

MINUTES

BOSTON CIVIC DESIGN COMMISSION

The meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was held on Tuesday, November 7th, 2017, starting in Room #900, Boston City Hall, and beginning at 5:15 p.m.

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

Michael 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, October 27, in the BOSTON HERALD.

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

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

Votes were passed for signature. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **70 Leo M. Birmingham Parkway Project**. David Carlson (DAC) noted that the Proposed Project, at about 82,000 SF, was somewhat less than the BCDC threshold but held a prominent location on the corner of Lincoln Street and was close to the recently reviewed Project at 530 Western Avenue and WGBH and the New Balance complex. The site was highly visible from the Turnpike. Review was recommended. It was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed 70 Leo M. Birmingham Parkway Project at the corner of Lincoln Street, in the North Allston neighborhood.

The next item was a report from Review Committee on the **Harvard G2 ('Commons') Pavilion Project**. DAC noted that this pavilion was discussed as part of Harvard's Klarman Hall Project and, because its design was not resolved at the time, its review became a condition of that approval recommendation. An affirmation of review due to that condition was requested. It was moved, seconded, and

VOTED:: That the Commission review the schematic design for Harvard's HBS Commons (G2) Pavilion Project in the context of the Harvard Allston Campus IMP, in the North Allston neighborhood.

The next item was a report from Review Committee on the **Boston Cargo (Stavis Seafoods,**

Massport Marine Terminal Parcel 5) Project. DAC noted that the Commission has recommended approval in January. The program had not materially changed, and so no action was likely on the part of the BPDA Board, but the design had been modified in a positive direction by a shift in building mass and a new architect team. NO formal review was recommended; instead the presentation tonight should be treated as a design update. It was moved, seconded, and voted to see the update. [As this was a formal vote for an informal action, no vote will be recorded.]

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Exchange South End Project.** DAC noted that the Proposed Project, on the site of the old Flower Exchange, was about 1,600,000 SF and review was strongly recommended. It was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design (and PDA) for the proposed Exchange South End Project at 540 Albany Street between Jacobson Floral Supply and the NEIDL laboratory building, in the South End neighborhood.

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **125 Amory Street Project.** DAC noted that the Proposed Project, at over 300,000 SF, was well over the BCDC threshold and close to the recently reviewed Jackson Square Phase 3 Project and nearby office building at 1785 Columbus Avenue. Review was recommended. It was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed 125 Amory Street Project, near Jackson Square in the Jamaica Plain neighborhood.

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Mattapan Station Project.** DAC noted that the Proposed Project, at over 160,000 SF, was over the BCDC threshold and held a prominent location in Mattapan Square near a terminus point of the Neponset Greenway. Review was recommended. It was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed Mattapan Station Project at 466 River Street on the Mattapan Trolley Station property a half block from Mattapan Square, in the Mattapan neighborhood.

Linda Eastley (LE) and David Manfredi (DM) were recused from the next item. The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **Seaport Square PDA NPC.** Andrea Leers (AL) noted significant improvements in response to comments; David Hacin (DH) also commended the changes made. Yanni Tsipis (YT) of WS Development presented an update with the latest responses, noting that the D-G Park concept, the midblock connectors, and relationship to the scale of the Fort Point buildings were three of the last issues discussed. He showed the proposal for modal setbacks, with various zones and defined spaces; all would return to the Commission for further review. He showed a diagram taken along Congress Street. YT: The height of the Boston Wharf Company buildings are about 70-80'. So the podium heights here will match that, and will be strong enough at the corner to make the relationship clear. (Shows views down various streets.) We will have setbacks which vary along the street in response to what they

face. We have emphasized the through-block connections. (Shows a new diagram; shows examples of 'expressed' passageways such as 175 High Street, the Juilliard, and more.) Regardless of the height of the space behind, the presence of a public passageway is signified in the public realm. YT then displayed a list of the changes made during the course of BCDC and BPDA review, noting improvements such as: the enhanced stairs; the variation of the singular open space concept into one where the nature of the spaces vary, becoming more of a network; the revised space in the center; the Autumn Lane improvements; and, the highly modified Parcel F building. YT: Review now is only at the Master Plan level; each will return for review. I'd like to take a moment to say thank you, and thanks for the time dedicated by the Commissioners to improve the Project.

