

DRAFT MINUTES  
**BOSTON CIVIC DESIGN COMMISSION**

The meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was held on Tuesday, June 4<sup>th</sup>, 2013, starting in the BRA Board Room, 9<sup>th</sup> Floor, Boston City Hall, beginning at 5:21 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, Daniel St. Clair, Kirk Sykes, and Lynn Wolff. Absent was David Manfredi. Also present was David Carlson, Executive Director of the Commission. Representatives of the BSA were present. Michael Cannizzo and John Fitzgerald were 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 Tuesday, May 21, in the BOSTON HERALD.

The first item was the approval of the May 7<sup>th</sup>, 2013 Meeting Minutes. A motion was made, seconded, and it was duly

**VOTED: To approve the May 7<sup>th</sup>, 2013 Boston Civic Design Commission Meeting Minutes.**

Votes and the sign-up sheet were passed for signature. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Jackson Square Building K (75 Amory Avenue) Project**. David Carlson (DAC) reported that the 75 Amory Avenue Project, on SWC Parcel 69, was part of the larger Jackson Square Master Plan seen by the Commission but in a phase not yet seen or approved in detail. Although the Project was now less than 50,000 SF, and generally not of a scale for BCDC review, a condition of the approval of the Master Plan framework was to review future Jackson Square phases and projects. Review was therefore recommended, and it was duly moved, seconded, and

**VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the Jackson Square Building K Project at 75 Amory Avenue, in the Jamaica Plain neighborhood.**

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on **Melnea Cass Parcel 9**. DAC reported that the Proposal, one of two such parcels released for RFPs by the BRA last year, was across Melnea Cass Boulevard from the Parcel 10 Project recently reviewed by the Commission and coming in for a vote tonight. These are gateway sites for Dudley Square; at 186,000 SF. The Proposed Urbanica Parcel 9 Project exceeds the BCDC threshold and review was recommended. It was duly moved, seconded, and

**VOTED: That the Commission review the proposed schematic design for the Parcel 9 Project on Melnea Cass Boulevard and Washington Street (bounded also by Ball Street and Shawmut Avenue) in the Lower Roxbury neighborhood.**

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on **Boston College's 2150 Commonwealth Avenue Project**. DAC reported that the BCDC had seen and approved the Boston College IMP in 2008; this was a significant site, and review of such was a condition of approval. It was also (at about 245,000 SF) well over the BCDC threshold; thus, a vote to review was recommended. It was duly moved, seconded, and

**VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for Boston College's proposed 2150 Commonwealth Avenue Residence Hall Project and associated amendments to its Institutional Master Plan, in the Allston-Brighton neighborhood.**

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **revised Fan Pier Parcel I Project**. DAC reported that the BCDC had recently seen Fan Pier Parcel C and Fan Pier Park; this Parcel I site had been approved for residential, hotel, and retail uses but was now substituting office and hotel. The Fan Pier PDA allowed such flexibility in site programming and massing setbacks. A new vote would be required from the Commission since the earlier version was approved in 2006. The Project alone (at over 500,000 SF) is well over the BCDC threshold and a vote to review was recommended. It was duly moved, seconded, and

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

David Hacin (DH) and Linda Eastley (LE) arrived. The next item was a presentation of the **Jackson Square Building K / 75 Amory avenue Project**. Teronda Ellis (TE) of the JPNDP introduced herself and noted the program (39 affordable units), distributing handouts with updated information. She noted that this would be the first project in Jackson Square Phase 2, as mentioned by DAC. Stephen Tise (ST) of Tise Design Associates showed the original Master Plan and then related the site to what is seen in Jackson Square now. ST: Originally this was larger; it was reduced in program (50 to 38 units) and height (6 to 4 stories). DHCD funding is tight, and that has impacted what we can do. ST then showed the site plan, noting their change to now beginning a roadway that could be continued in future phases, with parallel parking. ST noted the embedded townhouse units were a key to animating the area.

