

## DRAFT MINUTES

### BOSTON CIVIC DESIGN COMMISSION

The meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was held on Tuesday, October 6<sup>th</sup>, 2015, starting in the BRA Board Room, 9<sup>th</sup> Floor, Boston City Hall, and beginning at 5:20 p.m.

Members in attendance were: Michael Davis (Co-Vice-Chair); Deneen Crosby, Linda Eastley, David Hacin, Andrea Leers, Paul McDonough (Co-Vice-Chair), William Rawn, and Lynn Wolff.

Absent were David Manfredi, Daniel St. Clair, and Kirk Sykes. Also present was David Carlson, Executive Director of the Commission. Representatives of the BSA were present. Michael Cannizzo, Sonal Gandhi, and David Grissino were present for the BRA.

The Co-Vice-Chair, Mike Davis (MD), announced that this was the meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission that meets the first Tuesday of every month and welcomed all persons interested in attending. He added thanks to the Commissioners for the contribution of their time to the betterment of the City and its Public Realm. This hearing was duly advertised on Sunday, September 20, in the BOSTON HERALD.

The first item was the approval of the September 1<sup>st</sup>, 2015 Meeting Minutes. A motion was made, seconded, and it was duly

**VOTED: To approve the September 1<sup>st</sup>, 2015 Boston Civic Design Commission Meeting Minutes.**

Votes were passed for signature. Bill Rawn (WR) was recused from the next item. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Harvard Klarman Hall Project**. David Carlson (DAC) noted that the Klarman Hall Project was just over 100,000 SF, but as a significant IMP Project review was also conditioned by the BCDC recommendation to approve the IMP. Review was therefore recommended. It was quickly moved, seconded, and

**VOTED: That the BCDC review the Harvard Business School's Klarman Hall Project within the Harvard Allston Campus IMP area in the North Allston neighborhood.**

WR returned. Paul McDonough (PM) was recused from the next item. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **380 Stuart Street Project**. DAC noted that this was intended as an iconic tower in the John Hancock array of buildings and in the Stuart Street Planning Area. At over 600,000 SF, well over the BCDC threshold, review was recommended. A motion was made, seconded, and it was

**VOTED: That the Commission review 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.**

PM remained recused; Lynn Wolff (LW) was also recused from the next item. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Boston Garden Project Phases 2 and 3**. DAC noted that Phase One is currently under review, and that the Proponent was prepared to move forward to complete the additional schematic review required as a condition of the BCDC recommendation to approve the overall Boston Garden Project. A confirmatory vote to review was recommended. A motion was made, seconded, and it was

**VOTED: That the Commission review the revised and more developed schematic designs for Phase Two (residential and hotel) and Phase Three (Office) 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.**

PM and LW returned. The next item was a report from the Design Committee on the **Madison Infill Project**. Nick Elton (NE) began to describe the changes as a glitch in the laptop-projector connection was addressed. At some length, he noted the changes in the site plan, the proposed scale of the context, and the changes in the nature of the courtyards and the project's relationship to Melnea Cass Boulevard. He compared older versions to new, and began to go into the architecture again with the older version. MD: Just show the new design. NE then used SketchUp views to tour the Commission around the new Project. Deneen Crosby (DC) asked about Melnea Cass: ...You don't want to extend the sense of private yards to the street. NE: We are sensitive to that. There's a break.... Linda Eastley (LE): I appreciate the changes you've made in the nature of the open space and the pathways. LW: I think the cornice could be higher, like at the corner. NE: We have studied many variations of these elements.... MD: It's not necessary to show them. Andrea Leers (AL): You've done a good job distinguishing the private vs. main building entries, and you could work more on that. And a good job with the treatment of both. With that, it was moved, seconded, and

**VOTED: That the BCDC recommends approval of the schematic design for the proposed Madison Park Infill Sites Project on Melnea Cass Boulevard between St. Francis DeSales Court and Sojourner Truth Place, in the Roxbury neighborhood.**

