an option that DAC outlined. Meena Jacob (MJ) of POAH introduced herself and her colleague Charlie Dross. We received funding from HUD, and as a part of that process we responded to design requests from HUD. Joe Bamberg of the BHA: We found out we were awarded a \$30 million grant, and now we're on a *tight* time frame - we must spend all the money within five years on the *entire* Project, and deal with relocations. Michael Liu (ML) of The Architectural Team introduced his colleague Meghan Bell and the design. ML: You approved the plan for the entire site, and the architecture of the first phase. We did not win the first round of HUD funding; they did not like the 5-story embedded townhouses, and they wanted to break up the large space into smaller ones. (Shows

an earlier scheme, noting the earlier Tremont Crossing plan, and the infrastructure easement constraint. Shows an evolution of that, changing to more townhouses.) We then modified the plan to conform to the Tremont Crossing changes, which allowed a normalized street grid, while still keeping the easement. We also worked on the scale of the buildings (a HUD concern). Halvorson is still working on evolving the plans for the spaces. (Shows the most current plan, then side-by-side 3-D sketch comparisons, first looking from their corner toward Tremont Crossing. Notes that their site plan and massing respond also to that project's evolution. Shows another view, from the corner of Whittier Street. Shows birds-eye then ped-level views of both corners. Using an aerial sketch, notes the phasing plan, and goes quickly through that.) I think the plan has improved, with the vehicular connection and the smaller spaces.

MD clarified the Phase 1 bounds. KS: We talked a lot about pathways the first time. Also, the typology of the buildings couldn't be more dramatic - in a small area, you have a little of everything. I would love to hear your thinking about how this fits. DH: The plan has nicely evolved; it's much more natural. The Tremont Crossing changes reinforce your plan. I think the orphaned 4-5 units are a little funny, but understand the easement constraint. The trees - I want to understand how that can handle the energy coming from Tremont Crossing - the intersection there is more like a gateway. So that's an important interface; it needs to work. AL: You've been agile with the changes required of you. It was perimeter housing before, now it's three separate types. A remnant perimeter building, with rowhouses. Then just rowhouses. Then a third thing. Think of the rowhouses as a place of their own. ML (indicates): These here? AL: Yes. I want to understand your placement. DH: Like a city block that evolved over time. LE: I wish we had the Tremont Crossing plan adjacent. If the townhouses are in the first phase, you could shift them to be along the second phase easement. If the axis formed in phase 2A could also terminate in a larger space, that might help. Also, think about sunlight and shadow on the courtyards. WR: I want to ask about the interface with Tremont Crossing, the deluge of cars coming into the neighborhood. I'm hearing what others are saying, but shouldn't you close off that street? ML: That street is one-way.

MD reminds the Commission of the nature of the update. MD: Is there enough to merit more study? KS: I think it's very important to see both projects together. DM: We could see the larger context, I want to be reminded of that. Joe, could you cut the L-shaped building off [from schedule of others] if need be? It would be interesting to discuss, but we will intend to be quick. KS: You could reorient the massing against Tremont Crossing, then step down to front Madison. Andrea and Linda had interesting ideas, too. DM: One idea - might be pulling the townhouses away from the L-shaped building. The Whittier Housing update was sent to Committee - DAC reminded the Commission that this action required a vote reopening review, which was taken.

VOTED: That the Commission review Phase 1 of the updated Whittier Choice Housing Project to resolve the issues noted.

The next item was a presentation of the **1785 Columbus Avenue Project**. D'Artagnan Brown (DAB) of Embarc went through the design, noting the location (near Jackson Square, and downhill from the Dimock Center), showing context photos and noting the grade change between Columbus and Amory, and then going quickly through the scheme using plans, elevations along the three streets, and sketches of the proposal. He noted that the programming itself was

unusual, with the proposed homeless family services and nonprofit tenancies. He noted working with the BPDA staff to ensure consistency with PLAN: JP/ROX.

