

DRAFT MINUTES

**BOSTON CIVIC DESIGN COMMISSION**

The meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was held on Tuesday, November 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2015, starting in the BRA Board Room, 9<sup>th</sup> Floor, Boston City Hall, and beginning at 5:23 p.m.

Members in attendance were: Michael Davis (Co-Vice-Chair); Linda Eastley, David Hacin, Andrea Leers, David Manfredi, Paul McDonough (Co-Vice-Chair), William Rawn, Daniel St. Clair, and Lynn Wolff. Absent were Deneen Crosby and Kirk Sykes. Also present was David Carlson, Executive Director of the Commission. Representatives of the BSA were present. Michael Cannizzo was 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 Monday, October 19, in the BOSTON HERALD.

The first item was the approval of the October 6<sup>th</sup>, 2015 Meeting Minutes. A motion was made, seconded, and it was duly

**VOTED: To approve the October 6<sup>th</sup>, 2015 Boston Civic Design Commission Meeting Minutes.**

Votes were passed for signature. David Manfredi (DM) was recused from the next item. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Emmanuel College Julie Hall Project**. David Carlson (DAC) noted that the Julie Hall Project was over 260,000 SF, but as a significant IMP Project, review was also a condition of the BCDC recommendation to approve the IMP. Review was therefore recommended. It was quickly moved, seconded, and

**VOTED: That the Commission review Emmanuel's Residence Hall (Julie Hall) Project on Brookline Avenue in the Emmanuel College Institutional Master Plan area, in the Longwood Medical Area.**

DM returned. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **1235-1237 VFW Parkway Project**. DAC noted that, at 104,000 SF, the Proposed Project was over the BCDC review threshold and review was recommended. A motion was made, seconded, and it was

**VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed 1235-1237 VFW Parkway Residential Project, at the intersection of Gardner Street, in the West Roxbury neighborhood.**

DM and Lynn Wolff (LW) were recused for the next item. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Siena at Ink Block Project**. DAC reported that this was the amended other half of the building that was split to form (first) the Sepia condominiums. DAC: No individual figures were given, but this is a component of a Project (the Ink Block) that totals over 500,000 SF, and confirmatory review is recommended. With that, it was moved, seconded, and

**VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the ‘Siena’ (Building #5) at the corner of Albany and Traveler streets in the Ink Block Project in the South End neighborhood.**

DM and LW returned. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Washington Village Project at 235 Old Colony Avenue**. DAC noted that, at over 800,000 SF, the Proposed Project was well over the BCDC review threshold (and in one of the Special Study areas, PLAN:Dot Ave) and review was recommended. A motion was made, seconded, and

**VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed Washington Village Project at 235 Old Colony Avenue in the South Boston neighborhood.**

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **25 Fid Kennedy Avenue Project**. DAC noted that, at 157,000 SF, the Proposed Project was over the BCDC review threshold. But the proposal was to bring back an industrial use to an industrial building, and the building was being treated basically as a rehabilitation, with no substantive changes to the facade (except to make it look like new, because new materials were required due to the toxic nature of the original building cladding, and the windows were no longer useable). With so little change, and the industrial area of the BMIP around it, NO review was recommended. A motion was made, seconded, and it was

**VOTED: That the Commission NOT review the schematic design for the proposed 25 Fid Kennedy Avenue Project on Parcel N in the Boston Marine Industrial Park.**

LW was recused for the next item. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Lewis Wharf Project**. DAC noted that, at 187,000 SF, the Proposed Project was over the BCDC review threshold and review was recommended. A motion was made, seconded, and it was

**VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed Lewis Wharf Project in the North End Waterfront.**

LW remained recused, and DM was also recused for the next item. The next item was a report from the Design Committee on the **Boston Garden Phase One Project**. Bill Rawn (WR): David Hacin (DH), Kirk Sykes and I met last, with a focus on Champions Row. We all preferred the scheme that was asymmetrical, with the stairs and escalators to the side and the mezzanine moved back as far as possible. The model we see here seems more centered - so we should talk about this. Doug Gensler (DG) of Gensler Associates: The dimensions were as shown.... WR: The Project was recommended back for discussion without prejudice. DH: The sense of view, opening up was best with this scheme...opening up earlier to the larger sequence of arrival in the City. Coming in around the sides, with different uses, the asymmetry felt comfortable. MD: We are all very familiar with this, so please go right to the changes. DG: So, no preamble. (Shows the entry, then the lighting. Notes the arrival, the view of the space, their notion of a dynamic lighting strategy.) These are the drivers of Champions Row, like the pedestrian circulation. (Shows pedestrian traffic diagrams, queuing for an event vs. the commuter flow, and how that might be managed.) The space left at the mezzanine is the minimum needed to operate it safely. (Shows plans - mezzanine, then the ground floor. Shows queuing and circulation a different way, notes the program to the sides, indicates the garage elevators. Shows a section. Shows where they were, then where they are today, in comparison views from the same viewpoint taken from the SW corner of the space. Shows a diagram indicating the 'stitch' into the North Station terminal.) Light is conceived as part of the structure and architecture, using the ceiling, the stair, the escalator. We have a simple, framed floor with glass block at the mezzanine. (Shows a series of views heading out, and then in.)

DH: That's an important view (indicates one), looking out. There's a connection to the outside, and to Canal, looking out. Linda Eastley (LE): You've done an admirable job in presenting this over several meetings. There is much that's positive for the public realm. When Bill suggested the stair shift, I was hopeful...but not quite convinced. It's not the size nor scale of space that this venue needs. DH: Is that a solvable problem within the framework? LE: It might help, but I feel like this should be as wide as the street. WR: The reason I was focusing on the asymmetry, was that opened it up as much as possible, to ensure that the passage was commodious. DH: I completely respect what Linda was saying, the correlation between Canal and the space. That *was* brought up, even in the last meeting of the process. But progress *has* been made. Anything that could be done to reduce the stairs would be good...right now, they flare. MD: We could ask the staff to maximize that reduction. I feel compelled to take this to a vote. DH: I move to approve with the condition that the stair, escalator, etc. be positioned in such a way as to emphasize the asymmetry. This was seconded, and it was (by a vote of 4-1-1)

**VOTED:**      **That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for Phase One of 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 the stair, escalator, etc. be positioned in such a way as to emphasize the asymmetry, and with the continuing condition that each additional Phase and interim condition return to the Commission for further review and vote.**

DM and LW remained recused. Andrea Leers (AL) arrived. The next item was a presentation of **Boston Garden Phases Two and Three**. MD noted the time: Please, be brief. Melissa Shrock (MS) of Boston Properties: I will. In the residential building to the west, we have 440 units ranging in sizes. We have a 260-key hotel, with the flag not identified yet. The office is 525,000 SF. The idea is to build them all simultaneously, with a rolling construction. She then turned to the design team. Devon Patterson (DP) of SCB presented the residential tower, noting the 'urban window' diagram, with the lower hotel turned 90 degrees. He showed views and a site analysis. DP: We developed the idea of angling the edges of the tower, based on maximizing the views. Then, amenity serves as an organizing factor: at the podium level, a dog run. The amenity floor, with a lawn to the east. Finally, a pool at the top. We cut back at the top and ground, and expressed at the mid-level. Balconies were added as well, creating more corners. (Shows an elevation diagram, noting the composition of elements.) This is a glass building; in this market, we have floor-to-ceiling glass. There are two different facades, with a gradient pattern in the center area; these are metal elements going up the building adding a dynamic quality (shows material choices). We did a similar building (shows, as precedent) on the north side of Chicago. (Shows a skyline view taken from the Zakim.) This building is slim, with a bluish glass; 500' is as high as we could get; it's a beacon. (Shows views looking up from Causeway - from the SE, then from the SW. Notes the landscaping will be visible.)

JF Finn (JF) of Gensler presented the hotel design. JF: We are further behind on the hotel, because there is no flag yet. The hotel will actively program their public space atop the podium, which is at the height of much of the Bulfinch Triangle. The office tower is a different building, a Gateway building at the corner. We see them as parts that fit together, but with different personalities. The tower is as far east as we could push it, given the limitations of the Green and Orange lines below. We are marketing to the tech customer, and are inspired by the heritage of trains and transportation infrastructure. At the top, we are doing double duty with the HVAC (compares to other iconic towers in the City; repeats the structural elements composition diagram). A LEED Platinum rating is required, but it is also our goal. The top expresses its structure, but also contains PV panels. (Shows a lighted view to suggest the potential, and then views at a distance. Notes the grouping of two towers, plus the third at the Nashua Street Residences project. Shows views on Causeway, then more distanced views.)

