

DRAFT MINUTES

BOSTON CIVIC DESIGN COMMISSION

The meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was held on Tuesday, April 1st, 2014, starting in the BRA Board Room, 9th Floor, Boston City Hall, and beginning at 5:20 p.m.

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

The Co-Vice-Chair, Mike Davis (MD), announced that this was the meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission that meets the first Tuesday of every month and welcomed all persons interested in attending. He added thanks to the Commissioners for the contribution of their time to the betterment of the City and its Public Realm. This hearing was duly advertised on Wednesday, March 19, in the BOSTON HERALD.

The first item was the approval of the March 4th, 2014 Meeting Minutes. A motion was made, seconded, and it was duly

VOTED: To approve the March 4th, 2014 Boston Civic Design Commission Meeting Minutes.

Votes were passed for signature. MD asked for a report from the Review Committee. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **MassPort Parcel K Project**. David Carlson (DAC) reported that the MassPort Parcel K Project had submitted a PNF in December but the PNF content, because of a recent switch in program locations, was not then ready to appear before the Commission. After further study and improvements in the Project, they were now ready to present; the Project totaled nearly half a million SF and so was well over the BCDC threshold. Review was recommended. It was duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the MassPort Parcel K Project in the South Boston Waterfront District.

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on **THE Innovation + Design Building**. DAC reported that this Project was predominantly a rehab. However, there were modest exterior changes that may of interest to the Commission, as well as program changes that might inform other projects in the BMIP - also the soon-to-be focus of a new planning effort to change its Master Plan. The overall buildings total 1,400,000 SF, but this Article 80 process concerns itself with about 200,000 SF - still over the threshold. Review was recommended. It was duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for THE Innovation + Design Building in the BMIP in the South Boston Waterfront District.

The next item was a report from the Design Committee on the **Skating Club of Boston Project**. MD asked for a *brief* reprise and update. Yanni Tsipis (YT) of Colliers introduced himself and the team, including Philip Laird (PL) of ARC. He noted the locus, then the older site plan. YT: There was not much landscaping; there were comments to this effect from the BRA and BCDC as well as the community. There were improvements made during the process - the landscaping, the drop-off enhancement, the plaza areas, the marker at the central main entry, the Telford Street extension to the south, making this last a real City street. YT then showed an older perspective from the Everett Street entry, followed by an enhanced, updated view. PL: The building shells are also now canting (they were previously static). YT: We have also improved the community entry, now framed by the building (shows). Deneen Crosby (DC) arrived. YT showed the Lincoln Road view in older and newer versions, noting the strong visual marker with a shimmering wall inset (and spire). PL: All the slots within the shells provide natural light. The Commission had wanted elevations, too, since you had seen mostly perspectives (runs through elevations). YT: And we have been pushed on the energy front. Gold LEED is within reach, although this use is not especially energy efficient in the summer. We have a PV array now; this concludes the presentation.

David Hacin (DH): You have addressed the issues. Kirk Sykes (KS) asked about the interface on the west (Telford Street). PL described this using the elevation, noting there were mechanical spaces and Zamboni access, but no typical public access. KS: So, the pinch point... PL: That is caused by the adjacent building. The street outcome was the most important thing. MD: We really did have a long discussion about the siting of the building; this was the best location. Bill Rawn (WR) asked about louvers along Telford, which PL then explained. Andrea Leers (AL): The entries are *much* more clear. With that, it was duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the proposed Skating Club of Boston Project at 176 Lincoln Street in the North Allston neighborhood.