DC asked about the entry: Where is the floor level, how do you enter, and where do those windows lie? DAB noted the interior window elevation. DAB: The entries are flush with the sidewalk. The rest of the floor is raised about four feet due to the parking deck below. DH: It's hard to understand the massing in a snapshot. But this is really good. Bring a model to Committee. DM: A lot is good, but it's a very complicated building. I don't want to dissuade you from good urban design goals.... DAB: Some elements are to break down the scale - for the neighborhood meetings. MD: I want to be sure; this corner needs a lot of love. I want to understand what the pedestrian experience is like, walking past the garage. AL: You brought the scale down...I wonder if bringing the scale of the upper windows down might help - maybe they're more vertical. Be more deliberate about the datum. That might also help you with the areas where the parking rises above the sidewalk. KS: Widen the context a little bit. This has more to do with Dimock [the campus] than Columbus. But the scale of the townhouses on Columbus is 3.5 stories plus a cornice, so the scale isn't quite the same, their height is less. The separation of programs is your focus. DAB noted that the perspective Kirk referenced was not accurate. LE: It's unique for us to look at a building for a population like this. I would like to understand the playspaces; I think they'll be visible from the street. Most often, it's not just the wall, but there's a secondary visual barrier. If that's often playful, that could help the Project. With that, the 1785 Columbus Avenue Project was sent to Design Committee.

DM and PM were recused from the next item. The next item was a presentation of the **1000 Boylston Street (MTA Parcel 15) Project**. MD asked that the presentation be kept to a limit of 15-20 minutes. Adam Weiner (AW, the developer) introduced himself and the Project. Kevin Lennon (KL) of Elkus/Manfredi presented the design, noting first the location and area. KL: There are several air rights sites here; it's very important to create a continuity. (Broadens plan view, then zooms in, and returns to the three sites.) This is part of an attempt to repair and restore the urban fabric, knitting the neighborhoods together. (Shows a birds-eye aerial of the site, noting the terra firma owned by his client.) At the time of the RFP, the proposal only considered Parcel 15 and our terra firma. We did not consider the corner. After designation, the CAC urged us to include the corner Prudential parcel. It's just good urban design, and our project would have reduced the value of that - and the chance of ever doing anything there. The overall site is 46,000 SF (shows parcel ownerships). (Shows a set of site photos, then a series of diagrams showing how they generated the forms - with bearing lines, and the notion of a streetwall podium.) Above the podium, we have two footprints, 11,000 and 13,000 SF. These are slender residential buildings with light and air and space around them. The diagram lines show how the structure below informs the facade lines above. The taller tower twists to align with the grid of the Back Bay, then twists some more. It's further broken down by inserting balconies, giving the opportunity to bring green to the tower. (Shows an axon/section diagram explaining the program. Shows a series of plans - the loading, the ground floor retail. Notes the curb cut, then the second floor shift, and four levels of parking above, using stackers. Notes the amenity floor, with a transfer to the elevators for the condo building. Shows upper floors, green roofs. Shows the streetscape and drop-off area.) We are widening the Boylston sidewalk from 9 to 18'. We are investigating whether we can actually do the trees shown. (Shows a neighborhood elevation, with the heights of the nearby towers.) Our buildings are of unitized curtainwall, 540', and panelized metal with punched windows, 283', with interlocking volumes

(points to model). (Shows an aerial view photo-inset and several perspective views, ending on a podium view.)

WR: Is the garage totally enclosed? The Commission has not been happy with 3-4 floors of garage above retail. Your intention to fully enclose needs to be checked. AW confirmed that the garage was necessary because they have no ability to go below grade, but they do not want the cars to be perceived. DH: Bring more information. We have also been talking about the future of cars, so that [floor] plates could be designed to accommodate other uses in the future. You've taken a really difficult site and made a lot of it. I like your explanation of the extrusion of the two forms. I know there are community questions on the height, but I like the difference. I'd like to see more views of the tower. I find the twisting form AND the cut-outs to be - a lot. I understand the idea, but in a city challenged with elegant, slender towers, that might be worth thinking about. AL: The extrusion is really intelligent. I share Bill's comments about your decision to make those floors parking. I wonder if you might bring the potential of some liner spaces there - one of the ways we've raised of addressing the issue. A larger issue is the relationship between the two towers. They are very different, but both are growing from the same podium. Look for a strategy where there's one idea, one block. I know it's purposeful. Think of them as family members, both part of the whole. Is there a common language you might look for?