Lynn Wolff (LW): About the parking you show - is that in the greenway area? Is the MBTA okay with that? TE: Yes, in the discussions we've had with them, we have good feedback so far. The other option (a structured garage in the Master Plan) got taken out, as it became a private parcel. LW: It's not a good precedent for other places. David, is this in the greenway? DAC: Yes. TE: The (ongoing) planning effort for Site III (the larger overall parcel of Jackson Square) will look at the larger part of the greenway along the tracks, but we are also thinking about the treatment of this edge. MD: We will want to see into that crystal ball - bring more information on the Master Plan to Committee. LW: You will have to make a very good case for converting that to parking. LE: Will it be a title, or an easement? TE: It will be a long-term easement. Bill Rawn (WR): Is the street in that easement? TE: No, that's on our property.

WR: Is there precedent to count parking on the street toward that for a Project? DAC: It can't be sold, but yes, it can be counted, as it was for Maverick Gardens in East Boston, where the streets were also built by the City.

ST then presented the design, showing views, and noting the relationship to the adjacent factory building and the limited funding. DH: Materials? ST: Hardie Panel Artisan series at the top, tiling at the bottom. We had a Japanese system, but they pulled the product out of the country. MD: Do the townhouses go through? ST: They are just on this side. Flats are on the other side. Andrea Leers (AL): The combination of townhouse and flat units is hard to pull off. It could be understood as flats over townhouses. It probably started out that way. ST: Actually not. It's kind of a hybrid; they use the same central laundry, for example. But they are larger units, and we feel it's interesting to keep them more integrated into the life of the building. AL: The question is more the balance. At the moment, it's an apartment house with a few units tucked in. It seems like too few. TE: We had more. ST: We had 1-2 more; we liked it better. Daniel St. Clair (DS): So, the unit count? ST: No, it was cost. They cost more per square foot. WR: Could it be done at the end? ST: I didn't make it clear, but that does have its own entry. WR: I appreciate the idea. [A discussion ensued with ST about what the options might be.] DH: The bays express the townhouse units. The stairwell is a little tough. I wonder if there isn't more to do to simplify - if you looked at the use of Hardie, and simplified the building so that there were no tiles behind the bays, just the bays. MD: We will see this in Committee - show us more about the relationship with the Jackson Square Master Plan - a model is not needed. LW: Work to tighten the parking to allow a bike path. AL: Consider a bay at the end. With that, the 75 Amory Avenue Project was sent to Design Committee.

The next item was a report from the Design Committee on the **Melnea Cass Parcel 10 Project**. MD noted that it needed work, but also needed a vote. LE: We talked about activating the edge, and emphasizing the corner entry. Possibly extending Building B, and creating a stronger visual connection from Washington Street. Making it more pedestrian friendly. DH: We made many of the same points. The character of the parking area should be more urban, street-like, and less suburban. We also discussed the view, and making Shawmut Avenue more comfortable. AL: This is an opportunity to define Melnea Cass, and not make the building edge the back, or side. MD: (to Proponent) We understand you've done some work. So (to Commission) - keep your minds open for conditions.

Kirk Sykes (KS) arrived; DS left. Russ Tanner (RT) of Madison Park Development: Thank you for accelerating your schedule. Speaking for the team, we feel your review improved it. Fernando Domenech (FD) of DHK showed the site diagram, noting the building was shifted, creating a street-like path, with trees and lighting, going through the site. Cliff Boehmer (CB) of Plan B Retail showed the supermarket corner view, noting that it had not been changed, but then went through transparency diagrams to clarify how visible the supermarket was along three of its edges. CB: Another issue is the permanence of Melnea, and where you could add program. What can be done, is to add stands, etc. at the corner, and in the future open up the Shawmut bakery corner. FD showed the overall site again. Deneen Crosby (DC): It looks better. The circulation is a lot better. The gap (along Melnea) still feels wide, even though it's smaller. KS: This is the time to make this right, on Building B. We want to help you move forward. LE: It looks like you've added to Building B. FD: We have, and extended it over the parking

slightly.