PM was recused from the next item. The next item was a report from the Design Committee on the **Children's Hospital Pedestrian Connector Project**. Sam Norod (SN) of Elkus/Manfredi gave an introduction, noting first that the issue of connection to a garage was raised. (Shows a diagram of other LMA Institution campuses.) SN: We are the ONLY institution with their garage access across a major street. And Brigham's Francis Street bridge to Shapiro is over a street wider than Longwood. (Shows a diagram of the entry court's queuing capacity.) About half the time, the queuing capacity of the entry court to Children's is exceeded. SN then showed the improvements planned around the Perlmutter building, and possible future changes to the building. He went briefly through the BCDC's Bridge Guidelines, comparing their proposal.

SN: We are improving traffic. Improving pedestrian safety. Increasing retail. Providing better lighting of the historic Hunnewell Building. Removing an existing bridge. And integrating an increased amount of green space with an enhanced streetscape. (Goes through logic of each response.) 1200 vehicle trips daily are removed from the intersection by this proposal. The nature of Longwood is such that it has very little retail, but we are increasing that by adding a space at the base. (Shows a night view illustrating the proposed lighting opportunity.)

Mikyoung Kim (MYK) presented the plan for Longwood Avenue enhancements. MYK: We are bringing the language developed around the courtyard all the way around to Longwood. (Shows a tree infill diagram and a series of views.) We are also adjusting new seatwall curbing to discourage smokers from sitting next to kids. This is a new commitment to the public realm. (Shows views in seasons.) We have tables and chairs in front of Hunnewell; we are bringing that relationship around the corner. (Shows improvements with a refurbished trellis and a new mural along Blackfan Street.)

LW: It seems funny that you're eliminating the seatwall; that's a specific vocabulary in this area. SN: that's an issue with the Hospital; the idea is provide space (and seating) for smokers that's at a slight remove from patient traffic. MYK showed a detail of the proposed space. SN showed the diagram of the overall green space relationships, and noted the Guidelines checklist. LE: What is the experience of the pedestrian under the Connector? SN: That's a great question - it's visible in a 2-minute video. But the Connector has just *one* pier (shows plans and a view). SN then noted the structural system, why it was chosen, how it works, and showed studies of the variations of treatment and accompanying diagrams. SN: Back to the Guidelines imperative - simpler was preferred.

MD: We saw a lot of this two meetings ago. There is a *quid pro quo*, and traffic improvement, and what helps is the MYK contribution. DC: It makes me feel like this is more the operation of the hospital, part of the process of delivering a patient - that sells it for me. LW: This is the first time I'm seeing it. It's very long - longer than all those others. SN explained why, noting the difficulty of connecting to floor levels in Hunnewell instead. And gave more detail on the height, to a further LW query. David Hacin (DH): I always felt the design was good, for the structure. The question was whether there were other improvements to the public realm, and the enhancement of the garage program. The revised garage program helps, but MYK helps to convince. WR: I agree with DH. One question was the murals on the bridge. SN: We preferred to eliminate them. DH: You really don't want people stopping; it's not the function of the bridge. SN: That was part of our argument to the BLC. LE: The seatwall corner is *so* congested. Its removal helps; knees got in the way. The only issue I have is the column...if there's anything you could do to remove or cantilever it. MYK: We will expand the pedestrian circulation there as part of the improvements. DH: The lighting is a good idea; it's a classic. And the landscape is good. SN: We have to have a column.... With that, a motion was made, seconded, and it was

**VOTED: That the Commissioner recommends approval of the Children's Hospital IMP Amendment which consists primarily of the proposed Pedestrian Connector across Longwood Avenue in the Longwood Medical Area.**

