

DRAFT MINUTES
BOSTON CIVIC DESIGN COMMISSION

The meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was held on Tuesday, July 9th, 2013, starting in the BRA Board Room, 9th Floor, Boston City Hall, beginning at 5:20 p.m.

Members in attendance were: Michael Davis, Co-Vice-Chair; Deneen Crosby, Andrea Leers, David Manfredi, Paul McDonough (Co-Vice-Chair), William Rawn, Kirk Sykes, and Lynn Wolff. Absent were: Linda Eastley, David Hacin, and Daniel St. Clair. 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, Michael Davis (MD), announced that this was the meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission that normally 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 Wednesday, June 19, in the BOSTON HERALD.

The first item was the approval of the June 4th, 2012 Meeting Minutes. A motion was made, seconded, and it was duly

VOTED: To approve the June 4th, 2012 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 **Northeastern University Interdisciplinary Science + Engineering Building Project**. David Carlson (DAC) reported that the proposed Project was the first major building in the new Northeastern IMP, which was still under review; at 200,000 SF, it is over the 100,000 SF BCDC threshold and would also be an IMP Project and so reviewed as a condition of the BCDC's vote...but this latter is not yet the case. Review was recommended. It was duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the Northeastern University Interdisciplinary Science + Engineering Building Project on Columbus Avenue in the Lower Roxbury neighborhood.

WR returned. Lynn Wolff (LW) was recused from the next *two* items. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Mass Mental Redevelopment Roxbury Tenants of Harvard Residential Building Change**. DAC reported that the design approved by the BCDC in 2011 turned out to be infeasible economically, and the Project has been revamped with a new design and new architect. The change is substantive enough to warrant another look by the Commission, and the SF total still well exceeds the threshold. A vote to review was recommended, then duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the revised schematic design for the Roxbury Tenants of Harvard Residential Building on the Mass Mental site at the corner of The Riverway and Fenwood Road in the Longwood Medical Area.

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **1350 Boylston Street Project**. DAC reported that the Proposed Project is about 200,000 SF, well over the BCDC threshold, and review was recommended. It was duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed 1350 Boylston Street Project at the corner of Kilmarnock Street in the West Fenway neighborhood.

LW returned. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Government Center Garage Project**. DAC reported that a different version of the Proposed Project was seen initially in 2009; although the owner is the same, the development entity is new, the architect is different, and a new Article 80 process has been started. The Project remains at nearly 3,000,000 SF, well over the BCDC threshold, and a fresh vote to review was recommended. It was duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the new schematic design for the proposed Government Center Garage Redevelopment Project in the Government Center area.

LW was recused from the next item. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Seaport Square Parcel L1 Project**. DAC reported that the Proposed Project is over 600,000 SF, well over the BCDC threshold, and review was recommended for this reason and the fact that review was a condition of the BCDC's approval of the Seaport Square PDA in 2010. It was duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the Seaport Square Parcel L1 ('One Seaport Square') Project at the corner of Boston Wharf Road and Seaport Boulevard in the Seaport Square PDA, in the South Boston Waterfront District.

LW returned. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **D Street Development MCCA Hotels Project**. DAC reported that the Proposed Project hotels total about 340,000 SF, with 510 keys. Review of the hotels site was required as a condition of approval of the PDA for the site, when the designs had sufficiently advanced. A confirmatory vote to review was recommended. It was duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the developed schematic design for the hotels site component of the D Street Development PDA in the South Boston Waterfront District.

The next item was a report from the Design Committee on the **75 Amory Avenue (Jackson Square Building K, Phase 2, Parcel 69) Project**. Because the Design Committee had met last week and discussed at length the unusual proposed vote, Paul McDonough (PM) moved a recommended vote to table action while requiring the Proponent to return to finish review and achieve a vote of approval, but allowing the BRA to recommend procedural approval only for funding purposes. WR questioned what he saw as a precedent. DAC argued a near-unique set of circumstances, and MD recapped the discussion held in Committee. Kirk Sykes (KS), who was present in Committee, seconded the vote, and it was

VOTED: That the Commission table action on the schematic design for Building K, Parcel 69, part of Phase II of the Jackson Square Project, at 75 Amory Avenue in the Jamaica Plain neighborhood, until such time as the Proponent is able to demonstrate satisfactory responses to the issues raised. This action shall not restrict necessary actions by the BRA Board but is conditioned on return for final review and vote prior to any level of BRA design approval.