DH was recused for the next item. The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **Seaport Square Parcel H Project**. WR: Most of us here saw this. MD: Can we see the changes *only*, please. Tamara Roy (TR) of ADD Inc. noted the changes in a series of before-and-after views, noting especially the 'connector' change, and an extra floor on the retail building. The connector panel was now recessed back a full foot. Gary Hilderbrand (GH) of Reed Hilderbrand: I also will focus on changes. On the Church plaza, there are subtle changes in the paving color and on the edges. We considered changing the seating wall's relationship vis-a-vis the crosswalk, but elected to keep it where it was; we discussed this in Committee - it helps to end the plaza. The grade changes (notes) also help to define the screen (now lighter) at the south edge. The area can't be continuous because the floor of the Chapel is elevated out of the flood plain. At the Farnsworth plaza we considered furnishings, and added a bench. We see no fixed - but possibly moveable - chairs. There were minor adjustments in the ramp

landing. (Shows views.) At the Church, our adjustment does help the relationship with 51 Sleeper. On Farnsworth, We are still working on the lighting, and are expecting a spill-out from the uses inside. MD: Comments? WR: I think they've responded to comments. AL: The difference in the massing is appreciated. With that, it was moved, seconded, and then

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for Seaport Square Parcel H in the Seaport Square PDA in the South Boston Waterfront District.

DH remained recused for the next item. The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **Seaport Square Parcel F Park**. GH noted that the team included Hacin + Associates, and Jamie Carpenter. GH: A summary of things raised by the Commission include questions about the site circulation, the approach from Northern Avenue, the Memorial room, and the Food Hall and its expression. (Shows the overall site plan in its context.) Our approach differs from other green spaces in that we propose a more urban square. The path is more a meander; one can move through the site in many different ways. We think we have achieved a large figure of a lawn which can be used many different ways. With the Memorial, a question of how it is seen...and an observation in Committee was that the stair at the end by the Memorial room could be more 'internal,' with the room on the outside end. We studied that, but felt the stair needed to be public, too. The overall configuration has ended up as you saw it; our task is to make a beautiful end to the building. (Shows views of the Food Hall.) The earlier Food Hall version was darker; the new one is lighter in color - made of board-formed concrete. There's more glass, going up. (Shows north elevation.) I think this is an opportunity for a signature moment.

KS: What is the material in the middle of the building? GH: the glass of the Food Hall continues up, a curtainwall. (Shows more views.) This needs more development. DC: Can we see a view from the northeast? GH complies: We're not worried about it being beautiful. It should be a public invitation. DC asked about the tilt in the lawn planes. GH: They don't tilt; the paths fall away. It becomes more, then, like a garden path along District Hall. GH then showed a view of the Memorial tower concept by Jamie Carpenter. A discussion arose about lighting. GH: We are keeping the existing lighting along District Hall, and then adding higher lighting along the pool. (Shows an overall view.) KS: Is there lighting down the middle? GH: We are analyzing that - making sure there is sufficient light, but not emphasizing it. There is lighting in the pool features, and the Memorial. Jamie Carpenter is also our lighting consultant. KS: The safety of walking through the site.... GH: Of course, we will meet all safety concerns. DS: What about the pool in winter? GH: It is very shallow. You can walk across it when it is drained. With that, it was moved, seconded, and then

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the Seaport Square (Parcel F) Park between Seaport Boulevard and Northern Avenue in the Seaport Square PDA, in the South Boston Waterfront District.

DH returned. The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **190-206 West Second Street Project**. MD asked the team to start their presentation (while setting up), focusing on the things studied in Committee, and returned to us. Peter Zagorianakos (PZ): More information was requested on the landscape. The BCEC had done improvements along West Second Street.

We are maintaining that sidewalk, and widening it there and along West First. It's more of a boulevard effect. On First, we'd had more of a landscaped plan; the suggestion was to open it up more to seating. So we have less planting. Now, we have a railing, to address the grade change. The green roof and the courtyard are also more developed.