LE: Talk a little bit more about the ground plane when you return. When we saw the Avalon Project, we talked about that a lot. MD: Also, show your podium level treatment there. DH: A couple of quick comments. First, I just want to compliment your urban window concept, with light and air. But you do see the blank, blunt end of the hotel, looking up from Champions Row. At the residential tower, develop some sense of, some of the building coming to the ground. The two towers look almost the same height - I'm not sure if it was the FAA. If something could be done to elevate the office, maybe. And provide more vertical emphasis. Your Chicago tower looks very nice, but I would hate to think of this as a copy of that one. WR: The challenges of the (office) building are immense. The sides are...identical. So square. It adds to the blockiness of the building. What kind of imperative is behind this? I'm not sure that the corners help. I want to understand how your building avoids being simply a glass mirror during

the day. Its graining. And details, to explain in Committee. AL: I want to see this as part of an ensemble, including the base. A composition of four.... The residential is slender, glass - the cap as a separation seems less successful. The hotel, I can't quite tell. It looks darker; I'm not sure if that's related to the base. The office is the least successful; it's too related to the residential, like a stockier version of it, and the corners don't help that. This has a different purpose. Look at skin strategies that wrap. If the strategy was to make (the office) look slimmer, that doesn't work. Some material wrapping around it might be better, given the proportion. I urge you to find ways to bring the tops of the two buildings closer together. MD: I think the top is the wrong language. Maybe it needs to open up more. With that, Boston Garden Phases 2 & 3 were sent to Design Committee.

DH left. DM and LW returned. The next item was a presentation of the **1235-1237 VFW Parkway Project**. Joseph Hanley (JH) of McDermott, Quilty and Miller introduced the Project, giving some history, and noting the Mayor's push toward housing. JH: This is a zoning-compliant Project. He introduced Jai Khalsa (JK) of Khalsa Design, and Blair Hines (BH), the landscape architect. JK first noted the site and locus, doing so again on an aerial, relating that to the vicinity. He showed photos of the context, looking along the edges and into the property. He then produced a site plan, noting the main building was broken into two buildings, and noting entries. JK: The driveway is one way in, with a drop-off. The back of the site drops almost one story; we take advantage to access the garage. We take advantage of this also to have elevated patios for the units. The main entry is off the front, and back. They are brother and sister buildings, with different use of similar elements. (Shows elevations, then views - first from the VFW, then along the edge, then from the back. Shows materials. Shows a view up Gardner. Shows more elevations, then sections, and plans.) There is one elevator in each building. BH introduced the landscape plan, noting they were maintaining the VFW Parkway, then emphasizing it, with plantings around the edges of the parking. He described the scheme briefly.

Daniel St. Clair (DS): This is a great Project; there's a lot you've done. I was looking for some context that might guide - such as a stronger presence along the VFW Parkway. The turnaround is a little odd. Push yourself on parking a little. And the pediments don't do you any favors; your smaller building is simpler. DM: The trouble with the drop-off is that it doesn't get you to the front door. Maybe it shouldn't be there at all, but inside of the 'L'. I'd like to see it more like the context regarding the landscaped edges of the VFW Parkway. You could strengthen that, and make it what you'd want it to be. You have good forms, but Daniel is right, the pediments don't do you any favors. MD: You're not on the edge of the city. And you've left FAR on the table. Parking is driving this; I know your IAG is likely doing that. You should have more units, less parking, and more presence on the VFW Parkway. And the balconies are relentless; the architecture is a background generic - the market is looking for a more contemporary approach. And high LEED rating. David is right - the landscape is an important aspect - that's an important connection to make. I think you're missing the mark(et) - be more creative. Some stepping, or other studies.

LE: What I'm curious about is the long (south) side of the building. You have Cow Pond, Millennium Park - but nothing talks about that connection. JK: The height is relative to the zoning; that's where the mass came from. LE: I understand, but I'm surprised that there are no

references to the landscape resources around you. MD: Are these market rate? JH: Yes. MD: It would be really helpful to have a rudimentary model. With that, the 1235-1237 VFW Parkway Project was sent to Design Committee.