AL: The thing to watch for as you bring the buildings forward is the streetwall on the block 'exterior.' Those will need to be real setbacks. Your intentions are sound; the devil is in the details. I appreciate your taking Autumn Lane seriously...it started as a lost cause. Let things be more natural and flexible in their use. DH: I echo all of that. I particularly like the engagement of G Block with F Park. I hope that is fully realized, too. It's an opportunity at the heart of the development, and of the entire area, even with BTB's desires. Deneen Crosby (DC): I agree. How the spaces and buildings evolve will be exciting. DH: I appreciate your design-forward approach as well. DC: The two plaza spaces (on F) - I'm thinking of that linear effect, the layering you show. YT: It was a response to comments. MD: Making sure it is read as a public space, and not just a space with offerings to the public, is key. I'm very encouraged by your progress. I'm not sure we have a quorum...? DAC: We will take a vote with those present, and ratify next month (in December) with a fifth Commissioner as we've done in the past. Hearing no public comment, it was then moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the proposed PDA Plan and conceptual designs for the Seaport Square Project Notice of Project Change within the South Boston Waterfront District, with the continuing condition that all remaining Parcels included in the PDA (and any significant changes to prior approvals) return to the BCDC for further review and vote as designs proceed.

LE returned; DM remained recused from the next item. The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **Huntington Theater Residential Project**. MD noted that the suggested vote would be for the Project, with the request that the West Wing return for an update. BK Boley (BK) of Stantech noted that the last BCDC comments on the tower building in Committee included the canopy, pinch points at the entry, pedestrian flows, and the transparency of the tower glass...the Boston Preservation Alliance also had noted some issues. He showed canopy precedent images. BK: We are now proposing a simple canopy that slightly tilts up, allowing the entry also to come out slightly - which resolves the pinch at the vestibule. We have deferred study of the signage that would go with it. (Shows impact on a plan.) On the facade (shows a modestly colored version, then one less colored but preferred by the client), we are considering a metal that will change, and a frit on the glass. (Shows more view studies, a birds-eye, the same at night.) On the sidewalk (shows site plan), we have removed the trees in front of the theater to maximize the width of the sidewalk in front. Scott Aquilina (SA) of Bruner Cott then noted the need for the theater to relocate its program. He showed a loading diagram. SA: We can no longer load directly from the street, so we have to load off-street via the alley. The loading requires a high space in the rebuilt west wing building, and an elevator which gets up to the stage area. The entire program would take a building of 100'. (Shows diagrams of the programs

needed in the building and their relationships.) We are proposing just 90'; we will find some space elsewhere. (Shows initial thoughts, noting skylights at the top.)

LE: Are we approving the west wing tonight? MD: We are approving the overall Project. We will request that the resolution of the west wing and its mitigation will return for an update, and the signage resolution. DC: On the pavement, for the section without the trees, I would just bring the pavement out to the curb. LE: We haven't seen that canopy.... BK: We did look at variations on the entry, and some canopy precedent ideas. LE: The theater has balconies, and I love the large balcony with the view back to the City. The canopy is not quite at the same plane, it's slightly off. I like the geometry and the lighting. The datum is just slightly off. DH: The Project has really evolved. The relationship to the historic building has improved, the pinch point is improved. Furniture in front of the [tower] windows is less of an issue here, but I like the metal and frit approach. I wonder if the folded curtain idea isn't a part of the last idea, and not a part of this one. All together, it feels like a *lot* - you could consider a simpler glass wall. BK: When we modeled it as flat, it became a lot more commercial feeling. DH: I feel comfortable enough that you're in the right zone. AL: What you're doing with the glass above - keep going. It's west-facing; you want continuity, for when people draw the shades. The canopy will take as many tries. Right now, it's too deep...the width and position could be looked at. It feels close to the other balconies, but should not be part of the balcony 'system.' BK: We looked at variations, such as all glass, etc. AL: I saw in Dallas a museum with just a plate steel canopy, its structure hidden. Keep working. DC: Mind yourself on the space and trees.

