

DRAFT MINUTES

BOSTON CIVIC DESIGN COMMISSION

The meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was held on Tuesday, July 7th, 2015, starting in the BRA Board Room, 9th Floor, Boston City Hall, and beginning at 5:28 p.m.

Members in attendance were: Michael Davis (Co-Vice-Chair); Deneen Crosby, Linda Eastley, David Manfredi, William Rawn, Daniel St. Clair, and Kirk Sykes. Absent were David Hacin, Andrea Leers, Paul McDonough (Co-Vice-Chair), and Lynn Wolff. 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, Mike Davis (MD), announced that this was the meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission that meets the first Tuesday of every month and welcomed all persons interested in attending. He added thanks to the Commissioners for the contribution of their time to the betterment of the City and its Public Realm. This hearing was duly advertised on Sunday, June 21, in the BOSTON HERALD.

The first item was the approval of the June 2nd, 2015 Meeting Minutes. A motion was made, seconded, and it was duly

VOTED: To approve the June 2nd, 2015 Boston Civic Design Commission Meeting Minutes.

Votes were passed for signature. MD, in conference with Michael Cannizzo (MC), decided to go straight to reports from Design Committee and to defer reports from Review Committee until David Carlson (DAC) arrived. The next item thus became a report from the Design Committee on the **Clippership Wharf Project**. Nick Iselin (NI) of Lend Lease presented the various revisions to the Clippership design, and quickly came to the major view corridor shift from Clippership Lane to Havre Street. [DAC arrived.] Bill Rawn (WR) asked a question regarding the BHA parcel required for this shift. NI noted that language requiring the view corridor would be in the RFP for the parcel issued by BHA; competing for and acquiring the parcel to redevelop was a key part of the Clippership plan. NI then showed other views focused on the plan improvements and precedents for their implementation. He showed views of the Clippership architecture as seen from Carlton Wharf, a view through the ‘passage,’ and views showing changes to the ‘focal point’ portion of Building #2 (wood cladding, large windows). NI: We have worked on increasing the window depths, easiest on the metal-clad buildings. We raised the height of the ‘focus point.’

Deneen Crosby (DC): I think it’s *so* much better. The public way that comes through to Jacobbe Way must *feel* public. Linda Eastley (LE): What I like about this is that you’re being intentional. The western edge is especially great. Kirk Sykes (KS): I agree. Two points.... The center of the scheme, the plaza area, needs more character development. The space between

buildings opened up from 42' to 76', but we also talked about a greater 'transparency.' And a lot of the walls at the edges, closest to the pedestrian walks, are not developed, but have (very literally) sketchiness. MD: Note that I am collecting issues...I have transparency on Building #2, more on the architectural treatments, details at the edges, and an update on the BHA parcel. LE: Regarding Kirk's comment on transparency, I would love for that building to feel more a part of the plaza. David Manfredi (DM): I would add one thing - how the elements come together. They should, in different ways. And I want to know if all is at the same level (plane). WR: Could you also make changes like you did at the focal point? If you can change the height. The variation in plane between the edges, if it relies on material, is very minor. MD suggested a motion to approve based on an informational update presentation on the above matters. This was so moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the BCDC recommends approval of the revised schematic design for the Clippership Wharf PDA NPC in the East Boston neighborhood, with the condition that the Proponent return to give an informational update on the BHA parcel view corridor, Building #2 transparency and plaza development, details of the edges, and how the building elements: come together, provide depth, and achieve a modest skyline variation.

The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **Congress Square Project**. MD reported: This was a very good Project; the Committee discussed aspects of the office addition's relationship to the older buildings below. I suspect that all liked it and just wanted to see more of the team/design. It's worthy of approval. Amy Korte (AK) of Arrowstreet presented the design changes, noting first those on the 40 Water Street office building. She showed views, diagrams explaining the choices, and more views, noting a focus on the glass and on the treatment under the mass at the corner. She showed views down Devonshire and Quaker Lane to show how aspects of the proposal changed depending on the viewpoint, then showed an aerial view. She showed a precedents page on the approach and on the glass...AK: We want the mullions as simple as possible. It's an SS&G system, curtainwall, with low iron glass on the lowest floor of the addition. For the soffit (shows precedents for this too), one thought was stainless, blasted, with subtle diamond shifts. Another possibility was copper panels.