DC: Show more views along the street - from Mass Ave, how does this relate to your neighbors. And along Dalton Street, too. LE: St. Cecilia's Church is a beautiful piece of this neighborhood; I want to understand how this relates to that. Also, the opening for Cambria Street - how does that work? I'm not sure you need an opening that large, if there are no pedestrians there. Along Boylston, congratulations on thinking about it - it's bad now. You're looking at trees, but is there a sculptural piece you could introduce to augment (or replace, if need be) the trees. KS: On the podium, I'd like to see an analysis of that typology for a couple of blocks. Some projects create open space (Prudential, i.e.) - how is that punctuated. The Hynes is a block long, but the other side of the street is different. How to break this down? Some modulation, still its own, that does something of interest. A quid pro quo for the public realm. WR: If you look at Boylston, its entire length, there's a datum relating to the Back Bay. This breaks that, with the two towers. Should such a tall building be this close to Boylston? We should understand your rationale.

MD asked for public comments. Susan Prindle of NABB: It's important to look at the Civic Vision document from 2000. That calls for one tower, not four (including around the corner). I have photos... (passes out some). You should show the buildings set back so they don't canyonize Boylston. Mandarin is not set back, and is uncomfortable. But 500 Boylston is set back 150', and 888 Boylston, about 100'. I hope the BCDC will take into account the impact of height and shadows, even on Newbury Street. Alan Mackintosh (AM): You've done a really great job with the podium, it enlivens the block. This is not so much in a low rise district, it's near skyscrapers. This is not totally unreasonable, especially given the cost. The payoff is incredible. With that, the 1000 Boylston Street Project was sent to Design Committee.

PM and DM returned. AL was recused from the next item. The next item was a presentation of the **Wentworth Institute of Technology Multipurpose Academic Building**. Dave Wahlstrom (DW) of WIT introduced the project, which had been proposed as an Engineering Sciences

building (of 45,000 SF) on the Student Pike, and is now an academic building (of 69,000 SF) at the center of the campus, replacing tennis courts. We are bringing this to the BCDC because of our IMP approval promise. This is exciting for Wentworth; it combines three engineering programs, and includes a new Center of Innovation and Entrepreneurship. We intend a 3D printing lab, and have had positive preliminary public meetings. Josiah Stevenson (JS) of Leers/Weinzapfel presented the design. JS: WIT has not built a new academic building in 45 years. The site is highly charged - on the Quad, where there's a missing piece, and on the Pike. And Parker Street leads to Mission Hill. Now, the paths on either side of the tennis courts are constrained. (Shows pictures, describes intent.) The floors at WIT are mostly high; one has to step up, or step down to the basement. We want to do the opposite. We've worked hard to fit this into the 65-foot context of the other academic buildings. (Shows massing model studies, a view in context. Shows a section through the Quad, and elevations along the Pike and Parker. Shows a diagram of the building, floor plans, a cutaway section diagram, and perspective views.) We are studying the veil - this protects the building from solar glare, and protects the ground floor. The vertical fins face east and west; they are solar shading elements. (Shows solar emission diagram, then elevations, then more views.)

SGS: The Pike path is used by many students and workers. That side is open, to allow display - we want to support the experience. (Shows site plan, describes the program. Notes spill-out spaces, and space along Parker to address the otherwise narrow Parker Street sidewalks.) We are working on the paving. (Shows precedent photos, then a series of views.) We are picking up on the angularity of the veil, and making sure that the activity inside can be seen. (Shows a series of views around the building edges.) DC: The Colleges of the Fenway Walk. Is that a tour? Do people walk it? Is there a map? DW: There are kiosks along the way to guide you. But no brochure. JS showed a video/animation of SketchUp views, walking along Parker, through the Pike, across the Quad, looking through the space between buildings, back to the plaza along Parker, then inside to the Gathering Space and a 2-story lead-in up to offices. Then back out to the Pike, and along the accessway to the south (alongside the Library).