LE: We looked at planters as a way of reinforcing the edge. Do you have that? That could be further reinforced. The piers, and fencing doesn't make it seem urban. FD (showed the old scheme): We haven't updated the drawings yet; the landscape architect is fresh on the job. WR: Perhaps a trellis structure that relates to things behind it - a pergola. LW: Reinforce the entry to make it feel more urban. AL held up the elevation: This is a *very* wide opening, and a prominent entry point. It's better, but the opening is still almost the size of Building B. You could shift the whole building more. MD: (to Commission) We are suggesting working on the character along Melnea. To move the buildings closer together, add structure, work on the prominence of the supermarket corner, the nature of the drive. What should be the conditions of the vote? Shall we trust to the BRA staff to continue the discussion? LW: I would like to see the site. KS: I am willing to take a vote; the openings on Melnea Cass and Washington are far from what should be good urban design. It was then moved, seconded, and

**VOTED: That the BCDC recommends approval of the schematic design for the Madison Tropical Parcel 10 Project on Melnea Cass Boulevard and Washington Street in the Roxbury neighborhood, with the condition that BRA staff work to incorporate final comments into the site plan, and that any changes to the site and Building B return for further informational review and comment.**

KS was recused from the next item. The next item was a report from the Design Committee on the **University Place Residences Project**. Ed Hodges (EH) of DiMella Shaffer briefly re-presented what was shown in Committee. LW asked about the building and surrounds; EH confirmed there was movement through the building and site, and showed the treatments around the building. He then showed the massings studied in different views, noting the Committee decided that the materials changed in the right place. EH: DM and DH had asked for more retail study - we researched precedents. Here (shows), the retail sign band is consistent, but there is variation in the retail treatment - we're not sure that's the solution. DC: I have a question about the DCR road - if it doesn't change, my concern is that there is not enough space to circulate toward the beaches from all the new development in the area. EH showed the view from that side, noting an overall 10-foot grade change (about 2-3' at the building edge), with a sidewalk about 6-8' wide. DC: That needs to accommodate pedestrians. EH: It's not our property; we're 10 feet back from that line. The existing condition is to remain.

DH: This was well received in Committee. Also, I want to advocate for the earlier iteration (on retail) - that had a better architectural connection. This looks too much like Boylston Street. This is not that retail environment; a stronger, simpler treatment is in order. EH: It's primarily a residential building that has some retail in it; we were also convinced by the exercise. WR: DM and I talked about this afterward; I'm not sure I agree. This warrants some serious discussion. As a Commission, we should have that conversation. I worry that this might be too stripped down for a future retail district. DH: We should have the conversation. Many buildings float (on top of retail) - finding the right balance is critical. You showed two ends of the spectrum; maybe, somewhere in the middle. The streets should not be defined by national retailer standards. AL: The building comes down, and frames the retail. Rockefeller Center does that very well. DH: Yes. AL: This building doesn't do that yet, but that may be good. MD: Bring the architecture down to the street.

With that, a vote on the University Place Project was moved, seconded, and

**VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the proposed University Place Residences development and PDA at 140-144 Mount Vernon Street in the Columbia Point section of the Dorchester neighborhood, with the condition that any future development or phase in the PDA return to the Commission for review and approval.**

KS returned. LW was recused for the next item. The next item was a report from the Design Committee on the **399 Congress Street Project**. Models appeared on the table, and caused a stir. DH: I feel like I'm there. Tamara Roy (TR) of ADD Inc noted what they had done since Committee. TR: There are now two precast colors. We have darkened the metal at the gap, and minimized the transformer enclosure. We have added a wood pergola on the NE corner, opposite to the transformers. We have studied the streetscape and pedestrian experience; there is now wood material at both ends and in the middle. Mike Angelo (MA) of CWDG: We have added planters related to the shape of the canopy. Pavers are on the edge of sidewalk and serve as an infiltration zone. (Shows Complete Streets diagram.) This section (indicates) is where the sidewalk is widest overall, between the planters.