LE: I love the Project. At the intersection, where the buildings come together, is the place to be playful. And the lighting, too. DM: I agree. This is a wonderful intervention in the City. KS: The transparency is good. With that, it was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the proposed Congress Square Project in the Downtown Financial District.

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Madison Park Infill Sites Project**. DAC noted that the Madison Park Village Infill Sites Project was, at about 90,000 SF, slightly below the BCDC SF threshold. But this proposal was related to the larger Whittier Choice proposal and extends essentially the same community at a very visible point along

Melnea Cass Boulevard. These key facts suggest a strong recommendation to review. It was then moved, seconded, and

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

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Whittier Choice Neighborhood Project**. DAC noted again the significant potential redevelopment in this area. This site is next to the P-3 Project seen initially by the Commission as well, but the Whittier Choice proposal is over 470,000 SF, well over the BCDC threshold, and review is recommended. It was quickly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the BCDC review the schematic design for the Whittier Street Choice Neighborhood Project on the block bounded by Tremont, Ruggles, Cabot, and Whittier streets in the Roxbury neighborhood.

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **274 Southampton Street Project**. DAC: This is a straightforward storage building proposal at the edge of the Newmarket District, and over 80,000 SF - below the BCDC threshold, but including existing SF, it would be about 120,000 SF. The site is highly visible on the edge of the I-93 Expressway; review is recommended. A motion was made, seconded, and it was

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed Boston Self Storage facility at 274 Southampton Street in the Newmarket Industrial District in the South Boston neighborhood.

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Artists For Humanity Expansion Project**. DAC: This is an expansion of Boston's first LEED Platinum building into a similarly bold net-positive building. Here the proposal, although more in the PNF, is a modest 57,000 SF with a total over 80,000 SF - below the BCDC threshold, again. Here the site is at a key corner of the Innovation District and adjacent to a number of recently reviewed buildings, including Channel Center and its new park. Review was recommended, and hopefully a positive reinforcement of this creative enterprise. A motion was made, seconded, and it was

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the Artists For Humanity Expansion Project, located at 100 West Second Street at the edge of the South Boston Waterfront District.

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Seaport Square Parcels M1 & M2 Project**. DAC noted that this Project was seen in May in an informal advisory session. The Proponent is moving forward and a formal affirmative vote to review is recommended based on the conditions of the BCDC's initial approval of the Seaport Square PDA as well as the size - over 800,000 SF. A motion was made, seconded, and it was

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the Seaport Square Parcels M1 + M2 in the Seaport Square PDA in the South Boston Waterfront District.

DAC then noted that the **New Balance Sports Complex** was an informational update to be considered in the same light as the change for the 'Sepia' component of Ink Block. The removal of the rink component into the building on Parcel C-3 was reviewed by the Commission, and the changes there require some additional minor shifts in the PDA plan - thus, as with Sepia, there is a BRA Board action. Here, the Proponent has been careful to keep the essential mass, design, and public realm aspects of the scheme approved previously by the BCDC. The Commission, as with the Sepia, may agree with this and elect to pass, or may vote to review and either approve the modification affirmatively (as with Sepia) or send to Design Committee. It is requested that such a motion be deferred until after seeing the presentation - again, as with Sepia.