WR abstained from the prior vote. The next item was a report from the Design Committee on the **Melnea Cass Parcel 9 Project**. KS reported that there had been some issues left not quite resolved in Committee, notably the treatment of the plinth - especially at the corner - and the site plan, including provision for the bicycle path. Nader Tehrani (NT) of NADAAA pointed out on a model what had been changed for Committee. Using slides, he showed the bicycle path and its possible location to the frontage along Melnea Cass; this location better aligned with the path to either side, while still allowing ample sidewalks at the building itself. (This was an interim condition.) He showed views of the plinth and corner. NT: We have augmented the corner. On the rear, where there was the issue of the buffer, we have brought the landscape down, in a sense. The plinth canopy dips, with the landscape on top. (Shows a series of views.)

Deneen Crosby (DC): The bicycle path is an important condition; it should be at the edge. Katie Faulkner (KF) of NADAAA clarified that it was an interim condition, and showed the proposed future condition. KS wondered where the bus lane was; KF pointed it out on the future Melnea condition. MD: This has the potential to be a great building response to this site. Andrea Leers (AL): It's dynamic, and great at the corner. On the back, exactly how high is that canopy space? Can one walk under it? NT: About 5-6' high; you can't walk under it. We would provide safeguards. AL: I do worry about this in-between height - it's indeterminate. I would like either to pull it up, or all the way down. It's uncomfortable right now. KS: The fear is that it's modified to be neither. AL: Pass under it gracefully, or bring it all the way down. NT: If one could address the security issues, I would like to bring it all the way. If it's lifted - it's important to see up it. So not 8', but 6', say. I would the dip to have scale; I'd like to bring it to the ground. AL: That would be better, and would solve a rainwater issue. LW: You could have plant materials coming to the ground. NT: Which is the landscape response, but I would prefer the urban response of the building gesture. KS: Return to the front. It's a good solution. It holds the corner, but it's not excessive; it works with the idea of having some transparency toward the park. But not too much. I'm excited about the solution. With that, it was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for Urbanica's Parcel 9 Project on Melnea Cass Boulevard and Washington Street (bounded also by Ball Street and Shawmut Avenue) in the Lower Roxbury neighborhood.

PM was recused from the next item. The next item was a report from Design Committee on **The Point Project**. AL: A lot of our recommendations were incorporated, and the Project is clearly better, even when seen for the first time - the frame, the stepped angle of the corner. At the corner itself, there was discussion of the treatment and scale of the wind mitigation; David Hacin had suggested larger scale art. But it's good overall. Sam Luccino (SL) of Arquitectonica presented the changes, noting the change in direction at the corner angle, and a number of views. SL: The views had shown it was less kinetic and dynamic than desired, and the BRA wanted to emphasize the height, so we shifted the angle and added height in the center, thinned the 'frame' and the setbacks, and simplified the colors on the sides with white now only in the middle. SL then noted the difference between the two sides, showing additional modified views. He noted the penthouse accentuation and showed the windscreen at the pass-through, and the section there. SL: This fit with the stepping of the building from the street and in section; the composition was better. SL then showed the corner, noting they were putting together an RFP for a designer/artist for some assistance there, possibly art.

KS asked about the bridge connection over the pass-through; SL explained its purpose for the residents moving between this building and Trilogy. SL then showed the site plan. LW: Are those green roofs? SL: Yes. (Points out intent at the pass-through as well.) LW: I think the corner is critical. The building is beautiful, but it's important that the landscape be right. DC: What I like about the sketch is that you walk under something that changes the scale. KS: When you come back with the corner, you should walk us around the building, and show us how it's connected to the ground. WR: The adjustment of the geometries is a vast improvement. A vote was moved, but with the condition that the park come back for a presentation, and including the pass-through area. This was seconded and it was

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the proposed The Point Project at 1383-1395 Boylston Street and 176-200 Brookline Avenue in the West Fenway neighborhood, with the condition that the Proponent team return to show the resolution of the corner and the 'pass-through' areas in particular.