Tim Scofield (TS) introduced himself as the attorney for the abutter. TS: I'm here not to oppose, we support the Project, but the west wing was recently added. Many of our units are dedicated to denizens with mental health and other issues. This will be right on top of them. This will have a serious impact on their lives. The original filing makes it clear that the developer is not responsible for the theater, but the name is part of the Article 80 application. From my client's perspective, it's hard to have a conversation. They should not be allowed to add this on at this late date. You should ask them to come back. Greg Galer (GG) of the Preservation Alliance: We share some of that concern about the west wing. We still think the [tower] building is large for the area. And we thank the team for their responses to our comments.

MD: Can we condition this? DAC: The current suggestion is to have the west wing return as an informational update. AL: I don't see any other way to resolve the issue, other than a lower building. MD: Can we condition the vote by removing the west wing? DAC: The west wing is a necessary part of the theater program; they go together. It's an expansion of an existing structure. We could condition on return for review and approval of that element, but it's important for us to take a vote on the Project, since that is scheduled to go to the BPDA Board in November. DH: The [tower] building is already tall. The west wing was added, but maybe the tower could be taller if it accommodated to program of the annex. MD: The motion doesn't preclude that. More discussion ensued; Commissioners felt uncertain. DH suggested returning the Project to Design Committee. DAC noted that the Commission overall seemed supportive, and the two [tower and theater with annex] are integral. DAC: The BPDA Board is likely to act, and returning to Committee is not a good option; the BCDC may lose its leverage. Mary Marshall, counsel for the theater, noted recent progress on the west wing, and their intention to continue the dialogue on the west wing. LE: I appreciate that, but we have not had the opportunity to look into this in depth. A long back and forth ensued on this topic. A motion

was made to send to Committee again, and then modified to express support, but ask that the team study the alternatives discussed (including building below grade, combining loading docks, and placing more program in the tower with a little added height) and return for a vote in a month. This modified motion was seconded, and it was

VOTED: Despite strong support for the tower and site design and the theater restoration, the Commission recommends that the proposed Huntington Theater Residences Project return to Design Committee for a month for further study focused on the ‘West Wing’ annex, including the possibilities of building below grade, combining loading docks, and placing more program in the tower with a little added height.

The next item was a presentation of the **70 Leo M. Birmingham Parkway Project**. The team had not brought a projector, and so a delay ensued while one was obtained. In the meantime, Paul introduced the Project and himself as the owner. Gary Hendren (GH) of Hendren Associates first noted the locus, using birds-eye and plan format aerials. He showed views of the proposal looking east (toward Lincoln) and south (toward WGBH) along Leo Birmingham, noting the corner element at Lincoln. He showed the site plan. GH: The entry is off of Leo Birmingham because of the circulation forced around the larger block otherwise. GH then showed the upper floor plans, and views taken from different vantage points. He noted adjacencies on a model.

LE: In Committee, I'd like to know more about Centola Street and the Park. How do pedestrians use the area? Did you think of parking accessed from Centola? I'd like to understand the interface from the Park side. DM: Is that a public street? GH: Yes, it's only 20' wide. An entry there would take away prime residential units. LE: I'd like to understand more about that. DC asked about the parking lot; GH showed the plan.

DH: I understand why you wouldn't want the lobby there, but I'm not sure about its location relative to the core. I understand the idea of the corner, but the curve is also an opportunity. AL: This is a very simple planning approach, but articulated in a lot of ways - stepping the mass, the curve, the corner. That seems a lot for a building of this scale. The stepping and the curve seem to work, but I would resist the corner. Face one street or another. I like David's idea of an entry at the curve. Also, the corner hovers - *looms* - above the adjacent houses. DC: It would be good to have a building on that [opposite] corner. MD: That would help if we knew more about the corner. DM: For me, it's not just the curb cut and parking access off of Leo Birmingham. I question the [ground floor] units *on* Leo Birmingham. I get your issue on Centola, but think it's possible to rearrange that. There are a lot of pedestrians here - the New Balance folks jog to the River. You have a whole edge here...maybe there are amenities along it. LE: It's not a commercial street, nor a residential. It's a thoroughfare. DC: Thinking about Leo Birmingham, more people are using that. GH: We followed *Complete Streets*, continuing that strip. With that, and hearing no public comment, the 70 Leo M. Birmingham Parkway Project was sent to Design Committee.