DH: I know we can't ask you to do this, but if you adopted the islands closest to you, it would really make a difference. DC: Trees are really needed here. It's a little crowded (toward the north) - the trees need a good environment here. LE: I'm curious about the pergola here. MA: We are masking the area, making it buffered from the highway ramp with plantings. LE: You'll need that; good. TR: There's a bicycle path. WR: We asked for the model and work on the sidewalk a week ago. And given the environment, it's still hard to believe anyone would be walking here. I applaud this first pass. I think at the pergola, no one will sit there; I see abandoned tables and chairs. I don't want us to be Pollyanna about it. This should have a stronger point of view, not a series of little incidences. The parking entry is *very* wide. I recognize it has to be wide...can there be bollards? MA: There are; they're not shown. TR: We can work on changing the paving.

DH: On the end, if it were more protected from the street, bermed...TR: We had bamboo. AL: You could make the ends more similar, with walls. One you go into, one you don't. In stead of a roof (pergola), a wall that protects. KS: Good idea. DH: Yes. And there is a kind of human scale being introduced...improvements, and ideas such as the islands will help. MD: People will inhabit them...mind the scale. KS: A people scale. But the view from the road - they work as objects. And the speed - at 40mph, you *need* a buffer. DH: In Chicago, on Michigan Avenue...the granite is up high, and then there are plantings - enough of a wall. DC: I think it's this end (toward the north) - a little more space there. DH: There's a lot of detailed discussion on the streetscape. Do we want to approve the building, and see more on the landscape? MD: We could trust review to this firm and to BRA staff, hearing our comments. WR: If you could find the room to....AL: If you did the extended idea at the north, and wrapped it around...I had mentioned the idea of two sides to the building. TR: We brought that up in Committee. When we looked at the views, and especially with future conditions, it was felt less important. AL:

The vent building makes that side very different. But I understand you want to move this along.

MD: Make more defensible pedestrian space. And work with BTD to secure more generous environments. KS: Not just defensible, protected. But with larger scale elements.

MD: Who wants to see this again? LE: They should give an informational only presentation to us when the streetscape has been addressed. With that, it was duly moved, seconded, and

**VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the revised schematic design for the proposed 399 Congress Street Residences Project on the parcel bounded by Congress Street, B Street north- and south-bound I-90 Extension ramps, and the East Service Road in the South Boston Waterfront District, with the condition that the Proponent team return for an informational presentation when streetscape issues are addressed.**

PM left; LW returned. The next item was a presentation of the **Melnea Cass Parcel 9 Project**. Katie Faulkner (KF) of NADAAA introduced the design team, including John Houser and Nader Tehrani (NT). KF: We are across from Parcel 10. We have a hotel, and housing for about 50 units (describes program). NT used the overall site plan to describe the urban design intent: The context is varied; this gives a sense of presence. KF: Working with the speed of Melnea. NT: From the urbanism of the two sides - this is not interpreted as a wall, but as a funnel. We are using the sidewalk to reinforce the urban activity from the South End, while setting the stage for this area. We carved out space on the (Ball Street) side - it did not make sense to do it on the other. KF: The Project assumes a future Melnea, and so the site line moves back about 18'. It also has to accommodate the bike trail. This Project can survive in the other circumstance (Melnea not proceeding as currently planned).