PM returned; David Manfredi (DM) arrived. The next item, while a slow laptop booted, was a report from the Design Committee on the **Boston College 2150 Commonwealth Avenue Residential Building**. LW reported that the discussion had been about changes - there was more work to be done, on the corner for example - but much else had been resolved. MD: The Master Plan objective had been held, and architectural goals also met; we are inclined to approve. Paul King of EYP presented an update. He noted the original massing, areas of comment; the courtyard had seemed more successful. He showed some issues with the prior scheme. He

adjusted the model on the table, and showed a revised scheme with a central gable but glass at the corner, on the 'side' of another gable. The stair was now reversed and framed the glass. He noted also the changes in the courtyard, then in the elevations. AL: I saw it two meetings ago. By not having a symmetrical corner, it's much better. There are fewer elements projecting up - that's better as well. The remaining issues...the stair towers projecting now through the flat roof should stop at the cornice. PK: They serve the roof, too. WR: It shouldn't be too hard to do what Andrea suggests. PK: It will be difficult to achieve. AL: The flat roof just adds to the elements you show.

KS: The large moves were generally successful. DM: There's been a lot of progress. There's still a lot of moves. The stairs are one element that fit the least well with others. But this plan has resolved the corner. MD: Simplification, generally, is recommended for BRA staff. KS: What about the crossing of Commonwealth Avenue? I want to make that *clear*. MD: The public realm interests here have been served.... KS: But it was an important part of the discussion. PK then showed both long and short term conditions, with pedestrian passage lines. He showed a plan of the corner space, a lobby open to the public. WR: This is incredibly important, an entry building for a major university. If the road goes through, it's even more important. I agree with Andrea's comments. But the corner doesn't read as a major entry to the campus. Think of MIT, or Harvard Yard's gates. This is an entry? LW: I think, in meetings, knowing where the pedestrians are coming from - you can get through, but it serves that purpose. AL: At the moment we accepted the one building, we abandoned the idea of a Gateway. It's an important *corner* building, and the roadway is the Gateway. WR: But the future condition.... AL: I think is a bit of fiction. I don't think people will walk through. Except in inclement weather, they will walk around. WR noted Mitchell Giurgola's entry from the Kendall station into MIT. MD: We accepted the change; it will still be used. With that, it was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of Boston College's 2150 Commonwealth Avenue Residence Hall Project and associated amendment to its Institutional Master Plan, in the Allston-Brighton neighborhood.

DM was recused for the next item. The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **Fan Pier Parcel I Project**. KS: We were supportive of the design strategy. We were looking for a resolution of the side street appendage - I shouldn't call it that - being more related to the scale of the ICA and the hotel entry. We were looking for it to relate to the massing on that side, and also to adjust the 'wicket and louvers' at the entry on Northern Avenue. We talked about the glass types. LW: And where the glass comes down on the East. Art Gross (AG) of BBG-BBGM: We looked at simplifying the 'bustle,' improving the view corridor. We pulled it back 5', but we looked at other strategies as well. We also removed the 7th floor element, making it simpler. Also, the entry to the hotel had got short shrift; we wanted a sense of recognition equating to the office entry. We have schemes A, B, C...we did not want it to be a Mini-Me, and wanted asymmetry. AG then showed the variations - one a folded wall which went into a sided frame/canopy. AG: The 5' setback allows for more landscaping, and a possible cultural connection to the ICA. It's a short canopy; it could be angled, and extends to the north.

KS: And in the other direction? Richard Martini (RM) of The Fallon Company: We're thinking

about that, too. AG: On the lighting, we are showing lighting in the louver array above the office entry. Those are outboard; on the north, we can do the same in the stacked recesses. DC asked to see the site plan. RM unrolled it, noting the change on the side, and pointing out Northern Avenue. AL: Simplifying the side element is good. The one chosen was the best scheme. It seemed to me, one of the purposes of that side was to provide passage to the ICA. I understand the building is fully occupied, but you could consider an extended canopy along the edge, to the ICA. It seems to suggest a kind of movement. AG: We wouldn't want too much. RM: But we could do it, thin. AL: That would be enough. With that, it was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the revised schematic design for the Fan Pier Parcel I Project in the Boston Fan Pier PDA within the South Boston Waterfront District.