DM returned. The next item was a presentation of the **Harvard Business School G2 (Harvard Commons) Pavilion**. Andrew O'Brien (AOB), Director of Operations at HBS, introduced the Project and team. He noted the G2 Pavilion as it was conceived during the Klarman Hall review, noting the agreed-upon constraints. AOB: In 2015, we decided to abandon the idea of

expansion of the Klarman Hall student use program; we then reduced the footprint, and worked on an open air pavilion. Adrian Nial (AN) of Reed Hilderbrand presented the design, first comparing the footprint to that of the old Burden Hall building. AN: You had suggested we think of it as a pavilion, and we have just that. As we went from a footprint to a pavilion, that allowed us to develop an L-shape. That gives more space to Klarman Hall. It's closer to Kresge Way, but it's part of the spaces. Burden Hall's removal allows expansion of the lawn area of the Commons. (Notes grade change.) The area around the large oak tree is preserved...this Project builds out the pedestrian environment around Kresge Way.

Adam Amoroso (AA) of the Mass Design Group: We worked on a response that would address the scaling elements of the area, but also create spaces. The lower pavilion is 12' high; the upper pavilion 17'. (Shows photos of a mock-up.) We are testing materials, color. We are creating a bright space, connecting to the surrounding nature, but also offering protection. (Shows details.) We are using curved, laminated glass on both pavilions [roofs], and also a laminated panel on the smaller. Fritted glass with an etched surface allows patterning from the tree shadows. The walls on the lower are of diffused glass, which allow light, but define the space, offering a little privacy. LE: Is any part enclosed? AA: No. DC: Is it connected underground? AA: No. DH: This is great news. AA: It has no enclosure. AOB: It's all exits. AN: The base is all granite, the same as the Klarman base. The stairs are a bit lighter stone. The design allows flexibility for events and social interaction - food trucks, study tables, lawn furniture - and has a fire feature at one end. LE asked about the grades around the pavilion. AN pointed them out, noting the pavilion itself was flush. AOB: We are here to finish a conversation begun two years ago.

DH: This is the best part of the night. I'm glad you came to the conclusion that this was what the Campus needed. It's sculptural, and has a possibility with its modesty, elegance, and modernity. LE: The HBS is a very serious, enduring place. You are introducing a playful piece against all of that - it's wonderful. I think it will be a haven. I'm curious as to winter use. Thinking of the walls, and prevailing winds - in the shoulder season you could encourage their use as shelter walls. Maybe not orthogonal. Some forms were evocative of the North End Park pavilions; those have become a key element along the Greenway. I wonder if you've considered allowing it to hover, with materials that relate more, moderate the color and lightness. DC: The more transparent the better. I like that it opens up to Kresge Way. DM: It's a really nice project. The serenity here is really nice. The team has considered paths, connections. This is marvelous. AL: I like the two-level roof, surrounding the tree, making it off-center. It's a beautiful counterpoint to the heavy symmetry around it. Are there lights? AOB: Uplights. With that, and hearing no comments from the public, a motion was suggested to approve the project - then seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the Harvard Business School G2 (Harvard Commons) Pavilion Project in the context of the HBS IMP, in the Allston neighborhood.

