

MINUTES

BOSTON CIVIC DESIGN COMMISSION

The meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was held on Tuesday, January 2nd, 2018, starting in Room #900, Boston City Hall, and beginning at 5:15 p.m.

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

Michael Davis (MD) announced that this was the meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission that meets the first Tuesday of every month and welcomed all persons interested in attending. He added thanks to the Commissioners for the contribution of their time to the betterment of the City and its Public Realm. This hearing was duly advertised on Thursday, December 21, in the BOSTON HERALD.

The first item was the approval of the December 5th, 2017 Meeting Minutes. A motion was made, seconded, and it was duly

VOTED: To approve the December 5th, 2017 BCDC Meeting Minutes.

Votes were passed for signature. Daniel St. Clair (DS) was recused from the next item. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **One Post Office Square Office Tower and Garage Improvement Project and PDA Amendment**. David Carlson (DAC) noted that the Project was an interesting re-cladding as well as a new addition. The new SF was proposed at ~250,000 SF, but when taken with the existing building the total was over 1.1 million SF. Review was recommended. It was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed One Post Office Square Tower and Garage Improvement Project, in the Downtown Financial District.

DS returned. The next item was a report from Review Committee on the **100 Hood Park Drive Project**. DAC noted that was a garage site approved as part of the Master Plan. A more active use was proposed at the base, setting the stage for an updated Master Plan soon; this would be processed under the existing Master Plan with a minor technical amendment. The structure was effectively over 300,000 SF (active uses about 75,000 SF); review was also a condition of PDA Master Plan approval. An affirmative vote was recommended. It was moved, seconded, and

VOTED:: That the Commission review the schematic design for 100 Hood Park Drive in the Hood Park Master Plan PDA in the Charlestown neighborhood.

David Hacin (DH), Andrea Leers (AL), David Manfredi (DM), and Bill Rawn (WR) were recused from the next item. The next item was a report from Review Committee on the **Harvard Enterprise Research Campus PDA Master Plan**. DAC noted that this was a PDA Masterplan rather than an IMP because it would be developed by private parties on Harvard's property, like The Continuum at Barry's Corner, and it would be considered in a larger context which included both a 'Framework Plan' and the existing IMP. Because of the nature of the PDA, and the 900,000 SF of program requested, review was recommended. It was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the PDA Master Plan for the new Harvard Enterprise Research Campus in the Allston neighborhood.

DH, AL, DM, and WR returned. The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **125 Amory Street Project**. Kendra Halliwell (KH) of ICON reprised the issues discussed. Ian Ramey (IR) of CWDG noted the Project's position on the green corridor along the Orange Line. KH: This will fill in a missing link, as did the Jackson Square Phase 3 Project. IR showed the existing conditions, then the proposed plan. IR: We have focused most recently on the entry from Atherton Street. We've reduced the parking by 10%, and removed the head-in spaces from the area next to Building C. We've added tree 'pods' between parking spaces along the green space (along Western Drive). (Shows a view of the Atherton entry.) We're curving an existing retaining wall and cleaning up invasive species there. KH: We have clarified the entry on Building B, and modified/simplified the building (shows). Building A (shows) now relates better to the other buildings. It's a sibling now, slightly less industrial, and more colorful. We're using a wood Hardie material as an accent.

Deneen Crosby (DC) asked about lighting along Western Drive. IR: It's a continuation of that used along Jackson Square Phase 3. Kirk Sykes (KS) asked about the context. KH showed aerial and context photos to give the Commission a reminder of the context. KS: Helpful...it's eclectic. AL: This is a really nice Project. I appreciate your taking our comments thoughtfully. Building A is much better. DM: I appreciate the added parallel parking. Even if it's not all you need, it really helps. And you reduced the heaviness of some buildings [A and B]. DC: The head-in parking tends to make the green space recede. So continue to work at that. Linda Eastley (LE): The characters of the different spaces are nice. Also, rather than interspersing pods of parking with single trees, maybe aggregate the trees so that some of the park comes closer, at a strategic point. Hearing no public comment, it was then moved, seconded, and

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

The next item was a presentation of the **100 Hood Park Drive Project**. Mark Rosenshein (MR) of Trademark introduced their team, including Colliers and the Kaneb Family, then the Garage Project, noting the recent (late 2016) 480 Rutherford action by the Commission. MR: The Masterplan dates from 2000, and we have an office tenant for 200 Hood Park Drive (HPD) - which requires, per the PDA, that the garage must be built. So we must get going on that. In