DM and LW were recused from the next item. The next item was a presentation of the **Siena at Ink Block Project**. Ted Tye (TT) of National Development introduced the Project, noting that 1, 2, and 3 Ink were done, and 4 Ink (the 'Sepia') will open in a few weeks. 6 Ink (the AC Hotel) was recently approved. For the Siena, we originally had a single building that stretched almost the whole way. That changed with the Sepia; we are showing you the update. John Martin (JM) of Elkus/Manfredi presented the design. JM: It's a collection of buildings. The original plan (shows) was more of a wall. And the corner was vacant, and there was no retail. (Shows views and photos of the Sepia.) At the Siena, all of our massing, materials, and treatments are very similar. But we avoided the instinct to duplicate. All is per zoning - 100', 8 stories. (Shows an expanded site plan, noting the new Short Street connection adjacent to the garage entry.) We are treating this connection as a street. The interior street has the back facade, but it doesn't read as a back. (Shows precedent photos, many from the existing Ink Block. Shows a precedent image sheet.) We played up the notion of Siena, the banding on the Cathedral. Sepia was more the brownstone of the South End. This will be the highest price point - so we invoked fashion, a well-tailored suit. The balconies (shows a view from the Traveler/Albany corner) are inset here; at the Sepia they are outboard. (Shows a series of neighborhood views, then exterior elevations with sections as needed to describe. Shows line drawing perspectives, and whole section blowups. Notes the billboard.) On the billboard, we hope it will be removed when this opens.

LE: Do the balconies/planters face south on Traveler? Are they on the interior? JM: Yes. And I wanted to note the porcelain material used at the inset at the penthouse level. AL: I'm curious that you characterized this as your best location. JM: Highest price. But we think that evolved. And Traveler could be a very interesting street, continuing under the Expressway. We didn't think retail was apropos here. TT: The Troy has changed the neighborhood. (JM shows the program and entry area on the ground floor.) LE: I was surprised that the entry was so far toward the corner. And that you are emphasizing that rather than the other corner. The west (Short Street) elevation feels service-like; it's the least developed. JM: we felt that solids helped to offset the filigree of the glass and metal. The corner is a trash room. AL: I walk by this every day. It's amazing, like you are building a city. I like the collection of treatments. And I like the boldness of how this (the Sepia) is shaping up. Is that entry on Harrison? JM: Actually, it's the same. AL: The Siena seems to have a lot going on. It could be simpler. But coming across the service first isn't satisfying...I wonder if you considered flipping it. You have great views to the City. And the composition with the door seems a little graphic. Do a next version that's even better than the last.

WR: I think the Project is incredibly elegant. It's not easy to point to things.... I find the black/white thing powerful; I wonder why you hadn't carried it further. JM: This was the Herald Block, so B&W seemed a good metaphor. The white is in the same plane. But we can explore the idea more. AL: The Sepia has two materials, divided vertically.... WR suggested

and moved approval. MD checked for public comment. Mark Pasnik noted that he would agree with Andrea's comments - it's too complicated, there's too much going on. It could be stronger, simpler. WR's motion was then seconded, and it was

**VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the 'Siena' (Building #5) at the corner of Albany and Traveler streets in the Ink Block Project in the South End neighborhood.**

LW returned; DM remained recused from the next item. The next item was a presentation of the **Emmanuel College Julie Hall Project**. Sister Anne of Emmanuel thanked the Commissioners for their attention to Emmanuel's Project. Rayford Law (RL) of Elkus/Manfredi presented the design, first noting the locus, then showing views of the site, including the existing Julie Hall. He showed comparative versions of the IMP, the second showing the Proposed Project. He then showed the LMA Guidelines view and diagram, and a campus circulation diagram. He noted the notion of potentially opening up the residence hall to other institutions. He showed the basement and ground floor plans, noting the two control points and elevator cores. RL: The upper floor plans...the units are seen as quads, but more like 2-bedroom, to lure upperclassmen back. We have the ability to divide (lower floors) for a tenant institution. And we are creating a double-height space at the top. (Shows this, then a view from the St. Joseph and St. Ann dormitories. Notes the lightening of the material in the courtyard to provide light.)