The next item was a Design Update presentation for the **Stavis Seafood (Massport Marine Terminal Parcel 5) Project**. Seth Riseman (SR) of Handel Associates thanked the Commission and noted the Project had been approved early in the year. SR: We have been brought in to improve the design. (Notes locus.) It's exciting to work on this, a light marine industrial project in Boston. SR then reprised the uses, noting Project comparisons (earlier vs.

now) both visually and using tables. He showed a view from the Harbor of the earlier design. SR: I know there was a lot of discussion about appearance and branding. There's been a change in the phasing sequence - the Stavis timing has slowed down, and the Phase 2 tenancy is going faster - which means secure ground floor truck bays. We take our architectural cues from nearby buildings, and the RLFMP Plan. (Shows precedents of buildings and graphics.) We are working with Massport on how you break down the scale. (Shows an aerial with the site plan; notes traffic access and the pedestrian paths to the entries.) The buildings are simple and robust. I'll highlight the key features that break down the scale - the three towers: two entries, and the mechanical plant. (Notes the work done on the landscape, and the fence requirement around the secure truck court.) DC: Did you consider reversing Stavis? SR: The resulting back-to-back truck courts made it too difficult. (Shows an axon of the site and buildings.) WE see the surfaces as opportunities for signage. We're using insulated metal panel on the north, and reinforced concrete on the south, so there's a contrast between the two. (Shows views, one inland, one from the water.) The towers are perforated metal, acting also as an HVAC screen. (Shows a view from FID Kennedy at Tide, noting the patterned concrete panels and the vertical elements.) The lower windows are for offices on the warehouse floor; the upper ones are offices. (Shows concrete panel and graphics precedents, plans of the building, elevations, a section.) We're using simple, robust forms.

Mark Klopfer (MK) of KMDG: We looked at industrial landscapes - at MIT, for example. The industrial aesthetic should apply to the groundscape. Some stone is on the site. We might use other things, like yellow bollards or taxiway lights. The area immediately outside of the entry will be more informal, the benches backless so they could be used as tables. Straightforward plantings, simple moves, rough groundcover. Plantings that offer scale (like poplars) and grow quickly. The fence at the truck court is crenellated (folded) in plan, so it will produce moire patterns. (Shows precedents.)

DM: There's a lot of really nice improvements, including the density. I have a site plan question. At the IDB, thousands come to work on the Silver Line. And there's far more pedestrian activity than ever before. Why is there surface parking on the south? Why can't that be in the center? Most people park in the EDIC garage. There's a transformation to sidewalks that more people actually use. LE: I want to second that comment. It seems like on FID Kennedy, you'd want to bring the edge closer. I agree; this is the time to get the building to relate to FID Kennedy. There are four zones of vehicular accommodation. If they were in the middle of the block, it would be a better urban condition. SR: That was our instinct as well. We tried to shift Stavis, but that didn't work. Right now, *that* is what Massport will allow on the site. This does not preclude something more in the future. DM: I like Linda's notion. You can set up a less suburban standard, and give more pedestrians access to the water. DH: You could also move the parking to the Harbor, otherwise not changing the scheme. That would allow a larger site in the future. Or just convenience parking on FID Kennedy, with the landscape (which I like). SR noted the unbuildable area. DH: It doesn't change. SR: We can ask Massport to consider.

DH: The other thing is the 5th facade - the roof. AL: Once you've decided Phase 2 is three stories. That might be causing questions, since you rotated the scheme. We understand the sideways approach. What if you thought of it in line, closer to the street? SR: And the buildings are oriented that way. But we couldn't fit in the secure area. MK: In this orientation, there's a better pedestrian flow continuing Tide Street. AL: Once you turned, it would be great to move closer to the street. MD: We would welcome you back with another update. DC: I

like the landscape, but please don't plant trees that will just die. I like the fencing and the graphics. MD: Thanks for your presentation. (No action was taken, or necessary.)