April we will return for that office tower, and the new Master Plan. (Shows the 2000 Masterplan, and the slight amendment necessary for the garage as proposed at 100 HPD.) We've straightened Hood Park Drive. Everything along that, and south of the Drive, is included *now* in the PDA. Our presentation acknowledges the future office building. Mark Spaulding (MS) of SMMA presented the design. MS: The garage structure tees things up for the rest of the Plan. It sets up also for what might come to the west. It's a ventilated structure. There are four levels of garage above a two-story restaurant/retail space. But that's *very* high. (Shows sections, notes the PV panels at the top, shows building plans, then the ground floor plan and site plan.) The entries face Hood Park Drive. There's a service and parking speed ramp off of Chimney Drive. (Shows a view along HPD looking west, then a view of the garage venue from a space next to the existing Powerhouse.) There's a relationship to music on the screening devices on the garage...we're using one strategy on the [shorter] east and west sides, another on the north and south. 'Piano Keys' east and west, angled fins on north and south. The vertical fins form a 'curtain' motif, opening at the entry with a 3-D illusion. The material pulls away; there are visual changes based on sight lines to the fins. The building base on HPD toward the west has no windows - it's the performance venue. So we have elements - trees, and a canopy - which will allow gathering along that edge. (Shows a birds-eye overview.)

AL: What about the parking access? MS pointed it out. DH asked about the screen coming to the ground. MS: It reveals entries. At the main venue entry, and the corner retail/restaurant. The glass there is more than 25' high. AL: How does the approach work? MS: You can drop off in front of 500 Rutherford, and also there's a turnaround at Chimney Court near the corner. MD: Is the venue selected? MR: We don't have an LOI or deal yet, but we are well down the path. To Andrea's question more...(describes how circulation works in the area, using the overall plan)...the question of circulation is a topic of sensitivity. There will be a future connection north via Spice Street (a road across MBTA property circumvents Rutherford) and the Sullivan Square tunnel shift will allow a signalized intersection at Rutherford and HPD/Baldwin Street. (More discussion about circulation and future traffic ensued.) DH: Bring more on that to Committee.

DC: Can [Chimney Drive] continue to Bunker Hill Community College? MR: Not directly (explains, using an aerial).

DH: The architecture, and the strategy of parking that is convertible in use, are good. The amount of curtain that comes down over the active uses seems a little heavy. The volume of the lower floors helps the overall reading. AL: It's exciting that you've introduced a public use, and two floors of it. You're avoiding Miami. I have a concern about 4,000 people arriving and leaving. Is it comparable to Lansdowne Street? MR: Yes, a little bigger. But the event size is manageable, so it's not always at capacity. LE: The urban design, setting up the grid, is good. And moving the garage toward Chimney Court is good; it completes that street. The long facade feels too solid - that northern face needs to have more of a pedestrian scale. Given the performances - you want that energy - you need a visual signal. Right now, it just looks like it's curtains. MD: There must be something you can do, so that you're not looking at all CMUs.

KS: Show us views from the highway. Something we discussed at North Point - long views that provide glimpses, views, etc. MR: We owe you that. Also, I should note that we are elevating the entire site above the 100-year flood plain. DM: What is the floor-to-floor on the garage? MR: 9'8". We couldn't make the ramps work. So to convert in the future, we will eliminate

every other floor. We are creating, behind that curtain, a lobby that can serve that future. DM: We'll see the details in Committee. I think you could do more with the 45' height of the retail space. My instinct would be to go the other way [open]. AL: Maybe more of the building could use the short end strategy...that works. Maybe not using two distinct strategies. KS: This is one of three garages. Still.... MR: That gets to the Masterplan. We don't want a parking garage on Rutherford. This garage could fit up to 990 cars, reducing the total need to two, and allowing other treatments. We think that's better. With that, and hearing no public comment, the 100 Hood Park Drive Project was sent to Design Committee.

DS was recused from the next item. The next item was a presentation of the **One Post Office Square Project**. Jonathan Ginnis (JG) of Gensler presented the design. JG: When developed in 1980, this was a landmark. But it's an architecture of its time - then, and now. Urban flight has turned to urban destination. Single use has become diverse uses. Protective has changed to welcoming, and traditional to innovative. (Shows a program drivers diagram.) The systems are outmoded; we're changing to a chilled beam system. There are odd corners, and varying window sizes. This needs a more rational design inside and out, equalizing the tenant experience. The existing garage is difficult. We intend to remove it, and replace it with an automated garage with office floors on top. And we have about seven semi-public tenant amenity spaces on different levels. Not all the cladding will be removed - about 3/4 will be. The floors indicated in red (31-38) will have the precast remaining, due to tenant conditions. The re-cladding has its own challenges, as does replacing the mechanical systems; adding the tenant into that is too much. (Shows a design elements diagram.) It will be a glass box, triple-glazed; we're using two different facade types. The 'Porch' allows that tenant to come outside. The lantern at the top gives presence. We're filling in the corners, and defining the massing elements. (Shows views, pausing at one from Milk and Oliver.) Note the change at the parking garage. Retail is placed all around; the parking is above and below grade - we shifted the mechanicals. The parking system is constantly shifting, with a time of 90 seconds max to retrieve your car.