The next item was a presentation of the **Whittier Choice Neighborhood Project**. Roger Brown (RB) of POAH noted that they were working hand in hand with City (BRA, etc.) and State agencies; the Project was a collaboration of the BHA, POAH, and MPDV, all working to obtain a significant Federal grant for this transformational neighborhood Project. RB: We are here for the first phase. There has been an 18-month planning process with the BHA for and including housing, employment, and quality of life - including education, health, financial awareness, literacy, and more. Michael Liu (ML) of The Architectural Team began his presentation, noting that the ask of the BCDC was for a general approval of the overall massing and plan, and a specific approval for the Phase One building. He noted the locus, then noted (using an aerial view) the adjacent buildings, open spaces, Madison Park Village, and Parcel P-3. ML: On the latter, we are using a placeholder, understanding that the design is in transition. (Shows a site plan...buildings #1, 4, and 5 are on their site, and buildings #2 and 3 are on the Madison sites.) We are reintroducing the historic street (Hampshire) which is over utility easements, and have 39 townhouse entries in addition to the main building entries. The massing strategy is that we have streetwall buildings with a major space framed in the center, pierced by the street, and an open space at the corner.

Tom Schultz (TS) of The Architectural Team continued the design presentation, going to a colored ground floor/site plan view. TS: Community and BRA input resulted in setbacks - 26' along Tremont, and 28' along Whittier - in part to allow for a repositioned Whittier Street which would align with the Ruggles intersection. There will be 19 townhouse entries in the first phase. There are two stories of parking below Building #4, with an entry off the new street. (Shows a

view of the corner.) The building steps down toward Madison Park Village. On Whittier, it has a 2-story base, and shifts at the corner from a visual 4-over-2 to a 3-over-1 with the 5th set back. We have a masonry base, and 3-4 floors of 'deep shadow siding.' There is metal panel at the top, which comes down to grade at the public entry.

MD: We will probably send this to Committee, so we should focus on comments. DM: For clarification, your parking is ONLY in Building #4. (Yes.) Daniel St. Clair (DS): Where do you park in Phase One? TS: There is existing surface parking. Only 25 spaces are lost, and the unit change is not that much (63 to 83). DM: What happens on Parcel P-3? The view shows the street heading directly into a wall. MC: That was the Article 80 PNF massing. A more recent massing was different; I'll try to get that. DM: That would help. DC asked about the cross section of the streets, asking that they show both sides. LE: I would normally support a street dividing the block. I'm not yet convinced of that here; it doesn't connect to anything. KS: I would compare the character to other streets in the Madison Park Village. Is it local, or cut-through? How busy is it? Also, the scale transition - how does that work, from low rise, to mid-rise, to high rise. WR: I appreciate that you've shared this level of design with us. But in the courtyard, is there an issue with bedrooms on the first floor? ML: Most of the units at grade are duplex townhouses, so the more public spaces are at grade. And we have some separation from the sidewalks. WR: I encourage you to look at that issue. DS: Some study options...possibly shifting and creating an open space that resonates and works with the church. Also, the ramp along the Whittier edge - is tough for that edge. You could shift it...even to the courtyard. ML: Or split it, perhaps. MD: I would agree with the comment. Maybe bring Phase One to the corner, and place the space opposite the church. A question about the alignment of Whittier was raised. TS: That was to allow for a two-way traffic potential. With that, the Whittier Choice Neighborhood Project was sent to Design Committee.

The next item was a presentation of the **Madison Park Infill Sites Project**. Russ Tanner (RT) introduced himself and noted Project partners. RT: When working with the BHA, we brought to the table two underutilized sites. Nick Elton (NE) of Elton + Hampton presented the design, first noting the location. NE: Madison has the Smith and Hanes Houses, but the bulk is all small scale, affordable housing. (Shows photos of area and sites.) We will remove the day care building, and the field that is the second site. When Madison Park Village was built, the idea was to provide a berm to screen it from Melnea Cass, which was originally more highway-like. (Shows a chart with the new building types - duplexes in one, and mostly flats in the other. Shows a plan of the Melnea Cass edge.) There is a proposal to modify the intersection at the corner of Tremont to provide more land and allow development of the 'Crescent Parcel.' Our larger building is about 56' back from Melnea. (Shows an aerial view from the interior looking toward Melnea.) The local street pattern and use require the reintroduction of a new connecting street. (Shows notion of using five materials/colors to break down the scale on the smaller building; notes the corner elements.) The larger building has a somewhat similar approach; we have a corner emphasis, and glass marks the entries (shows lower views).