DC: Also, changes to the building were discussed. PZ: After the changes to the landscape are shown, we'll discuss that. (Shows a bird's-eye perspective, then a view of the of the green roof with separated deck areas in a larger green, then a view in the courtyard.) On the building, the comment was that the first floor looked squashed; we have lifted up the canopy (cornice) and modified the entry. (Shows before and after views.) At the entry, we have modified the windows to give it a more residential feeling (mostly more like subdivisions.) The brick is now down to the ground; we have black brick along First. We had only two stoops; we have added two more. DH: What are the materials? PZ: It's brick, with precast below it. The color at the top is zinc (preferably) or a metal. DH: The changes are all good. You have built on our suggestions. AL: The landscape has improved. I like the whiter metal at the top, but it's too 'white' now. PZ: That's the rendering; it's meant to be the same as before. The zinc only comes in 3 colors, all a light gray. DH: It would be better if that color were moving up. With that, it was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the proposed 190-206 West Second Street Project on the half-block parcel bounded by West Second, C, and West First streets, in the South Boston neighborhood.

The next item was a presentation of the **MassPort Parcel K Project**. MD suggested to the Proponent that they take their time - the Project would likely go to Committee, and comments will focus on that. George Tremblay (GT) of Arrowstreet introduced the team, and showed the context model, noting the locus. GT: The configuration of the end of Congress Street creates a perfect site at the end. You can live, work, and play in this area. The 600 cars below our building help support MassPort's plans for the area. Amy Korte (AK) of Arrowstreet showed a line diagram: The hotel and residential buildings frame an 'urban court' with an elevated terrace atop the podium. Retail activates the street edges and frame the urban court as well; they may also perhaps be hotel meeting spaces or amenity space (above) for the residential use. (Colors in the line drawings help to accentuate the use diagrams.) There is a sky bar in the hotel, and all the patios and balconies are highlighted. (Shows a view of the model from the same vantage as the diagram. Shows the connection alignment with the Park Lane complex.) We are trying to create a sense of place. There are rain gardens along Northern Avenue, and we invite the public up, with stairs. AK then showed a plan, noting how the parking and circulation work, the lobby locations, the connections to Northern Avenue and to the T, the back-of-house along the Haul Road.

DH: How is the curb cut used from Northern Avenue? AK: It's more ceremonial, in-only, to allow drop-off. More questions followed. AK showed where the cabs queue, and how the circulation worked. AK: One can enter from either direction along Congress. DC: This is the last block of Congress, and is more pedestrian; you can make it more so. GT: There's a very wide sidewalk at the Park Lane apartments. AL: I have a question about the overhangs.... DH: We apologize for interrupting - I'd suggest you continue the presentation. AK then showed and explained the second floor (terrace) level, then typical upper levels, noting the sky bar on the hotel. She showed the view from the Harbor. AK: One thing we are very conscious about - not making it look like a superblock. There are copper-colored panels on the residential, below; on the hotel, it's blue glass against the sky. AK then showed a view looking NE from Congress, noted the intent of the saturated red brick panel color, described the area in detail, and noted the entry. She showed the terrace level, a cutaway view, the relationship of the amenity spaces to the terrace, and the hotel meeting spaces on the lower level. And above, on the terrace. This was clarified in a hotel cutaway. AK noted the Project was at the FAA limit of 140'. Jonathan Garland (JG) of Arrowstreet walked the Commission through the vignettes, noting the larger framed openings in the view from Congress. He showed the entry, drive-through, and a frame of the more public spaces. AL: In this view, where are the micro-units? JG: Further along to the right (in the view). He then showed views from and to Northern Avenue, out of the court at the terrace level, into the court at the pedestrian level; he showed a view focused on the 'supercolumn' and noted its relationship to the hotel program and retail. Another Congress view demonstrated the use of color to accentuate the entry.

John Copley (JC) of Copley Wolff: Amy has done a good job setting me up. And the Commonwealth Flats standards determine the streetscape; we are matching that. In the courtyard, we are using raised (trapezoidal) planter areas with cor-ten steel curbs to define them. We are using more of the same for planters along Northern Avenue, and may use cor-ten on the stairs as well. The terrace is unusual in that we have a public space all the way through, and then more private spaces to the side. Again, we use cor-ten steel, tipping the grade so that there is more privacy at the units. Here there is more informal planting, more naturalistic, meandering. DH asked about the dimension of the space. AK: The space by the units is about 20'; the full width is about 150'. JC: So, it's a large space, and can be broken up.