WR was recused from the next item. The next item was a presentation of the **Harvard Klarman Hall Project**. Andy O'Brien (AOB), Director of Operations at HBS: We have a donor, and have done a lot of design. Why are we doing this? Because we do not have a space on the HBS Campus that holds even one full class. This Project was 141,000 SF in the IMP, and is now about 81,000 SF [plus the Pavilion]. AOB showed the program that was given to Rawn Associates. Cliff Gayley (CG) of William Rawn Associates presented the design, first noting the locus. CG: We are firmly in the Georgian part of the Campus, so our response is very different than with Tata Hall. CG then showed a diagram of how it fit into Campus patterns, and compared this site to other parts of the Campus. He noted arrival points, showing the ground floor's relationship to the surrounding spaces; he showed views of the 'winter garden' space, looking in and out. Then plans. CG: The main space has a thrust stage, so the audience are participants. The lower part of the stage is in the basement, with access to the Harvard tunnels - to Spangler, and a space across to the future G2 Pavilion. (Shows a large study model and a local Campus model. Shows sections. Using the models and elevations, shows the relationship to Spangler.) We using elements of our design to relate the buildings, with curving sides and an elliptical element on the top.

Gary Hilderbrand (GH) of Reed Hilderbrand showed the site plan and a Campus diagram. GH: I want to note the importance of Kresge Way - it's a pedestrian as well as a service way. It connects to Harvard Way, the loading for the Chao Center, etc. It will be a major connecting corridor to the Science Campus. This Project allows the resolution here, of Kresge. Burden is removed, and the Green clarified, as well as traffic, turning movements, etc. AOB noted the Project schedule, with BRA Board scheduled for January. LE: I'm noting the relationship to the east (Kresge Way), with no entry facing that. And what is happening on the south? GH: That's outside of the 10-year Campus plan, so there's no real massing or picture. LE: So, you will see this across the parking lot for some time. GH: Yes. Spangler is large, and this is too, but it sits well. CG: There are footprints in the future plan, of a certain height. There will be green, and some of that will come to this edge. GH noted the change to the lots in front.

DH: I am discouraged by the RAM Stern building, and excited by Tata Hall. So I am disappointed by your dream team. As an architect who works in historic districts, I wonder if this couldn't be served better by something which takes the Georgian proportions, but takes on more of a 21<sup>st</sup>-century approach. Maybe the massing and scale are right on. There's a problem with the language. Also, if it's classical, the G2 pavilion really crowds the entry on that side. I'm not sure that language has the super scale it needs. I challenge your client to change the landscape of where the HBS is headed over the next 100 years. AL: This is a part of the IMP, and supports that, in all the ways it was supposed to, for the public realm. That's good as an approach. And I have every confidence that the program functions wonderfully. But this is not in the heart of the Georgian campus, but at its periphery. So it's not bound to that, and can express itself. You have chosen to use the classical vocabulary. I would suggest a true engagement of the spirit of that vocabulary; there's a way to think of that as the goal. A stripped-down classicism, or modified - like the [-] building - classical, but modern in their time. What's here, is loving interior space, and an accommodation of the envelope. Because of this site and location, it should be respectful of the buildings around it, their materials and scale - but

should be of the future. We're not after a specific look in Committee. But why not a greater latitude to express? MD: I concur. We've been tasked with looking forward in architecture. I can imagine something which bridges both. I would like to think that Harvard can rise to help us meet that challenge. DH: The buildings on the other side [of Kresge] are a large presence that G2 cannot mask. You do not see a symmetrical Georgian front. And there's a piece from a different era. What better metaphor for HBS than a building looking to its future, as well as its past. Can there be another way to look at this, especially given the tasking by the Mayor? MD asked for and saw there were no public comments. LE: What do we see in Committee? MD: We can extend the question. DH: A further clarification of G2. CG: We have fully embraced the notion of expressing contemporary architecture in a Georgian architecture. DH: I respect that completely. But you haven't taken it far enough to bring out the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Not as far as an Allan Greenberg interpretation, or one more abstracted. MD: The details, the brick around the windows, or lack of details...is that expression. AL: I would like to see the studies you left behind. This is very developed, so I hope that would be possible - to understand how you got here. LE: If we are looking at earlier studies...the eastern facade, turning its back on Kresge. And the Soldiers Field apartments and garage. So the idea that the Kresge corridor becomes all service, is a shame. DH: I can't help but think of the Reichstag - the re-creation of a building, but done so with a dome that signifies its place in history. Maybe there's an opportunity there. MD: Bring other and more materials. With that, the Harvard Klarman Hall Project was sent to Design Committee.