DC asked about the entry potential from Melnea. NE: That's not in our control. The street may widen and shift, and a bicycle track is a part of that. We have made suggestions about how we

might interface. (Shows another aerial perspective.) We are using a green space and the setback to allow for privacy for the flats, which do exist on the ground floor (shows a building elevation). KS: In Committee, context photos would be very helpful. The existing is very established, so we need to know how this relates to that. And the ground plane - how this meshes with the context, including your head-in parking along the new street. DS: This doesn't seem to relate to the context, shown in your views as white buildings. What would happen if you reduced the scale, and covered more area? LE: On the new street, there should be ways of making that more a neighborhood scale. WR: Your major entries - are they on major streets? It's hard for us to understand the intentionality of where things are placed. MD: The architecture is creative, but you need to show its integration, how it works with the rest of Madison Park. WR: Is Madison Park a vibrant, successful community? KS: Yes. NE: The BRA and other are trying to create more density here. MD: Understood. KS: the problem with Melnea is that BTM is making it wider, using the Urban Ring easement. To your other point, the nature of the streets varies here. Some don't work; you need to understand it. Dorothea Gilmore and Alison Pultinas: We're very interested in bringing the buildings closer to Melnea Cass Boulevard to make it more a neighborhood street. We are concerned that the buildings are too far back from the edge, and the BRT route proposed here isn't even on the (State Transportation) list. MD: We are completely sympathetic. With that, the Madison Park Infill Sites Project was sent to Design Committee.

MD noted that he is honor-bound to end the meeting by 9:30pm, and there are five more projects...move quickly! The next item was a presentation of the **274 Southampton Street Storage Project**. Peter Quinn (PQ) introduced himself and the Proposed Project. He noted the location, which borders on the Expressway, Southampton Street, and the Fairmount Line. He noted other storage building(s), the transformer station, the edge of Newmarket, and the MBTA police building adjacent. PQ: There is an existing underutilized parking lot on site. A 128-foot building is proposed; it meets all the dimensional requirements of zoning; variance is for the use only. Self-storage is generally mundane and simple, with fake windows, and parking all around. We have tried to turn that on its head, and use simple materials to make something more iconic. (Shows a series of views, describes. Shows elevations.) We are using metal panel; there are some changes in plane. The building is on *pilotis*, similar to the MBTA police building adjacent.

DS: This isn't an automated building - people go up? PQ: We might have some pods. DS: So there are stairs and an elevator. And a corridor. I'd suggest strategies to provide more openings. PQ: Most of these are generally faux. Ours are, too - Sheetrock behind glass. LE: Is there any planning for the area? DAC: There was an effort recently resulting in zoning, but the intent there was basically to reinforce the industrial uses. Across the Expressway, we are engaging in a new planning process - for *those* industrial areas. DC: Southampton functions as a connector, with pedestrians. PQ: I agree. And we have set back the building, to keep the green space in front and to allow light and air to the Red Dog entry. LE: If this goes to Committee - I'd like to see the section - a lot of people would like to know if there's any chance to improve it. MD: We should look at this as a piece of infrastructure - and it could be an interesting piece of infrastructure. But there is too much going on here. KS: To say it another way, we all love the

Greater Boston Food Bank. It's very simple, but strong, with just a couple of moves. DM: You mentioned - I agree with Kirk, the GBFB is good - faux windows as a typology, but there's no need for that. So just the presence can be more interesting. And use texture. DS: There's a possible trade-off for the massing which may help the issue - you can extend it further, enough to lower it by a floor. This is *very* prominent. DC: Is there a green roof? PQ: It's not key to climate control. KS: I'm trying to think of different examples (than the GBFB) - in Shanghai, for example, the flower. With that, the 274 Southampton Street Project was sent to Design Committee.