The next item was a presentation of the **Exchange South End Project** on the Flower Exchange site. A model was placed on the table. Larry Grossman (LG) of Stantec presented the design, first noting the location. LG: This is proposed as a mixed-use project, potentially including lab, life sciences, headquarters, large users with campus attributes. The zoning allows 1.6 million SF. A portion of the site is on the highway, so it has great visibility. We are creating an acre of open space. An access drive was created for BioSquare; we are looking to connect it [to the I-93 frontage road]...this is an opportunity to weave smaller streets into the site as well. The Flower Exchange is a 1971 industrial building - in the late 1880s, it was wharves. A large culvert remains, bisecting the site. The height range we've split between office and laboratory; the market will determine which is where. There's a 5% civic/innovation/cultural space requirement, about 30,000 SF. The parking will be below grade, at a ratio of 0.7 cars/1000 SF; the soils are all marine clay, 35' down. Density for the PDA is 6.5 FAR. (Shows the overall area and the site in a birds-eye view, then in plan, noting the proposed bike trail.) We are talking about how to bring the bike trail through the site. The BioSquare garage (there's a sidewalk) is currently private, not public, serving BioSquare. The character of the Albany Street edge is masonry, with punched openings.

The site is not an established building address, so we've phased the project, and have buildings of different sizes. (Shows transportation easements proposed, on a site plan.) We want to connect to the frontage road on both sides of the site. East Dedham will connect locally. We're using the culvert easement as a service road. (Shows a massing diagram.) The mass is to the back, well off of Albany. The 1-acre open space - the podium becomes a part of that space, a cultural anchor; we are talking to the community about their desires and needs. We did a solar study, and propose shifting the mass differently from the height restrictions. The same neighborhood people that opposed the Harrison Albany Project like this, because of the step-down toward the neighborhood, and the height at the highway. The lobbies all face [what we call] Albany Green. LE: The setback on the left is not aligned on the plan...what is the reason? LG: Not a good one. There's an allee of trees leading to the civic entry. There's a lot of porosity. Service comes off of the service drive easement. The site works without the connection to Frontage Road, a state road. We're not sure whether C or D will go first, but we won't need both garage ramps shown. (Shows community space diagrams, with distribution of the 30,000 SF required.) LE: What's the phasing of Albany Green? LG: We think we need to create a sense of place, so it should be with the first. AL: Are all the garages separated? LG: C and D are together. We need an iconic treatment at the end of the Albany Green space. There could be subsidized retail... we're looking at a range of ideas.

Chris Matthews (CM) of MVVA: We conceptualized the space as extending through the buildings - not literally, with stripes, but that's the idea. The challenge is getting enough sunlight. Getting [Building A] down was key. We have the idea of creating a tree canopy, a kind of roof to the space. I think we'll find old granite seawall, so we'll use that. Multiple spaces will allow multiple events. There's a drop-off on the woonerf, a quiet space in the back, and retail spaces spilling out. The earth mound is about 3-4' high. The lawn is similar to the acre at Post Office Square. There'll be playful water. DH: Why is there so much hardscape? CM: There'll be a lot of people, and a lot of programming, so we needed a treatment that wouldn't be destroyed...one that is indestructible, in a way. (Shows similar spaces as

precedents.) The 'Quiet Garden' space is the most intimate, but it's a little diagrammatic. We want it to be safe, so we're establishing front-to-back sight lines. LG: This is an assemblage of buildings, with some relationship...terra cotta, curtainwall elements. There's a question about whether this is seen as a Project or a Master Plan. DAC: Both. We're asking for the simple approval of all components since the phasing is unknown. But this can be [in that sense] like Seaport Square. LG then finished with building elevations and views.

DH: I'm skeptical about approving all the architecture. Through circumstance and planning, only one street continues into the site. East Canton is a kind of chicane. The strategy of building height is smart, with the focal point of a community space. The trouble is with Building B, how it addresses Plympton Street. How that terminates, so it feels less like an edge.... Once you've decided to break the height, why not do more? Do the same on B, and weave the Project massing more into the neighborhood. It does feel very different, in terms of use and materials, against the historic district. AL: I appreciate a lot about the building plane...how you move through it, its use, how you circulate through. It's campus-like; there's movement. It's really sound. Think of it as more of a campus, rather than a set of commercial buildings. Right now, the buildings read each with its own character. Maybe arcades could be used as a character, or theme. An enclave, with the entries within. I agree with David. Three buildings are a part of the heights; one (B) is of two parts. Provide more continuity, rather than more difference. DH: One tower could be a marker; the other three more suppressed, perhaps. The transition [to the neighborhood] feels a little hard. AL: I don't think you need such a celebratory thing at the end of the space. The canopy of trees will be the marker.

