

DRAFT MINUTES

BOSTON CIVIC DESIGN COMMISSION

The meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was held on Tuesday, October 1st, 2013, starting in the BRA Board Room, 9th Floor, Boston City Hall, beginning at 5:20 p.m.

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

The Acting Chair, Kirk Sykes (KS), announced that he would invoke the words of Mike Davis [Co-Vice-Chair,] saying 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. KS was serving as Acting Chair due to a series of recusals for most projects by Paul McDonough (PM), Co-Vice-Chair, and in the absence of Mike Davis. This hearing was duly advertised on Saturday, September 21, in the BOSTON HERALD. The first item was the approval of the September 3rd, 2013 Meeting Minutes. A motion was made, seconded, and it was duly

VOTED: To approve the September 3rd, 2013 Boston Civic Design Commission Meeting Minutes.

Votes were passed for signature. KS asked for a report from the Review Committee. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Lovejoy Wharf Notice of Project Change**. David Carlson (DAC) reported that the Lovejoy Wharf Project had been approved by the Commission in 2006, and with a change in use from residential to office (Converse Headquarters) in the east rehabilitated portion, was under construction. That change in use was an NPC but the design did not change. The new owner/developer of the property desired to modify the new residential portion, and use a new architect - essentially the same team they had used to develop the Clarendon tower. This was also an NPC, but the design changed; the SF even of just the residential still exceeded the BCDC threshold, and a new vote to review was recommended. It was then duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the modified schematic design for the Lovejoy Wharf Project NPC at 131 Beverly Street in the North Station Economic Development Area.

David Manfredi (DM) and PM were recused from the next item. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Landmark Center Expansion Project**. DAC reported that the Landmark Center had changed ownership as well and the proposal for a research tower seen and approved in 2010 was no longer the plan. Instead, the parking garage was going to be

replaced by a below-grade garage, a retail and supermarket podium created, and above that three residential towers; overall, this totaled well over 700,000 SF and was well over the BCDC threshold. A vote to review was recommended. It was duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed Landmark Center Expansion Project in the West Fenway neighborhood.

[This vote was affirmed later in the meeting after David Hacin (DH) and Linda Eastley (LE) had arrived.] DM and PM returned. Daniel St. Clair (DS) arrived. The next item was not on the agenda, but was a statement by **Kairos Shen**, Chief Planner for the City. Shen noted that he hoped to speak to the BCDC on a more regular basis at least through the end of the year, to give some background on certain of the Projects under consideration so that the Commission might better understand the thinking and policies of the City in these areas. Shen: On one item - the Landmark Center - I wanted to note the desire to connect the streets in the area, and the important goal of recessing the structured garage below grade. The success of the area has led us to expand the planning notion behind it. This project would add residential uses, and improve open space next to the Army Corps of Engineers work on the Fenway parcel. The Point and Parcel 7 remain the high points in the area; we have worked with the development team to also have the height lower than the Sears tower. I am trying to give some background as part of a regular process.

You are seeing several Institutional Master Plans. On Northeastern's, there are some issues along Huntington Avenue, especially in conjunction with Wentworth's plan approved last month. Northeastern has a good goal of 1000 student beds in its plans, and since this is only an IMP, you will see it again when it is real. The Wentworth PDA has been tailored to accommodate the points well-raised by the Commission. I will include myself in meetings to give you some background, even in Committee. Thank you all for your work; we are incorporating your ideas into our actions. I want to publicly acknowledge your service and advice.

KS: Is one component you are going to offer, the community perspective? Shen: The community is concerned about the amount of Projects in some cases. In many of these cases, since there is so much in such a short band of time, one concern is the sheer amount of construction at one time. But also, these Projects may not all *advance* at the same time. We are isolating impacts, and working with BTDC. For large Projects, such as North Station and the Government Center Garage, the Proponent should be much clearer about the phasing of the Project. Also, there is the chance to re-review. DM: Your comment on Northeastern and Wentworth - it's very important that they talk to each other. If you can help make that happen, good. Shen: We are in conversation with them, working on guidelines - that's important. KS: Thank you for coming tonight. Shen: I'm happy to return to answer any questions.

DM and PM were recused from the next item. (PM was also recused from the three after that; he left.) The next item was a report from the Design Committee on the **80 East Berkeley Street Project**. DS reported that the Committee meeting was generally positive regarding the Project, particularly in the way the massing was broken down to respond to the context. DS: Seeing it in the context of future development was very helpful. As the first in this area, this Project had come at first as something of a shock. We had a discussion of the spaces around the building,

and the pathway behind it. Lynn Wolff (LW): And we noted working more on the Shawmut Avenue corner. Ron Druker (RD): DS did well. We will show what we've done; Daniel covered all the main points. Chris Milne (CM) of Elkus/Manfredi presented the design, showing the modifications. She noted the overall, then the change at the corner: they have reduced the scale of the glass mass, and it's better related to the context. We have adjusted the height and simplified the base. There is a lighter garage structure.