NT noted the constraints of the parcel. NT: We tried myriad massings. With the reduced site, a middle scale was sought. On the ground floor, there are active uses, a lesser amount of service. Mandela Housing is across Shawmut. Our intent was to allow a walk-through, like at Holyoke Center. Above that, we tried a number of shapes and configurations, combining the two programs. But the hotel and residential programs were inherently different. And the views provided the desired orientation. KF: The upper level is considered as a green 'crust' with the hotel spaces separated by the building, and residential spaces. The upper roof plan is PV-ready. NT: The key elevation is from Melnea Cass and the Park; the roof line hides rooftop equipment from selected views. Because of the construction type, this will be light materials, not brick volumes. A wood substrate. (Shows sections - cross and longitudinal - and a material study.) KF: This will be an aloft hotel, a premium affordable brand from W Hotels. (Shows a view.) Ball Street is two-way, and jammed during ball games in the park. KF showed a view along Washington, noting the canopy and overhang, with openable window-doors at the restaurant. Then a view from Parcel 10.

LE: Looking along Ball Street, you noted a 'bow-tie effect' to bring residents in/through. But is that discouraged? KF: No, that's encouraged. People are expected to cut through. LE: On Ball, that portion is not very animated, with mechanicals, etc. On the roof garden, you'll get a sliver of sun in the summer, but it's not hospitable in the winter. You'll want to think about that. WR: On the porte cochere, you've covered over a large area, but it's only 15' high. NT: It will be well-lit, and warm in the winter. The design is top-driven, with a double-loaded corridor; we had to negotiate height vs. the mass. This was simpler - and we added the

triangular areas, but within the vocabulary. It was higher, too, and we had to reduce that. WR: What I'm trying to get at, is the dark space. It just seems like an issue. Most of these have simple canopies. Urbanica: That was one of the hotel operator's comments. Less turnaround, more lobby space. WR: That doesn't affect the form? NT: No. DH: I like the project - it has the kind of energy needed to bridge the gap. A couple of things - I *know* you have a model. Putting the latest Parcel 10 mass into the model would help. And the retail - I'm a little concerned about the retail program at the corner of Shawmut; I'd like to hear more about the kind of retailers. MD: It's a very interesting project. I'm curious about the strategy of pulling away from the corner of Melnea Cass; I'm not sure that's strong enough. KS: I agree with that. A model is important. I'm taking on why you would not bring it out to the corner. The model should have all four corners. I expect this will feel differently. I'm not sold on the plinth, but I'm willing to be. AL: What's interesting is making two volumes instead of one. On the plinth, you have to OWN it, every inch, winter and summer. Do enclosure studies. This is a very exciting project, two over one. LW: Bring more information on the public realm. Sidewalks, bike paths. In the sections, you had a cantilever almost out to the street. There is a lot of overhanging going on. Does the plinth relate to the volumes? I'm not sure the space below is comfortable. DC: And show us the interim conditions, if Melnea work does not proceed. With that, the Melnea Cass Parcel 9 Project was sent to Design Committee.

LE and DH were recused from the next item. The next item was a presentation of **Boston College's 2150 Commonwealth Avenue Residence Hall**. Jeanne Levesque of Boston College gave a brief background and introduced Tom Keany of BC, and the Project team. She noted recent campus projects, and that with five new residential planned - this being the first - they would house 95% of their students on campus. This Project has 470 beds; the BLC has okayed the demolition of the existing Thomas More Hall building. Paul King (PK) of EYP presented the design, starting first on context (noting that building) and then an aerial view of the site area, and context photos. PK: The last residence hall, in 2004, in many ways is a precedent for this design. The IMP suggested it as two buildings. It is a gateway to the Chestnut Hill campus, and it leads to the Brighton campus. The IMP idea of greens, quads, and pathways continues. Urban design objectives included establishment of gateways, active edges, etc. On the site itself, topography, park ordinances, and constraints of the IMP limit the height. WE developed a critique of the two-building idea. First, Commonwealth Avenue is porous - and has setbacks. In the IMP, this was consistent, and the spaces were too cramped. So - the Commonwealth setbacks are now aligned, the open space is more open toward the campus, and the diagonal pathway still exists. The corner is made weak by NOT being built before. (Shows a site diagram and massing studies.) Crossing Commonwealth depends on the trolley move to that point. We are transparent at the ends, with a clear entry point; a monument, rather than a frame, as a gateway.