DS: What are the heights of the elements? RL: 205' and 71' - they conform to the Guidelines. WR: So, you're leaving FAR on the table? RL: No FAR. There are only height guidelines in the area. DS: So, no more height on Brookline? RL: With extraordinary public benefits, we could ask.... LE: What percentage of students live on campus? Anne: Now it's about 76%, and up to 94% freshmen. This will up the figure to 84%. LE: So, there's not a target that's part of the IMP agreements? Anne: No. RL showed a view looking down Brookline, then a view from the administration building, showing the east edge of the building. MD: Does the notch indicate a program change? RL: No, but using it seemed to break down the scale. (Shows an aerial view, with the LMA in the background; shows photos of their model.) DS asked a question about the cant, and RL explained the strategy. RL then showed a view of the upper lounge, elevations, sections, and a stacking diagram - how a tenant might fit in. Then plans of standard rooms.

AL: Why did you propose building more than needed? A future need, or an income source? Anne: Not so much economics, but more the highest and best use. And the income helps. We wanted to maximize what we could do under the Guidelines. AL: Is it your goal to house all your students? Anne: This is designed to give us that flexibility. It's hard to tell where higher education will go. LW: I have a question about the reveal. I'm not sure why it comes in there. It doesn't add to the building, which should be more continuous. RL: We can look at it. But we wondered about coming straight down, on the campus. WR: Northeastern had a financial crisis. Here, your architects have given you a wonderful opportunity to have flexibility. On Lynn's point, it does effectively break the scale. One architect did it; many others are doing it. It's a very nice building. But the east facade needs work. And the mechanical at the top feels

heavy. MD: The swing building on Brookline is dynamic, interesting. We spent a lot of time with Goody Clancy looking at the ground floor, paths through the campus, the mix of uses at the ground, etc. LE: I wanted to strip away the trees from your view along Brookline, to understand that (relationship). And we don't understand enough about the outdoor space on your plinth. But this is an incredibly clever way to respond to the Mayor's admonition on student housing. AL: I like the contrast between the low volume and the tall one. The thing I'm less persuaded by is the strategy for the enclosure. The Brookline view - maybe more solid on the low part and more open, glassier on the taller. A lighter frame. The strength is in the contrast. Emphasize the difference...I would encourage looking at that. The interior is good. With that, the Emmanuel College Julie Hall Project was sent to Design Committee.

DM remained recused, and PM was recused from the next item. The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **380 Stuart Street Project**. WR and AL discussed the Project as the team set up. WR: On October 20<sup>th</sup>, there were three Commissioners who asked the Proponent to investigate things regarding options at the base. That was presented to us present the next week; we preferred the original concept, even though options were very well presented. Yanni Tsipis (YT) introduced the team and greeted the Commissioners as the model was being feverishly assembled. He showed a locus plan, noting several things which informed the design. YT: The network of spaces in the area - Stuart Street has no respite. The idea was to provide this. Brian Lee (BL) of SOM noted that the design was shaped in part by wind, and showed the diagram of building elements, and the notion of light bouncing through the lower floor. He noted the points raised in Committee - the nature of the access paths, and their destinations. He showed an axonometric with the preferred connection to Stanhope. BL: We looked at lightening up, and cutting back, and expressing the brackets, and a pinwheel asymmetry. In the end, we were dissatisfied - it felt unexpected, lopsided. And we also tried *nothing* at the pedestrian passage, with a high canopy. From these options, we showed a preference, very light, with glass at the top and frames only at either end. BL then showed their current variation, which thinned out the original - opening it up more, but with the same forms. BL: This is more 'public meets private.' He then showed views and studies along both sides, from the alley. A view of the Stuart sidewalk. Skyline views, one at night. Then a series of views from different neighborhoods, including the South End, Cambridge, Copley Square, etc.