DM returned. MD noted that the warm-up period was over; there would now be six new projects, and an expected 3 hours of review - which meant that 15 minutes would be allowed for presentations, *max*. WR was recused from the next item and left. The next item was a presentation of the **Northeastern University Interdisciplinary Science and Engineering Building**. A model was placed on the table. Steve of Northeastern introduced himself and noted they were excited about the complex and its role on the campus. Kevin James (KJ) of Payette presented the design, first showing the locus, and introducing the concept of movement and flow through the site, creating a precinct. KJ: We are thinking of the site as a public part of the campus, from the north and south; creating a signature landscape move, and linking pedestrian threads. One of the signature moves is the consideration of bicycle paths, and so allowing one through the site - an important part of the program. (DAC left the room to tend to the recorder, which had reached capacity and could not be downloaded during the meeting.) The presentation continued and was generally well received. KJ noted the site plan and open space, walked the Commission through the building, showed how it connects to spaces, and explained some of the spaces and materials, comparing the proposed mesh screens to some used at the MIT Media Lab.

LW asked about information concerning the accessibility moving through the site. DC: Provide more information on how it relates to other (public) spaces. DM: You've set a very high goal of linking - it's a very ambitious building - and linking disciplines. How this relates to the community is important. I like everything, but the classroom space at that corner, which is symbolically important.... I'm not sure that's the right use there. KS: I agree with that on the Columbus corner. Provide some information on the amount of, the cycles of use. How does the plaza satisfy your security as well as being public? That's the biggest concern: focus on the plaza. MD: I agree. Since the International House opened, the level of connectivity hoped-for there really didn't happen. And the use of the upper level open space (at Behrakis) also didn't happen. It's a remarkable project; I hope for that level of approach to the space. KS: Given the disparity between the sides, how does this do better socially than that building? AL: It occurs to me - that's right. The problem is how to bridge to the community. Just the forms, two parallel forms, you pass right through. But you have an arc which differs on each side. And you have a shape, a variation on a bar, which curls in. It could curl out, to present a face embracing Columbus, similar to the shape on the other side - IF you think of Columbus as a front door.

With that, the Northeastern ISEB was sent to Committee to join the IMP.

LW was recused from the next item. The next item was a presentation of the **RTH Residential Building Change**. Peter Munckenbeck reintroduced the team, including Mark Klopfer, Rebecca Lee, Karen Gately and Carol Menton of RTH, John Copley (JC) of CWDG, and BK Boley (BK) of ADD Inc. He noted that the previous scheme was higher, but the cost was \$13 million over budget. We had to reduce the skin to SF ratio, net to gross ratio; there's a similar unit count, but less SF. 78% less, so costs are less, about in the same ratio. ADD Inc. are the new architects. BK presented the new design. BK: We have a couple of massing models (shows prior massing, notes adjacencies and daycare program, shows new massing). The new design has higher efficiency. BK went to a slide show, noting the locus and relationship to the larger RTH campus. BK: The warm materials are intended to relate to that. We have the ability to add spaces, to better define adjacencies. (Shows site plan, then a larger version, showing an enlarged space to the south; shows floor diagrams and then views from the Riverway.) We have 30-35% glass at most; using a punched window precast system. There are asymmetric precast depressions, the tone a subdued gold, which is not selected yet. BK then showed an axonometric and turned the presentation over to landscape. JC: We are working with Mark Klopfer and Brigham & Women's to integrate the scheme. The idea is to use trees - maples, etc. in the Riverway - and bring them through into the space. You walk, walk through - but the historic fence has to go back. The grade is better (shows sections). We are looking for trees larger than those planted by DCR along the edge, and screening the play area. (Shows the landscape between the buildings, then a view near the corner, and a view looking down the Binney connector.) Peter: There's no chiller, no generator, only a transformer.