DH: This is a nice project. It feels more open than it is now with the tennis courts - ironic. It frames the Quad. There's a sobriety to the WIT campus; it elevates that without feeling alien. The veil on the Pike side feels less exuberant than the treatment on the north. Maybe amp that up a little bit. JS: We will look at that; we've heard that comment. DC: This will do a lot for the streetscape along Parker, and help the image of WIT. The width of your walks feels very comfortable. Look at the materials in the Quad; maybe that language comes out, and connects better. LE: I really like the Project as well. There's no formal tour, but the Pike is a really useful tool. What the Pike really needs is a terminus - I wish the landscape there did that. You'll see the building from a distance - that's a clue. Watson, to the north, has a very simple, effective landscape. The tennis courts, for all their chain-link, did provide a view to the rec center, maybe there could be some cues about that. JS: The building begins to do that... DM: It looks like the wall begins to open out. The Autodesk space has the same program as yours, and on the ground floor, they have their maker space - with garage doors. They open them up - it's totally engaging. There's a secure perimeter within the building. Here, there's a natural affinity between the veil and the maker space. Go see Autodesk; they'll give you a tour. JS: The Director of the Department (the 'Accelerate' Program) would love that. DH: I would move to approve this. Hearing no public comment, the motion was seconded and it was

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the Wentworth Institute of Technology Multipurpose Academic Building Project (and the associated changes to its Institutional Master Plan) on Parker Street, in the Mission Hill neighborhood.

DH, DM, and KS were recused from the next item. WR left. The next item was a presentation of the **115 Winthrop Square Project**. Kathy MacNeil (KM) of Millennium Partners introduced the Project, noting the selection process for the City-owned garage parcel. KM noted the review process: We have had several public meetings; this will be part of the BPDA PNF review and scoping process. Blake Middleton (BM) of Handel Architects presented the design, starting with photos of the area and Winthrop Square. BM: We looked at notions of how to reinforce the space, using European piazzas as precedents. We're trying to preserve the honey locusts (shows a landscape detail, then an 1860 photo of the Winthrop space with cobbles) with the idea of reestablishing a continuous space as a better connection for the area. We're thinking bollards, continuous tabling, slowing the traffic down. The Great Hall is the foundation of our public realm contribution. It's a connector, linking spaces, even uses, with inspiration from many spaces (Gallerias, etc.). There are limited routes for loading and parking access (indicates). We want to activate the main space 18 hours a day - Boston's Living Room, a versatile space. Grab'n'Go below, dining above. The structure shown, actually *is* structural; the ends are as permeable as possible, with air hangar doors (shows views of the two openings). The material of the building comes all the way to the ground. The form of the building follows the street edge in Winthrop Square, while on Federal, the strategy is different. (Shows an axon, then a diagram of the massing elements.) We have a pleated facade, an idea drawn from the nearby Art Deco buildings of the Financial District, and old silversmithing traditions - catching the light. (Notes an axonometric program diagram, with a breakaway section which clarifies.) The form is driven by office and residential planning, and the cores. The office allows a fair amount of density. The Solaria form a pavilion-like 'bustle,' something of the scale of the Rudolph building. We are doing a LEED Platinum building, and taking that designation for the office a little further, to PassiveHouse (US) standards. (Shows sections of the whole building. Notes the parking below has stacker systems.) There's a grade change through the site, which may require steps and ramps to achieve our purpose. (Riffs through a series of slides, noting the proportions of the Great Hall, the ground floor plan, the programming, the upper floors. Notes the nickel silver facade, the Art Deco pleating detail. Shows a night view.) The deep fissures at the top are illuminated at night.