Mike of EYP showed the program, pointing out amenity and practice rooms, etc. College Health Services (because the topo worked in favor of this) would be in the lower floor, as well as building services. The rooms are 4- to 6-bed apartments; there are transparent study spaces at the end of corridors. PK then described the character and materials, noting first the use of Weymouth granite (on gable ends and on the base), similar to other campus buildings. PK: The body is brick - ochre to tan - with a limestone trim. There will be a metal roof (slate is typical on campus), likely zinc-coated copper. Ray of Stimson Associates showed a landscape view from Commonwealth. PK pointed out the common/study areas on the background facade. Ray

showed the site plan, pointing out the nature of the spaces and the rationale for selection of tree species, such as red oaks to continue an existing row of same. He showed a view of the courtyard, which was described, noting the scale of the building was brought down by the trees.

AL: On the site plan - I am remembering the goals of the IMP. A kind of diagonal thrust, up through the corner. The idea of capturing space on the campus side, and having a solid, albeit transparent, mass blocks the notion of that movement. The blocks - I understand it's more difficult to do two, but this destroys the intent of the original plan. What was the idea? PK: One was the operational cost/savings. One rather than two security desks, elevator cores. Also, we have worked on the community size, and 450-500 is a sweet spot. AL: That would have been known at the time of the Master Plan. PK: I can't speak to that. But the intent has changed. It's a solid, but feels like a public space; we're doing it both ways. LW: When two buildings were there, it felt open, welcoming. This is totally different, like a fort. The concept is really *different*. DC: Part of what I'm seeing, the nature of the plan, depends on how public Thomas More Road feels. PK: It absolutely feels like part of the City network. The site feels like an island, outside of the campus. It's very much BC along the road, but it's used as a cut-through. AL: That was the notion given at the time of the IMP - that there was a deliberate creation of a more campus-like, inviting, open gateway. Instead of the more public road. We may need to look at the change in strategy that this change implies. (LW and PK discuss further.)

WR: I want to second what AL and LW said. You articulated your argument quite well, and talked about the pathway. Given the sensitivity to security, you might consider Princeton, with portals at the corners. PK: Also at Yale, Northeastern, and Michigan...but Boston College, fond as they might be of Campus Gothic architecture, do not like those spaces, and find them cold and uninviting. WR: One or two stories. It seems like such a wonderful opportunity. PK: (notes axonometric site plan) The existing campus connection IS at the road. KS: On the IMP, there seem to be road paths as well. I'm trying to help you here. Is this a kind of system that works around, or are you trying to drive people through the building? PK: Not drive, but allow options. KS: I'm trying to suggest that a philosophy of going around the building could be thought about. On the corner marker - I'm not convinced there. AL: To follow that thought - there is another way to look at all this. But when the movement flows all around the building, it should be more permeable all around. Take what you've done, and make it more sensible - more agreeable all around. That makes more sense.

PK: The BRA has emphasized the strength of the corner. KS: It's nature is that of a dynamic processor of people, a link. MD: Are we clear on what is being discussed in Committee? WR: We've only discussed one issue. KS: The scale seems large, compared to the rest of the campus. MD: Something is lost in the transparency. It's a hinge block. The huge mass is rather daunting; that's where it varies. PK: The intent is to allow an urban mass along Commonwealth, and better open space. MD: It turns its back on Commonwealth. You might have erred too far. LW: Are there other glass areas that break up the scale? Further into the space? Maybe that could come in more spaces, passageways. WR: Can I suggest that we ask for a model, so we can understand the architectural intentions? The small model meets the letter of the law, but we need more. With that, the Boston College 2150 Commonwealth Avenue Residence Hall was sent to Design Committee.