AL asked about the band shown on the garage volume. JG: That's mechanicals. The parking is visible below that. JG then showed exterior wall details to explain the over-cladding. DM: Does the glass plane shift at the over-cladding? JG: It will be continuous; we are slightly extending the floors on the lower floors, so it will be co-planar - except at the 'porch.' DH: What about the night view? Will you notice the difference? JG showed some views: We're using frit, and chamfering. When all the lights are on, you'd notice. But with the more typical random lighting, it's much less obvious. JG then showed the change in plan at the street level, and views. JG: We are looking at vendors that will potentially manage all the venues (shows another view). DH: We'll have to understand happens, how the hotel guests are dropped off. There's a little confusion here on exactly where and how. JG then showed a section with the lower amenity space, and a series of views around the building. JG: We are working out the scale of the perforation (on mechanicals, and Milk and Oliver). (Shows sections at the ground floor, then a night view from the Harbor.)

DH: The Project is very exciting, a composition of elements. I have two concerns...one is the relationship to the hotel. It sounds like there's a lot of traffic on Franklin Street; I think it's surprising that there's not more of a connected ground plane. JG: I should have mentioned that the spaces connect. The desire is for a *rich* connection. DH: On the cladding: I do wonder if it

doesn't deserve a model; it's a new tower in the middle of the City. JG: We have one now, we're working on changes. DH: I kind of hoped that the re-cladding would relate to the elements on the building. If the idea behind the volumes was to address a difference in lighting, rather than depending on random lighting to have a better effect. JG: It's a challenging issue for us; we're studying it. DH: If a tenant moves out? JG: It's not going to happen. WR: I appreciate the uses. Along Milk Street, I worry about the continuity. Now, it doesn't invite you in, but it doesn't push you away. MD: Oliver Street. Pearl Street is getting some great benefit. I want to make sure that Oliver is getting a balanced approach. It will be getting some interesting parking, and an office tower. DH: How the parking is lit - I'd like to know about that. JG: We've been working on that. Possibly a light film. LE: I like the theatrical element of your parking, but I want to make sure it works compositionally, and with lighting. Paul McDonough (PM): Have a ham and cheese, or your Lamborghini.... LE: A model will help us understand how it works in its context. JG: Yes.

DM: One more thing. This thing is incredibly aggressive. I'd want to know more about the retail, signage, and more on the envelope - how it's different than a glass box. AL: A 'before & after.' I'll echo the others. Rethinking the top and bottom is extraordinary. But say what you will, it [the original building] was a single idea. In its place, I would hope for something as vigorous and dramatic in its own time. Now, this is something conventional.... But this building was far more dramatic for its time in the 1980s. I would hope to see more about what makes this building *extraordinary*. To me, this doesn't look to the future; it's rooted in the present. I hope it becomes more interesting. It could be a detail, or more...I applaud the thinking of other ways. KS: What the existing building does have is a fabric that has some of the scale of its older neighbors. This...figure out a way of celebrating your surroundings. I want to see how it works with the buildings around it. DH: Even the choice of reflectivity in the glass. Greg Galer of the BPA: Kirk said what I was going to. I encourage the Commission to think about the context, how this plays with its historic neighbors. I look forward to that part of the discussion. With that, and hearing no further public comment, the One Post Office Square Project was sent to Design Committee.

DH, AL, DM, and WR were recused from the next item. The next item was a presentation of the **Harvard Enterprise Research Campus (ERC) PDA Master Plan**. Kevin Casey (KC) of Harvard introduced the Project and team. KC: The land in this area was purchased by Harvard from CSX, and operated then by CSX under easements granted back by Harvard (a portion is currently leased to Volmar Trucking). In 2009, agreements with CSX were reached to remove structures and remediate the soil - and that occurred for 36 acres last year. The Harvard panel that convened at the downturn in 2008 to consider this area and the SEC had a series of recommendations in 2011 which they have been pursuing. Those included the Innovation labs and the Art Lab, and a major piece was the revised SEC plan seen by the BCDC. We felt that would create a gravitational pull - and create interest in the area next to this academic generator. (Shows an area diagram, with a constellation of institutions.) This is consistent with the 2013 IMP (seen as background there) and the Boston 2030 Plan. We're starting with the planning first, so that Harvard can maintain control and build character into the land - obviously important to Harvard. We're including 14 acres in the PDA plan now, part of the larger 35-acre context shown in the Framework document.