MD repeated his 15-minute presentation admonition. The next item was a presentation of the **500 Boylston Expansion Project**. Haril Pandya (HP) of CBT Inc. began the presentation. WR: Was the open space part of any special zoning requirement? DAC: It was part of the review and process of approval. There was not a direct *quid pro quo* for the zoning. HP showed the site plan, noting the almost-through-block connection, and showed a view of the courtyard, noting that Equity Office has tried to activate it. He showed a view of the tunnel arcade from Clarendon, and the Clarendon Street sidewalk itself. He showed the proposed new floor plan, noting an expansion of the 'lobby experience,' and a possible connection through the retail space. WR asked about the interior through-block connection; HP explained it more thoroughly. He then showed an axonometric diagram showing the intent of the infill proposal to connect floors through the U-form. DS: The intent is to fill it with office, and not retail in the donut? HP: On the office floors, yes. HP then showed more views, plans and elevations, noting a nod to the rhythm of the facade. And the same for the new Clarendon entry. HP: Our intent is to shift the landscape to the side along the street. (Shows a blow-up of the lobby space, noting no new security desks. Shows the modest proposal for 222 Berkeley, with two flanking insets to provide access directly to second story retail. Shows a view, elevation, plans, a revised elevation, and a SketchUp view.)

KS: Are you sure you want to close the Boylston entry? HP: It's 176' back. To go through - the retail has its back to it. If we can bring life to the edge... KS: I'm thinking 10 St. James, as a way of bringing the entry through. Clarendon is narrow. You'll jam traffic with drop-offs, etc. It seems like a side door. DM: I think what you've done is very nice. I understand the instinct to do the infill. The trouble is, if you told me that this was still the front door, I would understand. I have no problem with your architecture. But the building is *so* axial...Clarendon doesn't fit. HP: We're used to it... DS: Maybe one thing - if you showed the connection going through. HP: That would split the retail on the ground floor.

MD: I don't agree with the architecture, losing the public space. There's no public benefit. At the Mandarin Oriental, there are a number of entries. If here, you're turning the space into a single entry, there's no benefit to the public. LE: I like what you've done, but it so fundamentally changes things. Even if the open space is not used, it's part of how you enter. This has felt like an oasis. This absolutely changes the intent. And I'm not sure what we're getting in open space as an exchange. Bring back examples that give it meaning. HP: The break is not helping the building now. It's the opportunity to add something different. KS: I'd like you to look at the traffic counts along Boylston. This, taking people out of this as a front

door - drastically reduces the life on Boylston. There's no reason you can't move the source of the activity, focus it more. MD: The 222 proposal accomplishes your goal with subtlety. DS: At 222, did you look at an all-glass piece? HP: It didn't seem like the right vernacular, since it's a very tight space.

Elliott Laffer: I participated in the original process. The courtyard was an important element; it was the entry to the tower, which *had* to be set back. And it was a break. And, the courtyard is iconic; many people take pictures of it. Just because it isn't used is no reason [to destroy it]. At the time, the SF was a compromise; more SF should not be treated as a given. Aril (submitter of letter via email): I hope you will all have the chance to read my letter. I am frustrated by the attention here; 222 is a lesser Postmodern structure. 500 Boylston is a true classic, a paradigm of the style. Sue Pringle: I am concerned about the general loss of open space. I'm not sure how much effort has been made to activate it. The space is a respite. The architecture doesn't seem to fit with the building - it jars. And the entry on Boylston is critical. MD noted that David Hacin, not present, had also expressed his deep reservations. With that, the 500 Boylston Infill Project was sent to Design Committee.