DS: There was discussion about *not* covering the garage ramp. CM: The client prefers to cover it; the reason is security issues primarily. For the community also. DS: You can work it out with the staff. LW: I support its removal.... RD: The retention of a cover for the ramp was the strong desire of the community. And security **is** a concern to us. LW: There's not a good indication of pedestrian invitation into the passage. CM: We will address that with paving treatment; the material will have a continuity. RD: And not just a gated box. It's important to us that it be a feature. Deneen Crosby (DC): How much of what we are seeing, exists? RD pointed out the proposed projects on their large model: 345 Washington, Ink Block, 275 Albany, their company's other properties. More discussion about the ramp cover facility ensued. There was no public comment. Making sure some language was added regarding the possible elimination of the ramp cover and BRA staff attention to it in any case, the motion was made and seconded and it was (to be affirmed later):

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the 80 East Berkeley Street Project and PDA on the site at the corners of Washington Street, Shawmut Avenue, and East Berkeley Street in the South End neighborhood, with the condition that BRA staff attend to either eliminating or minimizing the presence of the garage ramp cover structure.

DM returned. DH arrived. The next item was a report from the Design Committee on the **Northeastern University IMP**. DM reported that the Committee meeting was mostly a conversation about the ISEB rather than the IMP. Kathy Spiegelman of Northeastern noted that the discussion had included open space comments. DM: That *was* a topic, and was discussed also at last month's meeting as part of the Wentworth discussion. Kairos mentioned to us your recent efforts at communication. Patrick Tedesco (PT) of Chan Krieger NBBJ showed slides of the IMP, noting the open space network, and showing the IMP Project sites in red. LW: The hierarchy of open spaces was an issue; didn't we discuss that at your presentation? Kathy: Yes, and we have worked on that with BRA staff as well. PT showed another slide. PT: We have developed the 'Northeastern Necklace;' the space along Forsyth becomes a central connection space, with other spaces also studied. There are improvements to the quad and along Huntington. We studied the Huntington project site. (Shows modifications to the original massing proposal.) We have reduced the height - it's now 18 stories, about 200', vs. 22-25 before, and angled in such a way as to minimize shadows. We placed the mass off of the Huntington podium, but are sensitive to bed counts, and so have added some height to the Cargill site. (Shows an elevational perspective diagram with this included.) There are several taller buildings, all set back from Huntington, except for the one existing tower.

LW: Can we see a plan relationship to the MFA? PT showed more perspectives, then the plan. DH: I am still coming to grips with the Wentworth tower, but I am concerned about your wing

that frames the entry below. PT^: We need that for the bed count. DH: It's crowded with the Wentworth building; you are exacerbating that crowded feeling. KS: The existing tower is slim...this seems to be adding to the bulk. PT: Bed count is key. DH asked more about the impacts on the MFA and Huntington; discussion ensued. LW: I'm not asking so much about shadows, as what you see when you come out of the MFA. DM: At the Cargill site - you showed alternatives. PT: 16 stories, with 12 on Huntington. Kathy: This is an IMP, not a PDA.... DM: The studies are convincing, but I agree with David; I wish the wing weren't there. I think there's a very nice scale elsewhere. DC: What is the dimension between you and the Wentworth tower? PT: There's a service alley; about 40' total. Alex Krieger: If the wing went away, we might add the mass to Cargill. DH: I would prefer that. Kathy: We want to reserve rights for Northeastern, and not just accommodate Wentworth. PT ran through the rest of his slides. DC: There should be more detailed information for some spaces. I like the idea of Forsyth as a public, but central organizing space. You need to do more work on the spaces to promote the hierarchy. DH moved to approve, with the caveat that BRA staff work to explore the shifting of the wing mass. That motion was seconded, and it was

VOTED: That the BCDC recommends approval of the new Northeastern University Institutional Master Plan, with the conditions that all IMP Projects subject to Article 80B return for further review and approval, and that the University work to the extent possible with Wentworth and other institutions to better resolve their IMP Project on Huntington, moving the wing mass shown to another appropriate site.

DM was recused from the next item. DAC conferred with KS as to public commentary. The next item was a report from the Design Committee on the **Children's Hospital IMP and Projects**. Charles Weinstein (CW) introduced the IMP, noting the two Project teams. CW: We need the administration building to continue to decant that use out of the main campus. Also, on that site, we cannot do parking below grade, since it's on top of the T tunnel. In the clinical space, we need state-of-the-art single beds, and the expansion of our capabilities to meet up with both code and demands. Uma Ramanathan (UR) of Shepley Bulfinch: I will try to go through this (Clinical Building) quickly. UR then proceeded un-quickly through a presentation of plans, open space analysis, views, and the model on the table. She continued with an analysis prepared for the Boston Landmarks Commission, going through three options for retention of a portion of the Wollbach Building. And then again in more detail.