WR returned. PM was recused from the next item. The next item was a presentation of the **380 Stuart Street Project**. Yanni Tsipis (YT) introduced the John Hancock Company team, noting their commitment to the City and its architecture. YT: All three buildings built have won the Harleston Parker award. (Shows an aerial location map, then a site diagram.) Hancock purchased this property in 1990; it's a mid-block building. (Shows program highlights.) YT then introduced Brian Lee (BL) of SOM Chicago. BL: We like office buildings, making them efficient, fitting them into their context. What are the clues that inform? (Shows the shaping strategy as a diagram, then a view comparison, followed by a wind diagram comparison.) Our shape is an advantage. The tapered massing is a strategy - which allows permeability. Our strategy of fitting into the context - we have an entry arch comparable to the base of the hotel, or of The Clarendon. It opens up (shows section through base), allowing light through. The arch is also a support of the structure above; it's totally 'open' below in its nature. (Shows wind mitigation diagrams around the base, using canopies and trees. Notes the relationship of the podium sides to the main arch. Notes the idea of passages, north-south connectors. Notes the program in the lobby.) We are working out the details of public access. (Shows a view of the top.) The top is part HVAC, and part amenity/terrace. Our idea of the skin is not just glass (shows intended detail) but metal as well, with variation. (Shows an overall view.) We didn't want a top that's an add-on, but a whole.

DH: On the site plan, why do you have garage access in the path that has a better potential of connection to Stanhope Street? YT: Traffic engineers. But also, there is a legal agreement to allow only one lane of access on the other (west) side. So, rather than have an expanded driveway, we chose to have access there. DH: So, that's a conversation. Why this height? I'm

excited about the [public] viewing platform, which often are not as public as they seem. YT: That's not a day-to-day public amenity. It can be reserved, but it's not a walk-in. The height is set very clearly by the Boston Garden shadowing rules. LW: We need more information on the spaces and pedestrian networks. YT: Also, we will bring a model. AL: The basic strategy of tapering the building down to provide space is good. The large elements at the entry are a good idea. A nice set of ideas to shape this. The light coming through - this is the north side - is a stretch. But it's the combination of ideas. The top is not as elegant as the bottom - a Star-Trekkish pad. A little bit like one scoop, we're done, especially if it's a private space.

MD: I buy the architecture, the wind mitigation, the scale of the gesture. I bristle a little at the idea of a public room. It would be better if the street were activated by the lobby. I'm skeptical as to how public it will feel. I'm not convinced by the little (café) pods. BL: One of those two places allows us to think about those edges. When we go to the 200 Berkeley Building, it's almost like providing food trucks - there is interest. MD: Show us more clearly in Committee what that's like. LE: I would love an eye-level tour around the building. The arc covers the sidewalk, and meets the street. But it doesn't offer street trees. I want an understanding of how it feels, how I skirt around it. MD: If someone says, 'Wintergarden,' I want to see it. DC: David's comments are good. The structure - how far does that come out? How much does it block? BL: We struggled with that, and considered trees. But when you're confronted with both... AL: I wonder if you might not make the sides very different. One pedestrian, one vehicular. The east is not so very inviting. The other is more so. You could bias them. BL: We shifted to the other side because of The Clarendon. DH: People go to the restaurants (on Stanhope). I agree there could be a bias. Andrea's comment on the top...there are a group of buildings there, all illuminated at night. How this takes its place would help us understand. WR: I want to compliment this...the Chicago view of Boston. It's well-behaved, with some flamboyance. The shaping is not all that different from a rectangular building; it would be good to see how that evolves. Stuart Street needs that life. With that, the 380 Stuart Street Project was sent to Design Committee.