DC: The building seems closer to the roadway. Peter: It's 42' - 20' from the property line is required, and we're 22', a little more. KS: Looking at the model, the building works from the Riverway scale; I'm interested in discussing more about the ground floor spaces. Some are ambiguous, especially the spaces on the Fenwood side. I'm less concerned about the Riverway side. DC: Question - where the seating comes up, is that the garage? BK: It's a vault. That's where the MRI machines come up; they need service that way once a year. We created secondary seating areas. We think they will be popular at lunch, with the light coming down. DC: So does it remain at that height? BK: It rises as you go down. PM asked about the loading. BK showed the spot, off the road. AL asked about parking. Peter: It's in the RTH garage. AL: So the question is, where do the people come from who live here? Peter: Brigham Circle. Many are walking from there, or the Longwood stop. He noted the path from the RTH garage next to Neville House, and the elevator and stair from the upper RTH campus. AL: People will drop off, leave bundles, etc...the address? Peter: 74 Fenwood. AL: The amount of building on the site, the fact that it sits flat on the ground, is all good. I like the fact that it bends back, a good response. I agree with KS that the other side is less loved. If you bend it like this, that's where I would expect it. I think something welcoming, visible, sheltered is in order. An entry sequence; think it through more. I'm not sure why the back is crenellated, why it folds the way it does. The other side does better with a single fold. The masonry is very visible on the Riverway; the view is more constrained on Fenwood.

DM: The foam model is very compelling. To AL's point, it's a better Project. AL: It was such a struggle before. It's generous and gracious now. MD: We'll send this Committee. Comments from the public? Karen Torres of Fenwood Road: We have had a lot of parking taken away from us, so availability is an issue. The daycare, for neighborhood people, is good. But if it's for the hospitals, how is dropping off in this congested area going to work? Especially with the B&W clinical building, we will be engulfed in traffic. Where are the people who can't afford to buy a space going to park? PM: Is there a neighborhood impact group? Karen: RTH is the neighborhood representative - and their Board. This is a major thing for us. MD noted again it would go to Committee, and summed up comments. KS: To AL's point, know where people come from; understand the flows. If the drop-off an issue or not? With that, the RTH Residential Building change was sent to Design Committee.

LW remained recused for the next item; PM was recused from the next *three* items, and left. The next item was a presentation of the **1350 Boylston Street Project**. Shawn Hurley (SH) of Skanska: We're excited to be in the area. This is the Burger King site; we are proposing a multi-family development. BK put the model on the table, and noted the locus on slides, showing photos of the site and a massing diagram of the zoning build-out. BK: We looked at shadows; we did not want a single, rectangular massing. We came up with a 'hammerhead' scheme which we didn't like. We went with variations going up to 180' and 210' to the community and the BRA. In all our schemes, we pulled the building off of Kilmarnock. We took the plinth and pushed it down to four stories, with four pop-up units, and a 195' tower. There are mixed inspirations, such as the red color used on barns throughout Sweden ('Falun Red') and the interlocking volumes of Romeo and Juliet (shows illustration). Juliet is light, metal; Romeo is more heavy, grounded. BK then showed a series of views, noting a lively retail base along Boylston. He showed a distant, then a closer view there, noting the Boylston Street plantings. Shauna Gillies (SG) noted the City's plan to redesign Boylston as a more Complete Street. SG: Our attempt is to do that, using planting strategies, taking the language and using a sympathetic but not mimicking design. There's a freestanding green wall on the edge of the roof. BK then went briefly through the plans, noting their restraint; they did not want to fill the site out. Each pop-up unit had a solid and a glass side, and a private terrace. The tower was compact. Two levels of parking were below grade.

DC: On the site plan, you have the pinching of the sidewalk to provide parking, but this also skews the street trees. The other thing about the pinch - the property line is somewhere - the public path has to be in the public way. BK: We can discuss this more in Committee. AL: The urban design analysis is terrific, going to a slender tower to let the light through. I like the pop-up things, the innies more than the outies. Feel free to shape your tower - go for it. I was expecting more a Fred and Ginger. Just a few strong moves to shape it...right now, it's just slender. It could be more dynamic, special, a real landmark. DM: I want to reinforce that. I want it to be even more figural. I agree with the urban design moves. Even between the tower pieces; it makes them legible. I do like the color; it's fine, lively, reinforces your other moves. I should ask how you achieve that. KS: Emphasize more on the tower, like Atelier in the South End. This, in 3 parts - Falun Red, etc. - it's sometimes not clear in the renderings. There are a lot of projects that levitate. I would like to see how this project meets the ground. MD: There's a lot of built stuff happening on Boylston. I'm a little concerned about the site, it reads a little barrier-like. You reference the City plan, but I'm not sure we've seen that. By itself, that's not

clear. SG explained a little about the planters proposed at the neckdown. BK: We'll bring a model of the plinth.