DC: The open space is too zoned...think about it as one space, with continuity along the street edge. LE: I like that the open space arrives with the first building. That will make this space unforgettable. But I'm struggling with the central space. Deneen's compartmentalization, David's hardscape. There are a lot of elements; this should be clean, simple. Bring it all together. Striations as organization.... We're so hungry for green space. I assumed the striations were stormwater channeling, and was excited. But they're not. DC: Look at the scale of open spaces in the area. DH: The South End has one of the lowest neighborhood ratios for open space. If this is successful, there would be an audience for it. But I worry about it feeling like a hospital zone. LE: The whole building [at the space's rear] could be a backdrop, or a stage. MD: I'm not sure that a campus is the model; this should be more a public space. Benefits should accrue to the community here. I want to have that conversation - how this benefits the entire City. DM: I agree on the ground floor organization; that's smart thinking. I'm also not sure about it being more or less like a campus. The fear is really that it turns out like BUMC. You have all this texture across the street. Have a strong point of view! More campus? Can one piece be more eclectic? The story of innovation...how does the District tell that? DH: There's no T connection, so many will walk through the neighborhood. AL: What is the population? LG: Up to about 6,000 people. With that, and hearing no public comment, the Exchange South End Project was sent to Design Committee. AL left.

The next item was a presentation of the **125 Amory Street Project**. Noah Sawyer of The Community Builders introduced the Project: This is largely about stabilizing and creating affordable housing. There has been about two years of community process so far - and all before Article 80 started. Kendra Halliwell (KH) of ICON presented the design, first showing the location and noting nearby Jackson Square, noting the intention to create more than 300 new

units, and introducing Ian of the Copley Wolff Design Group. Ian showed an aerial of the existing site, noting the grade change and a BWSC easement. He showed earlier studies, then the current plan, including its connecting streets, including Northern and Western drives. Ian: Western connects at the back of the site. We are providing a lot of trees and connectivity, with a play lot toward Atherton Street. (Shows street sections.) We are setting back the fencing along Amory to meet Complete Street standards. (Goes through a series of site plan vignettes with precedent photos illustrating the design ideas.) KH then showed how the buildings worked with the site, noting each building, its height and entries (Building C has three). KH: The parking space you see at the PACE building is related to the senior services there. (Shows a birds-eye view.) The facade and designs relate to their placement and context. Building A relates to 125 Amory itself, a breaks in its facade and a step toward the abutter. Building B has a series of vertical expressions related to the Greenway. There's a step up at the corner to relate to Atherton (notes also the entry and the trellis). Building C is next to smaller residential structures; it's 4 stories stepping downhill and becoming 5. It has a series of volumes related to the residential scale, with the corner marking the entry; we're using playful colors. There's a community space at the base by the play area.

MD asked for building plans. KH showed some, noting Buildings A and B had parking below grade. She noted their ground floor entries and the unit plans above. DH: And the parking is enough for the buildings? KH: It's also along the streets. LE: And in lots - the one that's split. KH: That is serving the 125 Building. DH: The site plan is very smart. Where the lobbies and the streets are, feels logical and considered. I like the extensions of the neighborhood streets. On the architecture, there's a lot of things to talk about. Materials, windows.... I followed the logic of B and C. On Building A, perhaps that could be more industrial? There's still a lot going on. But it's a good project, it enhances the area.

LE: It's a great presentation, easy to follow. The entry thinking - your ideas really worked. On the roadways, the South and North drives are typical. Western is a different thing. What intrigues me the most, is that Western can extend beyond the site. I want to think about that section...can you manage the needed parking spaces by having parallel parking? If it can be thought of that way, it's more a resource, and less a parking bay. DC: If the parking were parallel, the linear park would feel more a part of the Project. Parking would make a big difference. The park connects to the Jackson T. MD: All the way to Forest Hills.... DC: Where you have the parking, I'm not sure where those facades are. LE: The model is helpful with the topography. Thank you. MD: I'm familiar with the site. The bikeway...the idea of the connecting street. I appreciate the Amory improvements. David suggested more variety in the buildings, but I'm not sure. B and C have a shared language. A, less so. I think it's very successful. With that, and hearing no public comment, the 125 Amory Street Project was sent to Design Committee.