PM returned. LW left. The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **Pier 4 Phase 3 Residential Project**. MD: This was actually an extraordinarily good project. I was almost embarrassed to send it to Design Committee. But we saw the development of the landscape and answered some questions about the building. GH: The site plan discussion was in three pieces (notes overall elements). Here's the landscape view of the pass-through (shows a diagram as well). The restrooms are a part of it - actually, they are mid-pier, so a good placing for events on the pier. (Shows vignettes [view, plan, section] of edge conditions, Harborwalk west, the Harbor edge.) We are studying proportions (of the opening at the end), but we widely embraced the feature itself. (Shows another vignette, the stepping down at the northwest, more views, an aerial view.) Bill Sharples (BS) of SHoP then showed views from the NW. BS: It's a great opportunity to work on this pier. It's got civic-ness, and openness, but it's also a community within the community. The building helps to organize the relationship with the car, and it is engaging on all four sides. (Examines the building in highlighted portions, shows more views, notes the 'ha-ha,' notes the separation of materials, shows an architectural view of the pass-through, with wood moving inside. Then a section. Shows a view of the SE corner.) We

have been refining the loading area zone, making it more attractive. The ground plane ideas are lifted up into the building. And our dynamic cantilever faces the ICA.

DH: I want to reiterate the compliments...the relationship to the waterfront, and to the District. This helps fulfill the promise of the ICA, and creates a space beyond that. AL: I haven't had a chance to see it. In some ways, it really improves the ICA. And the water, leaning toward it. It's welcoming to the public, inviting, accessible, with truly interesting edgework. LE: The whole thing becomes a stage. The exciting thing is the infinity view, and the railing down into the water. DC: I love this project, how the landscape has been developed. All the ways in which it meets the edge. WR: Likewise, I'll pile on. This is an interesting approach to the water. The building is not all out there on the water like many. With that, it was moved, seconded, and

**VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the revised schematic design for Phase 3 of the Pier 4 PDA Project in the South Boston Waterfront (Innovation) District.**

PM was recused from the next item. The next item was a report from the Design Committee on the **Boston Garden Project, Phase One**. MD noted the votes suggested as available to the Commissioners - the first is a conditioned (positive) vote. The second is a tabled vote. The third is to approve. Bryan Koop (BK) of Boston Properties led the presentation: I hope you have the same passion for this as we do. This will be the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the demolition of the old Garden. It's important to start with the end in mind; we have completely revamped the presentation. This is authentic to the neighborhood. Things were *made* here. Also, how does this work for its constituents? That's driven the team crazy - how that works. This is NOT a lifestyle center. Nor glass coming down to the street. We have things that the Project is NOT, but we want a *great* place.

Doug Gensler (DG) presented the project and design changes. DG: The idea is to have a project where architecture is not the headline. We want to bring back the richness of what [industrial] neighborhoods were about. As we share our updated design with you, we have been working hard to absorb all your comments. Where we are is not only supportive of your issues, but also our constituents. (Shows the view from the SE, noting their TAMI clients and the expression of the building that carries it over the MBTA structure below.) Champions Row is the entry to the Garden, and a civic space. And the cinema expression is reminiscent of the Garden, but not literal. The chassis are reflective of contemporary uses. (Shows the view from the SW. Notes the treatment of the 'BRA alley.' Then shows Champions Row head-on.) Champions Row is strong enough to hold its own, but light enough. (Shows a diagram of movement through North Station.) We know people will want to walk through - it's a choice. We've biased the location of the stairs and escalator to the east, to provide for that flow. The existing east entry will maintain its operation, but most now will come through the west entry and Champions Row. DG then showed a section with ceiling heights tapering from 11'5" to 13'6" to 16', noting that the passage sloped to the south. DG: We have taken to heart your comments on the lightening elements. We have introduced a cable structure that lightens up the edge of the structure from 40" to 18". BK: We really wanted to create an elevated Great Space. It's an opportunity not

just to take care of the passage, but also to create a space of inspiration. When you Google elevated views, *nothing* in Boston comes up. There are great examples of urban staircases. Can we make it famous, like Times Square?