KS: A question for David - the Boylston corridor - think about light levels. I'm thinking about the 7th Street area in D.C. The lighting of the buildings, its intensity, the character of comparable streets. Becoming a distinct District. You should think comprehensively. AL: This is a good model for how to take a volume and make a street, rather than building all to the max. A good way of getting to the zoning volume. With that, the 1350 Boylston Street Project was sent to Design Committee.

LW returned. The next item was a presentation of the new **Government Center Garage Project**. Tom O'Brien (TOB) introduced the project and his team, including Kishore Varani (KV) and David Nagahiro of CBT. TOB: The Government Center Garage was built in 1970 and has been a blight and obstacle ever since. The prior scheme, as you know, was not phased. But it's an operating garage, so this proposal phases. We include some sidewalks, but this is mostly on our own site. (Shows aerial.) It's possible to sink structure into the spaces between the trays. That allows us to build two buildings, and then to cut off the garage at the end. The area is also not safe. KV: The area is designed for cars, it's not good for pedestrians or bikers. The garage is hard to understand, too. (Notes phasing, shows diagram.) We are undoing the urban renewal project; this is a transformative vision. We are embracing environmental stewardship, creating great public spaces and architecture. (Shows the massive wall of the garage.) There is only comparable transformative project - the Prudential Center. (Shows diagrams of the garage's placement in the City.) This is a complex project made even more interesting by keeping the garage core, salvaging the infrastructure. The existing garage retail is not very successful. Our plan is to wrap the garage with activity, and to use the other parcel to create a pedestrian link to the Greenway, with all retail or activity at the base, making every inch feel active. (Shows activity diagram.) It will be a garage for 850 bicycles, too. KV then showed building sizes as a figure-ground diagram. KV: We really pushed to create slender towers, address scales. (Shows evolution of massing thinking.) Along Congress there are two things, identical but not quite, like at State Street, but scaled back. It's not a singular icon, but a group of buildings as a composition. With individual personalities. "They can be all by different architects, as long as they're CBT." It's about 250,000 SF of land, and 2.9 million SF of building. (Shows axon view, notes program.) It's consistent with the guidelines. KV briefly noted sustainable strategies, with office LEED gold and residential LEED silver. He showed shadows... MD: Later. Then before and after views, day and night.

AL asked about the width of the space. KV compared it to Faneuil Hall Marketplace. LW: The density here is comparable to the Seaport; you need to make sure the density compares to sidewalk width. DC: Like Washington Street, there has to be a balance between the spaces you create and the street life elsewhere. KV: On Sudbury, it's a little challenging. But the intent is NOT to siphon away activity. KS: Did you look at the east plaza as an enclosed space? KV: We did, but think it works as an open space. We didn't want to close it up, having opened it all to the sky. TOB: The team wanted it to be a public space, and wanted to keep it perceived that way. KS: Faneuil Hall Marketplace...but the Greenway is still not populated. There needs to be a diversity of spaces in a 4-season area. Not Saturday at 6, but Wednesday at 7. (KV began to respond.) KS: Look at Congress Street. Map nodes of activity in different time cycles. Imagine this in the context of all those other spaces. AL: I question the prototype of a slender