The next item was a presentation of the **Mattapan Station Project**. David Saladik (DS) of the MASS Design Group introduced the team present, and presented the design. He first showed an aerial with the site, pointing out Mattapan Square. DS: This is an MBTA parking lot, and there is a stipulation that they retain 50 spots. We are working with the T and the community, where we have strong support. It's just an empty space, an eyesore now. (Notes site boundary.) The street on the site is a dedicated T busway. We proposed converting that to a public street...that's

an ongoing discussion. But the lease line may be rewritten. There is also a 20' MWRA easement, which acts as a southern building boundary. (Notes program for the development. Shows an axonometric on the site plan. Notes the separation of the second phase. Notes that the T operations must continue uninterrupted through construction.) We're proposing 6 stories. There's an urban street edge along River Street. There are two connections to access the T (and the Neponset Greenway). There is also a connection to a pedestrian path through the City lot across the street; we want to strengthen that. (Shows connections through the building.) The community would love a café or restaurant.

LE: Did the MBTA require parking *there*? DS noted the circulation through the site, a kind of short circuit [avoiding the busway]. He pointed out the entry into the [below-grade] garage, and showed the site section, noting the grade change. DS: There's a possible farmers' market site, and a community room toward the back. The ground floor along River Street has a pedestrian connection through - part of, or next to, the lobby - we are working on that. DS then showed the Phase 2 circulation [mostly parking at grade], upper floor plans, a perspective taken down River Street (notes inflection), a street section along the main connection, a plan showing the Greenway and the connection to it, a frontal view along River, a view of the plaza in the rear, a view down the connection corridor, and a view looking up from the Greenway entry.

DM: This is terrific. The planning is really smart and clever. We just saw two projects with high affordability. Both with parking below grade, and attention to pathways. This is a really good Project, planned well. The road next to the busway is out of your control. I understand the plaza grade. The architecture is straightforward and simple - it feels fresh and bright. DC: The bus loop concerns me, because of the connection to the Station and the Greenway. You should be pushing the MBTA. It's a significant safety concern. DS: Right now, the buses fly around that. What we've tried to do is limit the crossings, and have them well-lit and signed. There'll have to be a perception shift for the drivers - this is not a speedway.

DH: I want to echo David's comment. Every decision reinforces the other. I worry a little about the public passage through the building...the landscape design doesn't seem fully fleshed out, but the architecture feels fine. DS: We've gone through many iterations; there are a lot of stakeholders. Landscape is the next step. DC: I'm happy to see more space along River Street - it sets a precedent for others. LE: The setback from River is good. The landscape architecture isn't set yet, but the bones are there. The other piece...there could be a great relationship between the outdoor space and the community space. That whole zone could be wonderful. I worry about the gash through the middle.... Think about how you screen the parking. I encourage the same on the north, so it feels like it's own courtyard. DH: I wonder if it couldn't be a powerful graphic, a deliberate intervention. An element that makes it cool. LE: More playful. MD: I agree. This is brilliant. I'm very familiar with this site. And I welcome MASS Design to the BCDC. I'd encourage pedestrians to go along River into the Square...less so, through the lot. Keep in mind the Mattapan edge. DH: The Phase 2 aspect is great.

Commissioners discussed briefly and it was suggested that the Project could be approved. Hearing no public comment, it was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the proposed Mattapan Station Project at 466 River Street on the Mattapan Trolley Station property a half block from Mattapan Square, in the

Mattapan neighborhood.

There being no further items for formal discussion, a motion was made to adjourn, and the meeting was duly adjourned at 10:06 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was scheduled for December 5th, 2017. The recording of the November 7th, 2017 Boston Civic Design Commission meeting was digitized and is available at the Boston Redevelopment Authority.