LE and DH returned. The next item was a presentation of the revised **Fan Pier Parcel I Project**. Richard Martini (RM) of The Fallon Company introduced Lewis Hedgecock (LH) and Art Gross (AG) of BBG-BBGM. LH: We spent a lot of time making this a different parti than the rest of the buildings. AG: There are four sides, but two distinct environments. Our original design was four composed elevations. The BRA appreciated the designs, but wanted something different. Like the other sites, the site is essentially square. What is unique is the relationship to the ICA - and the removal from other similar parcels. The ways through which people perceive the building - along Northern Avenue, from the Harbor - provide an opportunity to start layering the texture. There are two masses - one facing south, a sheath to the north. The color is grayer than in the (blue) model; on the south, we are using a darker glazing system, different from the others. The north system is lighter. The problem is then how you take simple forms and add detail to those forms to give interest. The entry is designed to call your attention to the office entrance, but also to relate to the retail context. The 'bustle,' as you move toward the ICA, is the hotel entry. LH pointed out the locus on a plan. AG pointed out how the edge was skewed to align with the skew of the ICA - which also opens up I to the Harbor. [Commissioners move to walk around the model.]

AL: How did you arrive at the entry location? RM: The tenant as well as the architects. DH: Why glass? AG: It's an office building primarily. We did not want to make it residential. It's more open, marketable. We played with the articulation of the glass. DH: I ask because I get asked questions. The glass - and there is a lot of glass - details look like they will be great. But even though I don't prefer brick, I'm beginning to long for it. The model is great. You show materials; we don't always have the benefit of that. For example, when we see Seaport Square B and C. We talked about that recently. AG: We considered other materials - there's a lot of precast, too. AL: You inherit a mass which is fundamentally impossible to make graceful. Two slipped volumes, a simple move, is a good way to approach this. The whole taper is good. The saddlebag, which feels tacked-on, takes away from that. I'm surprised that the lower floors are the hotel; you might look at a variation of the material there, within your gesture. You have a bold massing gesture. It doesn't *have* to be in these materials. But the side distracts.

WR: The use of glass to set off the ICA is good. The glass at the ICA is different than this. LE: I have a different comment on the ICA - you have only a glimpse of it. Are there hints to know it still exists? The gem becomes hidden, so how can that be done? It seems like a missed opportunity, because the side blocks the view at the base. DH: And the Harbor view. And you have to remember there's a park *here* (across the street). Some of the comments I'm hearing...you have an array along Northern Avenue. I'm really worried about the *flatness*. In that spirit, I wonder if it's possible to inflect it a little. MD: I think that's right. This might be a site where a large, simple box is right, but inflections might be a good way to augment that. WR noted the Boston Magazine article on Boston and the BRA. WR: The ICA - the most important view is the corner, and the angle of its stair. Lift up the saddlebag. Move it 25' back, or up. Cantilever it. DH: The view of the ICA...I know they are concerned. AL: That kind of volumetric move is welcome on Northern Avenue, and a problem on the side, where a broader, paved 'courtyard' might be a gift to the City. RM: I appreciate the notion. With an inflection, the view on the other side, and the restaurant, would be reduced.

DH: We haven't talked about streetscape. This is a gracious way to the water, not just the ICA. AG: The saddlebag is a scale-giving element (shows a street level view, with pink and blue glass coloration.) The view is revealed - that's more urban. AL: You don't have to do it all with the

building. It can be canopies, other things. DH: Something you can walk through, and high enough to allow the view. WR: The protrusion can be shaped, like a sawtooth, i.e. AL: Subtract the addition, then add back what you need. LE: Even if you erode the volume, you'd still need to remove it.... DH suggested other moves. AL: This is a real strong geometric gesture. Don't fuzzy it. DH: An inflection can help.

With that, the revised proposal for Fan Pier Parcel I 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 9:41 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission is scheduled (it turns out) for July 9, 2013. The recording of the June 4, 2013 Boston Civic Design Commission meeting was digitized and is available at the Boston Redevelopment Authority.