WR: How can the public access the spaces? (AK: Stairs, elevator.) I just wanted to compliment you. Both you and Gary used the word 'meander.' The shaping of the area is a nice change from the usual. The whole presentation makes this clear. The only thing I would say - the brick color is the architect's choice - dark brick on the side facing the water. You should think about that. But it's not in our purview. DH: This is very nice. It's good to have something not boxy. Several things.... I'm not sure why the curb cut on Northern Avenue is needed *at all*. It's an address, but you could restrict access. I'm concerned about circulation around the shards. They might be technically okay, but also people are *already* nervous. Congratulations on the breaking down of the building. You've used the idea of two materials on both sides; that may defeat the idea of it overall being one project. Even though the materials change, I still see one hand. AL: I am keenly aware of the challenges. The water-facing thing is also north-facing. What caught my eye is the deep overhang on the edge of the urban court. You might look at a light canopy; it's a little cave-like. Another thing. In terms of cladding,

the hotel is more successful. Why? It's a bit sandwiched on the residential. There's a layer of retail. Then retail/micro-units. Then units, and the top. But the hotel is simpler; it has a nice quality. MD: The outdoor space looks very engaging. But it may be shaded, and I would like to see the invitation up into the space be more prominent. All members of the public welcome. DC: Is there any sun at all? AK: In season. AL: Show us shadow studies in Committee. DH: It may be that the light is enough if the skin plays off of light, on the residential. DC: We should understand what the depth off of Northern Avenue is - do a section. And that stretch of Congress. KS: On the (Congress) streetscape, are those canopies or doors? AK: May be both; those are the innovation spaces. DC: Give us more street views. With that, the MassPort Parcel K project was sent to Design Committee.

PM was recused from the next item and left. The next item was a presentation of **THE Innovation + Design Building**. Mark Sardegna (MS) of Elkus/Manfredi introduced the team, which included Steve Woods (SW) of CRJA and Katie Scallon and Jeb of Jamestown Properties.

MS: I want to clarify what DAC said - we are asking for a change of use of about 200,000 SF, but there is only about 2,500 SF of new space. The building was designed and built in a year (1918) - its intended use was provisioning for the WWI European Theater. But the building was completed a few months after the War ended. Jamestown is primarily known as a developer who repositions interesting buildings in the market. (Notes Chelsea Market in Manhattan, and Industry City in Brooklyn.) We plan a diverse set of uses in a marine environment, and are working on how the building presents itself to the public realm. The building is 1600' long, with six interconnected structures. Most of us only know the one at the Design Center; one would be hard-pressed to find the others. (Notes the locus and project area.) We do not control the building at the end. There is a farm on part of our roof. There is existing (asphalt surface) parking in front. The BRA is starting a Master Planning exercise; we will work with them. (Notes revision to the entry at 27 Drydock, the part they do not control. Notes the 'back.')

The back of the building faces the Cruise Ship Terminal, so we are trying to make it as beautiful a place as we can. MassPort wishes to expand that.

MS showed a photo of the loading docks along Drydock Ave. MS: These were designed for freight to roll off the trains, with haphazard changes over time. Track 61...is a rail line available for the future, and it has a Federal overlap; it's classified as 'active.' And even though it's partially asphalted, it's a good potential connection to the Back Bay (traces the route). WR: Are you going to get to the design? [Laughter.] MS then showed the new path idea, with a bridge that can go down at 6am, and up at 9pm. MS: The Cruise Terminal is active (which makes that side also changeable.) Four of these entries will change, with containers framing the drawbridge. A change to the (front) bay will wait until after the Master Plan. We plan on turning the entry path into a plaza area; really, there is not a lot of outdoor space here. The entire loading dock becomes a promenade. It's an active zone, activated by people, open to the public. (Shows views of the drawbridge up and down; shows precedents.) DS: So, if the rail is used, then the bridges will work...every 20 minutes? MS: When it's active, you might go up the Tide Street spur, or to the end; it used to go to the concrete terminal until the Big Dig, 14 years ago. SW: The plaza frames the approach, but it's also a part of the continuum along Drydock

Avenue, and is permeable. We are proposing a vertical bosk of trees as a marker. Gateway point entries.