The next item was a presentation of the **Artists for Humanity Expansion Project**. Andrew Motta (AM) of AFH introduced the Project, first noting the location, then talking about AFH's program and mission. AM: We fuse maker spaces with training and education. We are adding a gallery and more public spaces. We were the first LEED Platinum in the City, and 9th in the country. We want to build the ability to self-fund by creating stronger employment ties/opportunities for youth. AFH is already the largest single employer of teens in the City. Jill Kaehler (JK) of Behnisch Architekten presented the design, noting that community meetings prompted them to bring the mass away from Second Street, and then to reduce the height. JK: The site is small. The side along A Street is set back for a future taking along A Street. JK then shows a massing diagram and strategy, and the idea of using solar cells to get to energy positive. Shows a section with program relationships. Then a view, and another section showing their relationship to the park and its two other buildings. A view of this also showed the scale of their building edge fronting the park - only a few feet wider than the small atrium space expressed on the One Channel Center building. JK showed a series of plans, noting program and grade changes, and more active entries at two points [corners] along A Street. She showed the program expansion above - lateral, vertical, including an open gallery space. Studio Partners. In the building itself, natural ventilation combined with the stack effect, a solar wrap, and radiant slab, to achieve energy goals. Another Behnisch employee showed the solar harvesting strategy used on the facade, with a honeycomb and sawtooth geometry combination used in facade details. JK then showed a view from the southeast across Second Street. JK: On the landscape, the idea is to bring the park through the building, and add green at the corners and raised areas. Along 'A Street, we are placing the trees to allow them to remain when A is widened.

DS asked about the curb at the intersection. JK: This would be a part of the City project. KS: This is a great presentation. The civic engagement - this seems very reactive. DM: I agree. I understand the relationship to A Street and to the park. MD: If you can bring the 'park' to the

Second Street entry, that's great. LE: The whole building is thought of as art in action; the wrapper is part of the story. This could be very exciting. DC: The lighting...? The detail on the street trees - you will want to encourage the roots to move *toward* the building. I like the idea of creating your own connection to the park. WR: I want to understand if it mediates to the scale of the neighborhood. DC: And more on the lighting. MD: We are positively inclined, but if you could indulge in one meeting - with more info on the massing, the lighting, and a zoom in on how this meets the ground. It's very close - we strongly support this. With that, the Artists for Humanity Expansion Project was sent to Committee.

DM was recused from the next two items. The next item was a presentation of the **Seaport Square Parcels M1 & M2 Project**. MD again noted the desire for efficiency and speed in presentations. Jaimie Von Klempner (JVK) of KPF: We can do that. WR: We've seen some of this recently. JVK noted the organization of the Project program and massing: towers around a space in the middle. JVK noted a change in the loading, now off of Congress Street, which allowed a lot more retail around that corner. He showed the site plan, and second and third floor plans showing the relationship to amenity/open spaces. He showed alternatives to the central space. JVK: A rectangle is preferred to shape the space. A trapezoidal funnel is preferred by a member of the development team. JVK showed some familiar (seen in May) precedents, noting that they would likely use less glass than shown in the example from Shanghai. He showed 15-18' wide connecting arcades, going by residential lobbies: These are important to 'irrigate' the passage through the block. JVK: The diagonal passage toward Seaport Boulevard could be straight, or have a series of 'echeloned' corners. (Shows a view, then a diagram.) Balconies could possibly be placed at the corners for emphasis. JVK then shows.... a series of axonometric diagrams showing different massing bay treatment studies. These are all different, but all related; the analogy of books on a shelf was used. Variations of dimension, or color, such as the Boston Wharf buildings along Summer Street. A KPF Wooster Street precedent, frames within a frame. Another diagram showing variations on how the tower elements come down, or not, to the street. A view from Autumn Lane. A series of massing views illustrating different facade treatments. The Wooster Street idea again, coming to the street (vertical) or sitting on a podium (horizontal mullion elements). Grouping these treatments as cousins. Illustrating the ideas by using photos of portions of recent KPF building facades.