AL: Thank you for looking so thoroughly at the ground plan. Is the plan the same? YT: With the exception of the restaurant, yes. We have strengthened that. MD: There are multiple entry points? YT: Yes. AL: Back to the modified proposal...this is much lighter. We had discussed the two paths. It would be nice to have the top light coming down, not touching the (adjacent) building. More in scale with the rest of the building. No studies at the top? BL showed a more articulated sketch model, which showed details, and notions such as gutter troughs to capture the edge. BL: The lower terrace is more articulated. Also, we have begun working on (associated details). DS: I appreciate all the work you've done. It still looks a bit like a starship has crashed between buildings...it doesn't feel like it responds to the context. LW: I *really* like the sculptural base. It needs to be *substantial*. BL noted the notion of the podium base and top. MD: The civic gesture - isn't really a civic gesture. But you've managed to make that deliver. This will be looked back upon as great architecture. WR: This is appropriately contextual for

the street, but it does it in an interesting way. More projects like this would improve the area. LE: On Stuart, there is a feeling of motion - the arch, springing - a clue to explore, along the edges. And now lightness. AL: To pile on, the development of the curtainwall is very subtle. It will immediately stand out. MD: Comments from the public? Rachel Slade: There are very thick corners. I worry about that thickness. YT: The structure does come down, and the arch ends in a thrust block. With that, it was moved, seconded, and

**VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the 380 Stuart Street Project, on the block bounded by Stuart, Clarendon, and Berkeley streets and Stanhope Street / Alley 559, in the commercial section of the Back Bay neighborhood.**

DM and PM returned. The next item was a presentation of the **Washington Village Project**. David Chilinski (DChil) of Prellwitz Chilinski Associates presented the design. DChil: This is a program presented deliberately as a diverse group of building types. Workforce housing, but also affordable, with market rate in the higher buildings. A blend of rental and ownership. David (of CORE) invested in this site a few years ago, and has been engaging with the Andrews Square Association - they have their own 2005 Master Plan. They wanted a vibrant neighborhood meeting place. There is a variety of building types, but this is really focused on the commercial. DChil noted the locus, and the residential walking radius (to commercial uses).

He noted the extent of the BRA study area. He noted the site on an aerial photograph, and the uses that used to be in those buildings - which make it difficult to go below grade for parking. DChil: The idea is to bring Alger Street all the way through. There are a number of new connections to Damrell, Old Colony, and Dorchester Street. But also Tuckerman Street, which is good and bad news for those neighbors. So now there is a pedestrian connection to Tuckerman, and no connection to Middle Street, so as not to disrupt the neighborhood. (Shows a streetwall diagram, and the idea of creation of the Square.) Here (at the Square), Alger is a shared street. (Notes the changing of the Square via programming, using model insets on a study model. Notes the same on a larger model. Shows precedents.) Of the 5 acres on the site, half are streets or open space. (Shows a chart of the buildings and types.) The scale of the block with the two towers is driven by the size of the grocery store. These two parking structures take care of the parking needs in the other buildings. There is an up/down drugstore at the corner of Old Colony and Dorchester; a fitness center, a daycare. A series of services that don't exist in the neighborhood, some of which don't need a ground floor presence. (Goes through the project's overall plans and sections. Shows views - aerials, with limited context. Street level views. Notes a 5-foot grade change up to Middle Street. Notes likely phasing.)

Paul McDonough (PM): How will this be regulated? Are you seeking approval of all? DM: This is a big picture, and there's a bigger plan that's going to evolve. Dot Ave will become an important street in the City. And Broadway has more people than Newbury. So we have to think about this in that context. I understand the difficulties of the site, of going underground. But I find it hard to accept anything on the ground floor that's parking...I'm troubled by parking on the ground floor. *Every block* is going to transform. Moakley Park is so important...and *every* street has to engage. The porosity, the scale of the blocks, the uses - all are convincing.

MD: I'm working in a breathtaking lack of context here. How does Andrews Square work with all of this? I'd like to know what PLAN:Dot Ave is. DChil: We have been discussing that with staff. DM: I suspect that's a ways off. DAC: We are at the beginning stages, but we may have a framework that can help.