tower. Your approach to the ground plane in general makes a lot of sense. The question is the assortment of towers. There is something there in the disposition of the towers that doesn't settle down yet. I'm looking for a family; they grow out of a common space. But they're not alike, and don't understand their differences. I don't know what the story line is. KV: Stepping down. AL: But it isn't. If you want the pair, then it's not a ladder. KV defended the scheme. AL: If three were the same, and one bigger. I urge you to think about them; they're like on big ensemble. They want to belong to the same hand. The tall ones are uncertain in their relationship. The ground plane....I was expecting more plaza, too. Not retail. TOB: We wanted to split the path. DM: I wonder if east and west aren't too much the same. If the blocks were more visually separate - maybe the two towers should not be the same. The 4th tower crossing the street is hard to explain. MD: The proliferation of little towerlets is perhaps what bothers us...you should do more massing studies. DM: The ground plane decisions are really very good, though. KV: Clearly, if one tower goes, the other gets taller. MD: Understood. AL: Another way to think about it, is that the east block is more a 150-foot block, and the other has 3 towers. The number, size, and height are not assembling yet into a single Project. KS: Not an International Place. KV: We looked at 3, 4 towers, and more. MD: We're supportive, but you have to study it more. With that, the new Government Center Garage Project was sent to Design Committee.

LW was recused from the next item. The next item was a presentation of the **Seaport Square Parcel L1 Project**. SH of Skanska once again introduced his team, this time Jonathan Ginnes (JG), Jeff Piperones, and Scot Simpson (SS) of KlingStubbins. SH noted the location and thanked the BCDC for making Parcel K better, noting it would be starting soon. Here, they are working on a major tenant. SS showed a context model, noting the massing was determined in large part by the PDA. He showed context boards, with the site in the center. SS: The BRA said to make it simple, elegant. It's a tower on a plinth with three different wall treatments, responding to solar exposure. The massing is very simple (hands around a model). We have a rooftop terrace - not for the public, but for the tenants. And the face along Harbor Way helps give life to the edges. SS again noted the location diagrams, and cited BRA guidance several times. He showed an exposure diagram, with horizontal fins shown on the south, and vertical fins on the east and west. He showed conceptual details for each. Then a series of views, describing various relationships, and finally sections and plans.

DC: Will you build Harbor Way? SH: We will build most of it. DC: So it won't be passable? SH: It will always be passable; it's pedestrian-only. MD: We'll want to see the interim condition. DM: What do we know about L2? SH (pointing to the model): We intend to get L2 as well. So we will build Harbor Way and Autumn Lane, and will design all of Harbor Way now; its other side will echo what we do. DM: There should be more information on that. The idea of the master plan, what goes on all around your ground floor. SS showed more views. AL: The view, especially the one from Seaport Boulevard....I'm trying to understand the 4-story base. A 2-story atrium above a 2-story lobby space and - you're trying to show a retail scale on the side? We have the booklets... What's really nice about this is that it *looks* like 2-story retail, and then 2 stories of office. If there's the ability to do any of that, retail on the second floor would be nice. KS: We need more info on the glazing. The buildings you've studied. JG began noting buildings they've done. KS: I'm not just asking your experience. I'm asking about the glass color. There's a lot of this material in the area. What does this extra layer of suit add to that? I'm asking about the architecture, not just what the engineers are giving you to

do. AL: The direction you've been given is a good starting point. It's not unlike the Lever Brothers Building, but you're unlikely to surpass that. So don't go there. At the end of the day, you don't want to be an almost-Lever. So, maybe not just making the faces different. More like Morphosis buildings, not just different, but *very* different. DM: In the Seaport, where do we go next? Information on the buildings, but also more is expected. Parcel L1 was duly sent to Committee.

LW returned. DM was recused from the next item. The next item was a presentation of the **D Street Development Hotels Project**. Geoff Lewis (GL) of the MCCA introduced the Project, recapping how we got here. GL: The Aloft hotel is 330 keys, the Element 180; ultimately the idea is to lead to the expansion of the BCEC. Tim Love (TL) of Utile presented the MCCA site and area studies. TL: I'll go through this quickly, you've seen it before. (Shows a massing phasing diagram and notes program.) We are hoping to eliminate the garage on D Street. These moves allow fulfillment of a longer vision, with an event space, the expanded volume of the BCEC, and more hotels in the area. This is the center of gravity on D Street for a retail node; it's about a 5-minute walk from both the Seaport and South Boston retail. (Notes the idea of a roadway connection from the Event Space all the way to the Reserve Channel.) TL then noted the pile of earth at the BCEC, and showed interim conditions, including a retail building and surface parking to the south, and temporary landscaping across the street.