WR: This is even better than what we saw a few months ago. Exciting. With elements of not all-glass buildings. I have some questions about how pedestrians can cross. The cut toward the corner is brilliant, novel. LE: I missed the presentation. A question about the connection to Seaport Boulevard. Is it a 2-story space? JVK compared it to the Burlington Arcade, noting they would have to study it. LE: I'd like to know more about the treatment along Seaport Boulevard...access seems too tentative. I'd like to see more shadow studies, understand how the plaza is to experience. And if stepping up and down could inform the amount of sunlight - on rooftops, too. DC: It would be good to know how those are seen from the street. The variety that you're investigating is really good for the District. I like the cornered scheme, the series of pockets is more engaging. DS: The corner of B Street and Seaport Boulevard seems tight; the World Trade Center West Office Tower has a wide space there. Other than the opening itself, this side is not as inviting.

John Hynes noted that what wasn't shown yet is the seating for the retail. And the passages were not originally part of the PDA plan. JVK has shown brilliance in fractionalizing the spaces; there's an order that's been set up. WR: I tend to agree with Daniel's point. LE: A question worth looking at...I can see the podium. The edge there seems like the right amount for that (space). KS: When you go to stuff that's granular, like the corner retail - I prefer the corners - if you have similar sketches, that would help. This is an interesting presentation, because sketches are combined with diagrams with precedents. DS: Is this Article 80? DAC: Seaport Square (and Fan Pier, etc.) are unusual, in that the public process is mostly done. Ultimately, this should be treated by the Commission as though it's a typical Article 80 process, even though we're technically not doing that. It's at that stage of the design process. WR: Will we see more details on the buildings? JVK: Yes, and on the landscape. With that, the Seaport Square Parcels M1 & M2 Project was sent to Design Committee.

The next item was a presentation of the changes to the **Boston Landing (aka New Balance Sports Complex)**. MD noted the actions available to the Commission: comments and a pass; a vote to review and approval; or, a vote to review and sending to Committee. WR asked further about the options, wanting to understand the process. Keith Craig of New Balance explained further, noting the Commission's 2012 approval of the Headquarters and Sports Complex, and the more recent approval of the rink and office structure (Parcel C-3) across the street which is now under construction. We are now consolidating minor changes to the PDA. The program is simplified within the building, and the design is essentially the same.

Mark Sardegna (MS) of Elkus Manfredi presented the design, much of it in comparison to what was approved before. He noted the Master Plan and the Headquarters building complex, now under construction. He showed a plan of the building ground floor embedded in a site plan, noting the treatment of the Hichborn Street alignment. MS: The retail is now stronger along Guest Street. (Shows series of floor plans, explaining the program relationships on each floor.) The track level connects to the exterior stairs. MS noted a few changes. Showing perspective views, he noted that the height and form were about the same. (Shows a side view, then views along Guest looking toward the southeast and southwest.)

WR asked about the south side. MS showed the revised elevation and a view, showing the loading access. Some discussion ensued about the nature of this service area. LE: The southeast corner - in the future of the Hichborn connection, I would wish it were better. MS: Us too. We had it more planned as open space. But it depended on the acquisition of three more properties. Chris Jones (CJ) of CRJA started a brief presentation; WR wondered if landscape were critical if this was not being sent to Design Committee. DC: I don't recall the landscape treatment. CJ then gave a quick presentation of the landscape strategy - briefly of the overall plan, and then a reminder of the treatment for this triangular space with views aligned to the rink on one side, and the HQ entry on the other. He noted the tilting, sloped park being built with the HQ building and nearing completion. Commissioners present agreed that no action was required and thanked the team for the update.

There being no further items for discussion, a motion was made to adjourn, and the meeting was duly adjourned at 9:31 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was scheduled for August 4, 2015. The recording of the July 7, 2015 Boston Civic Design Commission meeting was digitized and is available at the Boston Redevelopment Authority.