AL: I'm interested in what the BRA is thinking, for parking. I'm not convinced that residential works as an idea, going through floors of parking. MD: The Red Line capacity has to be part of the thinking. You can't solve all on just that. LE: I'm interested in the BRA thinking about the street grid...it's chaotic. A mews, street, etc. I appreciate the spaces of the precedents; Rockefeller Center is very public. But (your) open space is too hidden. And the street's character changes - it's a mews street, and Alger becomes a parking lot. DChil: Part of the thinking is to introduce an open space; there is none in the study area. WR: Linda's notion of a street network bears discussion. It would be good to see what's happening across Damrell. What is thinking for the area? And what happens to the industrial uses? Joe Hanley (JH): That 2005 study was remarkable, for a citizens' group. And we've incorporated many of those ideas. WR: A lot of what you've done has been well worked out. There's a lot of detail. But what's across the street? DM: You can't think of Damrell Street as the west end of your Project. You have to think of what *will* happen. WR: Old colony is residential, with that scale on three corners. Dot Ave is where you might place the height. But you're having fun.... DChil: The engagement with the community has been fascinating. The Andrews Square folks are looking elsewhere and saying, "When are *we* getting some of *that*?" JH noted an older proposal for 501 Dorchester Ave. DS: Maybe you should show how that fits. A discussion ensued about how best to work with the BRA to ensure the BCDC understands the background for the Project (DAC suggested a staff in-process update), and it was voted to send the Washington Village Project to Design Committee.

LW was recused from the next item and left. The next item was a presentation of the proposed **Lewis Wharf Project**. Will Adams (WA) of JW Capital Partners introduced the team and Proposed Project. He noted the locus, describing the site based on an aerial plan view, then a birds'-eye view of existing conditions. He noted the Boston Sailing Center, currently mostly on a Louisiana riverboat. WA gave a quick historical context, noting an 1887 grant, and showing a 1980s aerial with dilapidated structures. WA: In the Harborpark Plan, and the MHP, this is one of the few remaining parcels. (Shows an illustrative of the earlier ~1990 proposal, with 335 keys and 550 parking spaces.) We believe we are fully compliant with Article 42, and with Chapter 91. And the Urban Renewal guidelines. WA noted the open space metrics of their proposal, giving SF totals, and noting 1800 linear feet of Harborwalk would be created. WA: The community - there is HUGE opposition in the four abutting buildings. There's a lot of support in the broader community, who also wants the existing parking (223 spaces) to stay. WA then gave a brief summary of Project benefits.

John Tittman (JT) showed the site plan. JT: I appreciate your stamina. (Indicates the park area, drop-off, connections to the water, etc. Shows view corridor diagrams. Shows the program at the ground floor, noting the ground floor connector piece.) The lobby is at the corner; there is a

bar and a waiting area in the middle. The connector is very porous. (Compares to other nearby context buildings.) Parking, and deliveries also, are below grade. DM asked about the service, how it worked. JT: Through the same corridor. DM: It's pretty crowded.... A discussion ensued on this point. Below grade service connection is difficult, it was stated, due to a bulkhead. But the Team could explore that further. JT then showed elevations, noting that the FEMA-required elevation created a walkway slope - there was a 4-5' difference. John Copley (JC) of the Copley Wolff Design Group talked about the space in the middle as a porch, permeable. JC: We are working on the relocation of the pool. And working on a story - what Lewis Wharf is. And the look and feel of the North End. WA then returned, showing a series of views.

WR: This is an intriguing Project. The hard thing is the 'hyphen' (connector) blocks; they make the water feel privatized, inhabited by hotel guests. When you look at Rowes Wharf, it's not the Arch, it's the cross path that makes it public/permeable. They've got all sorts of things, but they haven't blocked the way with a building. If you can do what they did, this would be a fantastic project. DM: I agree with Bill. No matter how transparent, it's still there. But if lifted up, of if a colonnade you can walk through...it could be up, and have some program below. LE: In the view looking out, the hyphen buildings look apologetic. If they were larger.... PM: What does DEP think? This is a non-water-dependent use. WA: They are okay, that's not an issue. We have been working with them.... AL: If there were two buildings, you wouldn't have any problem. Everything depends on that. I'm not sure it's solvable. Maybe a thin, thin bridge connecting the two. That's the heart of it - trying to connect two buildings. But maybe it's thinkable, in this climate. Alison Frasee of the Boston Preservation Alliance: The BPA concerns are expressed in our (comment) letter to the BRA. But also - could this extend beyond the pile field, to create a destination, out on the water?

With that, the Lewis Wharf 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 10:14 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was scheduled for December 1, 2015. The recording of the November 3, 2015 Boston Civic Design Commission meeting was digitized and is available at the Boston Redevelopment Authority.