AL: How big is the square space? About 16, or 60 square feet? DC asked about the materials. The containers...it looks like a kit of parts. DH: Some of the beauty of container ports is their variety, and how they're stacked. MS: We had them all colored, like the Partridge Family, but then dialed it back to red. SJ noted the grade change down (off Boylston): This will address run-off. (Shows precedent images of repurposed containers for bike storage, etc.) DH: So the container spans are actually used? MS: Those are too high. (Uses model to indicate which can be used, which not.) WR: I have a question about the parti. From the parking - the quickest way is through the lot, to the midpoint. Who actually uses the spaces? MS indicated the Silver Line stops. WR: Are there other parking lots? MS: In the main central garage. DH: Short and long term parking. It's a long building. If you stop for 20 minutes.... Katie: We are thinking about short and long term. AL: You should think about surfaces. MS showed views of the dock environment, and described the treatment of the surfaces. He noted that they are trying to use windows that meet code, and that look like the Hope industrial windows above. DH: You should be trying to light the space. AL: It's very dark in there. DH: Use lighting technology.... MS: We are thinking of different ways, like lighting in the floor.

KS: I have a question about any more restrictions. MS: There are a lot of restrictions. The owner wanted to do more. We are limited by Chapter 91, historic considerations; we want to do what we can now. The square footage noted also cures some current leases. (Discussion ensues.) Matt Kiefer (MK) of Goulston Storrs: There are restrictions in the EDIC lease as well. The Master Planning process is also intended to address some issues by creating a use mix that doesn't affect maritime uses, etc. KS: So this is important. I encourage you to think more broadly, create a larger statement. (MS had noted the desire for larger ideas earlier.) DH: The goals you've set up are really nice. Modest, against what you're doing. The shipping containers are a good idea. I had a client in #21, and #23 - I always confused that. But you show all red containers; some differentiation would be great. Could the containers have more? Take the idea and turn it up a little - also the landscape spaces. Hubway spaces should be incorporated. AL: A big and bold idea for the entire canopy area. Not just the retail signage; you can't count on that. The ceiling surface. The ground plane. Radiant panels, so you could sit out more. Katie: All ideas require EDIC approval. We had chess tables.... DC: The uses could come out. KS: Like food trucks.

WR: As we send you to Committee, I urge you to think about what Andrea said. Likewise the bridges. I hope you have different bridges in different landscapes. Containers - there are so many examples of different ways of doing this. Here, it's used in such a heavy way...but there are so many interesting ways. MD: If we're going to ask the Proponent to do more than is in their scope - we have to understand their limitations. MS: We still have to get EDIC approval; there are layers of approvals. Katie: It's a limited scope of work, for these initial pieces. Several Commissioners: But you're still doing what you're showing. Katie: It's a first step. MK: We still have to wait for the Master Plan (to do more).... AL: Where is the 200,000 SF? MS: Within the five buildings. Katie: The spaces are scattered, but they are in the (3-building) Bronstein Center section. And some leases. AL: So, still, there are changes in four sections.

DH: The canopy is such a strong feature. This is one way of approaching the problem. But the other is that you *emphasize* the length. With that, THE Innovation + Design Building 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 7:49 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission is scheduled for May 6, 2014. The recording of the April 1, 2014 Boston Civic Design Commission meeting was digitized and is available at the Boston Redevelopment Authority.