AL: I want to understand the ground plane. Do you have an elevation? BM showed the Winthrop view, noting the residential lobby to the left, a *porte cochere* beyond, the office lobby to the right, and the Great Hall entry. AL: And the facade - how do the windows work? BM: It's a glass wall with angled fins, which change angles as they move up. MD: I would like to understand better how the stack of lower public floors works. The section through.... LE: It becomes the street. MD: ...How one goes through/between the levels. PM: And you have escalators as well? BM: We might - it depends on volume, if the uses require more people moving between. MD: The resolution of the Great Hall back on Federal Street is very successful. It seems lost on the Winthrop side. AL: We've all seen a lot of images of this. How you brought the ground plane in, the use of the bustle - is really intelligent. There's a beauty to the idea of the texture of the building. But all the images did not prepare me for the sheerness of the facade. Winthrop Square could feel dwarfed by something that close, and that tall. To me, that's the biggest concern, not the 75' scale you reference. It's about the massing, not the height,

per se. I'd like to know what else you've studied. BM: This is one of the rare opportunities in the City with a space. Shoppers' Park at Filene's is close to this space. AL: Could the top peel back more? BM: Maybe. We have early reports from the wind engineers, which will inform how we develop the scheme.

DC: It was shocking to me to see the model. Even the Great Hall seems diminutive. It's great to have an indoor room; it's a great amenity. I am concerned about the shadow impacts. Once done, there's no undoing. It's also about vegetation, the impact there. PM: Where does the shadow stand? Joe Larkin (JL) of Millennium spoke briefly about the proposed legislation, limiting impacts to this one Project and possibly eliminating the remaining shadow 'bank.'

DC: The issue is really that some of the really old trees may not be able to tolerate more shadow.

JL: I can tell you, what we have so far, is that the consideration is an exception for this site only, with some offsets. MD: The RFP requested that height, right? JL: Yes. All respondents were in the 675-750' range. LE: I'd like to know more about Winthrop. I think the bollards detract; can you do without them? PM: They make the space more constrictive. LE: More on the scale of the space, the historic plantings. I realize that the height of the 'frame' of the Hall picks up the average height of the other buildings in the Square. It feels resolved on Federal, but not on the other side. Do you need the structure? The frame appeals to me. It feels like a modern entry - with a thing inside. AL: It's functioning differently. By the way, the 2-story studios (Solaria) are great. There's something - the imposing wall. Think of the planes, how they lift. This is the side (Winthrop) that's hardest. Look at heights, angles, displacement (setback) to give some air to the Square.

DC: Did you consider spill-out programming? BM: Yes. MD: A closer level of analysis about how the space(s) operate. We recently looked at North Station.... I would love to see this function. I'm very convinced by the gesture, but I want to be sure it works. BM: Millennium takes the [curatorship] of the space very seriously. The more versatility, the less particularity. Bryant Park is an example of curated outdoor space. It's much different than the North Station problem. AL: Is it open or closed? BM: Seasonal. AL: The canopy at Les Halles, in Paris - they do not close it; it's absolutely public. Think about that openness.

MD opened to public comment. Martin Roetter of NABB: I'm in opposition, not only because of shadows on the Garden, but because the Project was conceived from the get-go to modify the legislation, and that might impact many other sites. You do not change the law to suit. Fritz Casselman: I'm glad we talked about aspects of the Great Hall. Folks with disabilities should be able to take in the experiences equally, like the Louvre. BM: This is the time for us to incorporate that thinking. A 3-story spread. MD: That stack of public spaces. Greg Galer of the Preservation Alliance: I want to thank the Commission for their concern about Winthrop Square and its historic properties. One issue of timing - I have concerns about moving forward with the Project without checking all the environmental impacts. A lot of folks feel these issues should have been expressed before. MD: We'd prefer not to get out ahead. AM: This is an incredible Project for the City, and I hope it moves forward. With that, the 115 Winthrop Square Project was sent to Design Committee.

There being no further items for discussion, a motion was made to adjourn, and the meeting was duly adjourned at 9:44 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was scheduled for March 7, 2017. The recording of the February 7, 2017 Boston Civic Design Commission meeting was digitized and is available at the Boston Redevelopment Authority.