DG: Back to the facts. We have rotated the escalators (and stairs skewed) - this creates a 25-foot wide translucent piece. This has been tightened up, and the opening enlarged. And we have shifted the whole slightly back. (Shows a comparison; shows diagrams of commuter queuing and flows. Shows views which show their preferred alignment with the tightening of the deck above, and describes in more detail.) BK: We are still investigating the lighting on the stairs, and the steel structure. DG: Looking back (shows the view from Canal), you have memories of where you've been. No one talks about the buildings. They talk about the spaces, the activity. BK: Because of our decision on leasing, it creates more challenges. Live Nation is coming here. Two years ago there was a Target. Now there's a cinema; we have to figure out how to come out. There are 240 nights a year at the Garden; we have a lot going on.

AL: With your studies, I came to a couple of different conclusions than you did. I was very taken with the split stair strategy, because for the first time there was a lightness that suggested multiple paths to take. I understand your point of view about pinching, but the real value was the sense of a public space, for all the reasons we've talked about. I am intrigued by the notion of a full glass floor, because then you have a sense of being in a taller space. Mike Cantalupa (MC): It's glass block.... DH: I want to thank you for looking at the stair options. I think the other option has good points. The lighting schemes - a lot of them could be developed. I'm convinced *somewhat* about the idea of a social space. But the relationship of the Champions Row space to Causeway and Canal was a missed opportunity. Hancock came in tonight with a proposal for a mid-block building with a *grand* entrance. Progress has been made; I'm more comfortable with the buildings to the sides. The stairs, etc. all feel like they're headed in the right direction. But the real regret is that the whole thing couldn't be 30' to the east. MD: I agree. I'm still struggling with the faux industrial language, and that of making a grand civic gesture. The split stair, the cable...move it closer to be a real civic space.

WR: I'm a little less optimistic. This is an opportunity to have a great public space in the City as you enter North Station, or the Garden. The challenge - to show us glass floors in the mezzanine that do give a sense of *up* - is that they quickly scuff up. I appreciate the sense of a place of respite, but not as a sacrifice of civic space. Pennsylvania Station - everyone acknowledges that's a big mistake. And here we are, making the same mistake 50 years later. How many spaces in the City are more public than Champions Row? LE: Your 3-D goggles made me agree with Bill. The space could be so incredible, to align with the City grid, to get [a sense of movement] out from trains. DC: At [South?] Station, even though it's constricted, there's a sense of movement and space. Here, there's not enough space. Too much of the space is covered. BK goes back to the section, noting that they are punching through the Garden wall, and moving escalators. DH: I was thinking - what if the gathering space moved somewhere else? Like at the entry? DG: We looked at that...it made it more like a Galleria. DH: I've changed my mind about that. Maybe that's another way of making this a prominent space. That's where you have the interview. DG: It feels like a mall. MD: the reduction of the mezzanine imposition in the space. The treatment of the stairs and ceiling. WR: The

whole.

After a brief discussion, it was formally moved, seconded and voted to table and to return to Committee, with the focus being on Champions Row and the discussions above. Thus:

**VOTED: That the Commission recommends tabling action on the design for Phase One of the proposed Boston Garden Project at 80 Causeway Street to the south of Boston Garden in the North Station Economic Development Area, with further study in Design Committee for final resolution of the issues discussed (the mezzanine platform, the treatment of the stairs and ceiling, the prominence of the entry, the *whole* of Champions Row) and, assuming progress in good faith, that the Proponent return for a confirmatory vote on these elements in a month's time.**

The next item was withdrawn by the Proponent team. There being no further items for discussion, a motion was made to adjourn, and the meeting was duly adjourned at 9:01 p.m., albeit not without a last-minute vote of congratulations for the Commission's Executive Director, who was one of the recipients of the 2015 Shattuck Awards for public service. The next regular meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was scheduled for November 3, 2015. The recording of the October 6, 2015 Boston Civic Design Commission meeting was digitized and is available at the Boston Redevelopment Authority.