Kent Knight (KK) of Elkus/Manfredi presented the design. KK: We've been working with Commonwealth Ventures and Jones Lang LaSalle - they apologize for not being here, it's too late for them. LW: We look forward to seeing *them* (laughter). KK showed a view, then reoriented to an overall site plan. He pointed out the hotel drive, the service loop, the future replacement of the back area and the service drive with future expansion. There'll be more on that later (introduces Susannah York [Ross] of Sasaki [SR]). KK then noted the differing character of the hotels; their entries were a distance from D consistent with their natures. SR: I think there's an actress named Susannah York....(shows an illustrative site plan, noting an early version of the temporary landscape across D Street, and the connection to the corner of the Aloft hotel). The back spaces serve as surrounds for guest service areas, so they are pleasant. (Shows sections, notes adherence to Complete Streets, notes the additional setback for the Element hotel and its retail.)

KK then showed the Aloft hotel ground floor. KK: It's a Starwood brand; they have rigorous standards. It's active, a public hotel. There's an open plan lobby where they greet people. Stairs go up, but on the rest of the ground floor there's the 'xyz' bar, a pool, and a fitness center opening up to the back yard space. At the front corner, we are thinking of ways to activate it. We can open the door/windows, and create a soft line between that and the restaurant. (Shows upper floors briefly.) The Element is a simpler, calmer space, with a U-shaped plan above. KK then showed elevations, noting that metal panels, ceramic, and precast materials were studied. He showed the 'distinctive corner' with Aloft's "swoof." KK: The back ell is more a punched window expression. KK noted the 2-story expression; there's a break-out gallery above, and retail below. KS asked about the materials again. KK: On the Element, we'll use precast and similar (ceramic) materials. On the Aloft, the night lighting is mostly along the bays and at the "swoof." On the Element, it's calmer. KK then showed views of the retail along the street, the facing elevations, the Element entrance defined by a 'hoop,' and a neighborhood elevation.

LW: It's not clear if you have Master Plan guidelines for the area. TL: We are working on a plan that will be different from the Waterfront District, from Cypher Street to Summer. LW: And the BRA? KK: With them, too - Kairos, and Jim Fitzgerald. LW: And Street One and Street Two? TL: We're working on those. DC: The crosswalk shown on this plan.... SR: That will be removed. TL then explained the series of actions on the streets. KS: This is a beacon for long views; I'd encourage you to be more liberal with the design. Lightness, reflectivity - it's an opportunity for a beacon - it can activate the street for a quarter mile. This building is influenced by spaces, etc.... TL: The view you see was chosen carefully; it's the view you will have stepping out of the BCEC. KS: I'm suggesting a longer view - *way* back. AL: I'd take it a step further. Looking at the models you've made, I think there's a huge opportunity here to make this more a compound. They're different - but you're using the same window, though. The taller should be more glassy, the smaller, more solid. Double up on the cluster. If you have red stripes here, use body red *here*. A grouping of similar things from the same palette - and there's a third thing there. A cluster. One solid, one open. TL: Conceptually, the urban design is headed in the opposite direction. AL: Why wouldn't it be more like Rockefeller Center? TL: There's a lot of copycat buildings. I'm worried about the sterility of D Street. AL: You could get more out of the punch. If you think of it as a group, that adds up to more than one. It's going to be different anyway. So you feel like you're entering a complex. KK: Starwood works hard to be different brands. KS: Work on facade articulation - but maybe the Element is okay. Create a place. If brands create it, it won't be a space. A reason to go outside and walk this distance. It's interminable inside. Crosstown as a family.

MD: You're not there yet. Liberty Wharf is most beloved; 411 has some of that jazz, that peters out by the Element. You can do more. KK: The lower floors? KS: The whole building. Melnea Parcel 9 is taking Aloft to a whole 'nother place. With that, the D Street Development Hotels Project was sent to Design Committee.

There being no further items for discussion, a motion was made to adjourn, and the meeting was duly adjourned at 9:565 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission is scheduled for August 6, 2013. The recording of the July 9, 2012 Boston Civic Design Commission meeting was digitized up to a point and what was recorded is available at the Boston Redevelopment Authority.