Elisabeth Seissel (ES) of the Harvard Planning Office presented the plan. ES: The Framework

shows plans for the area over the long term, not the immediate future. The PDA sets that up. The historic evolution of the area is worth noting - from harvesting salt hay, to early industry, to I-90 and a transportation transfer hub. The area is all fenced now, paved, relatively flat, and impenetrable. (Points out the MWRA lines, and the old Sears warehouse foundations, and the elevated Cambridge Street.) The planning is at two scales: a District scale in the Framework plan, with its principles enforced in developments. And then the diagram of the 14 acres within the 35. The intention is that this is an evolutionary document that will change over time. Projects in the Masterplan PDA will go through the Article 80 process and submit Development Plans for the PDA. LE: So we're really considering three documents - the IMP, the PDA Masterplan, and the Framework Plan. We need to understand how the three work - and play, and live together. ES: I'll describe that in the document coming up. You'll be able to understand how the systems plug in. (Shows the principles, which include Urban District, Synergy, Adapting to Context, Infrastructure, Open Space Network, and more.) On the Framework Plan, the gray areas are *not* intended as building footprints (notes an illustrative example using Spangler Hall).

KS: Aside from the main streets, how are the building blocks derived? ES: We looked at the SF requirements and building sizes for different uses, and wanted to allow through-block connections. We developed [hierarchies], so that loading and parking don't come off of main streets like Cattle Drive. The streets link into future planned intersections (shows a street framework diagram). We're using the Complete Streets policy. The Land Use diagram shows how the IMP and ERC [and other elements, such as lower residential] interact. Having this area as an enterprise area is consistent with the IMP along Western Avenue. We have introduced residential, and included a residential buffer along the neighborhood. The documents are not in opposition, but consistent. MD: A clarification - the IMP is amended? LE: I'd request that you bring back the full IMP so we can look at it. There was an open space structure that we were excited about, and a roadway network, which seems similar. KC: You're right, the Greenway approach has been modified. And Stadium Way was carrying more than; traffic is more distributed now. DC: Traffic will impact a lot of this - Cattle Drive connects right to the Turnpike. MD: Plans of a certain scale have come back to us several times in Committee.

ES continued on the theme of the PDA context. ES: Given the constraints, it seemed logical to complete the Western Avenue corridor. (Describes the 900,000 SF program.) The parking will be one tray below grade - the water table is 8' down. The balance will be on interim lots. KS: What's the long term approach? ES: Parking integrated into the buildings. Distributed parking garage structures are possible. It's premature to think about the parking distribution now. KC: We can assess the parking as it moves forward, to reduce future demand [for structures]. KS: We need to understand your thinking. It's not lost on us that the Business School lots go away in the future. LE: At Suffolk Downs, we asked to understand the background to help us understand the first phase. You may not know where the garages are, but your approach is important - how you're thinking about that. KS: The Seaport seemed to incrementally close off vehicular options. We want to be sure. Suffolk Downs also has a 'trust us' attitude. DS: Work on how the parking is included. You can't kick that can down the road.

PM: What is the schedule for the State transportation project? KC: Comments on the EIR are due in February. The major realignment should be done by 2026, with the lesser streets following 1-2 years later. West Station will be done after that. A no-build option is also kept. PM: But that doesn't impact this phase here. KC: No. LE: Have you looked at alternative

plans to see their impacts? KC: On all except the no-build, this works with the options.

ES finished describing the Street Network diagram. The Public Realm - we have no buildings to show, but we have been thoughtful about the public realm. We're doing improvements along Western Avenue, and plan open spaces along Cattle Drive that then can be extended further down. Interim areas will be fenced and screened. There will be an interim connection to Windom Street [which intersects with Cambridge Street]. (Shows the illustrative PDA Masterplan, opens for more discussion.)

LE: East Drive aligns with Kresge? ES: Yes. LE: The historic slides are fascinating. How long is the interim condition? Paul's question is a good one. I would still recommend our spending our time understanding the relationship with the IMP and context. MD: Western Avenue, the Greenway, Cattle Drive - how those concepts mesh. KC: I think we can do that. Also, the future at-grade connection to the open space on the River has changed our open space thinking. AS a single land owner, we have the ability to implement our infrastructure. We appreciate the cautions, and precedents. KS: It would be helpful to understand where you stand firm. DS: What drives your first program elements? KC: We want to be selective about development partners, to capture the right ideas. We're not sure if it's lab or offices. DS: Why not encompass the entire ERC Framework area in the PDA? ES: Elements like the parking garages - we don't want to be too early there. KC: I-90's final configuration will inform as well. KS: I thought this would be more of a work-live-play idea. What makes this unique? DS: You may be punting parking in the future. Maybe three parking lots is all that happens. Thinking about services may help you think about what you do now. Right now, this plan feels like a suburban business park. With that, and hearing no public comment, the Harvard ERC PDA Masterplan was sent to Design Committee.

There being no further items for formal discussion, a motion was made to adjourn, and the meeting was duly adjourned at 8:05 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was scheduled for February 6th, 2018. The recording of the January 2nd, 2018 Boston Civic Design Commission meeting was digitized and is available at the Boston Planning and Development Agency.