DH: Is this historically significant in some way? Marilyn Sticklor (MS) of Goulston Storrs: It has been petitioned to be landmarked; the ideas you see as mitigation have been discussed with the BLC and BRA staff. DS: The notion we discussed in Committee was to disaggregate it in the garden. MS: BLC wanted a current use to engage the saved portico. LW: Did you consider an interior installation? UR: Yes. Our preference is to separate the two. MS: The options are still under discussion. DH: Can we see the existing? KS asked about the new building as well. DH: I wanted to understand the placement. It's a very nice building. There's some space around the portico remnant that suggests the scale of the original building. LW: In Committee, we felt it should be in the garden, as a separated folly. DH: If it is there, it should be detached.. LW: What was the requirement to repurpose it? MS: That was the *desire*. CW: We had a thought to place it along Meadow Lane, as an artifact. DS: I can see the logic in these 3 schemes. They all create a

kind of car crash. If history is forgotten, and it will be, you will have an odd element. It seems like such a bad combination, a last minute thing. LW: Like the Penn Station portal, it should be inside, to commemorate that. DH: Like the American Wing at the Met. If it were inside, you would expand the curtainwall. LW: I'd move to approve, with a preference to move it inside.

DAC noted that there was a second Project in the IMP, and the meeting was running 45 minutes late. DC asked quickly about the size of the open space shown. UR complied. Sam Norod (SN) of Elkus/Manfredi showed the 819 Beacon Project, giving a quick presentation of its modified design. He noted their progress on the green wall notion. SN: We have figured out how to do a green wall on the normal condition, but the sloped ramp section is more problematic. LW noted that the green wall and lighting were concerns. SN in response showed the multi-use path, and green space in both plan and elevation. DH: We should review more on the Wolbach portico, or just make a recommendation. DS: I recommend that the portico not be attached; that it be separated, whether exterior or interior. It was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the Children's Hospital IMP and the associated schematic designs for its primary IMP Projects (Children's Clinical Building on Shattuck, and 819 Beacon Street) in the Longwood Medical Area and the Audubon Circle neighborhood. The BCDC recommends no retention of the old Wolbach portico, but if required, prefers an alternative where the portico is separated from the new building, either on the exterior or interior.

DM remained recused from the next item; LE arrived. The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **Harvard University IMP**. Kevin Casey of Harvard introduced the team and the IMP planning effort. Gary Hilderbrand (GH) of Reed Hilderbrand showed drawings and the model. GH: We are showing uses and landscape decisions in the context of the future. Someone mentioned postcards, the spaces that become future post cards. We have those, and we show the connections of green spaces in the long range plan, Western Avenue, the Green. BRA staff asked us to contextualize the proposal. And this Commission did as well, also when you were reviewing Barry's Corner. In the long range plan, there is some fiction, but a number of good things are set in motion. Some improvements have begun to open up the campus, arising from discussions around Tata Hall. (GH goes through a list of some Projects, noting their participation in setting up a sweep of spaces on the campus, continuing the sensibility developed by McKim Mead and White, and including Spangler. The Greenway includes the back of buildings along Western, and sets up the front for the future buildings to the south. The Greenway will connect from North Harvard, through linked spaces to the River. It's long range, but in the right place *now*. It's a great place for people to walk, but also allows drainage and infrastructure. There will be a quad as big as Baker's lawn (points out). These are high-performing spaces. Western Avenue is more an urban condition. It existed in 1830. We establish a podium height; we give some more height to the hotel/conference center. This sets up a good microclimate. At Barry's Corner, there will be a basketball venue (shifts model on table, realigning segments). We are confident in the plan. There is a lot of weaving going on.

DS: What bounds the southern edge of the lawn piece (Greenway)? Is that a road, or the edge of your property? GH: It's Harvard's property, but encumbered now. DS: Does it have to be a

road, or at a diagonal, making a wedge? GH: Nothing I know of means it has to. Harris Band of Harvard agreed, adding they had looked at a number of options. GH: We *don't* see that as a series of interconnected streets. KS: The back of those buildings? GH: Really a second front. Remember, these are a series of parcels, not buildings. (Shows a fleshed-out illustrative plan. DAC reminded KS that it was still an IMP; the BCDC would see all projects that came through, in greater detail.) The model was changed to show the 10-year Plan.

DH: I appreciate seeing the long-range plan; it's good to keep it in mind as we see things. KS: One thing to keep in mind is the distances - part of the context for how the campus is experienced, how one gets around. LE: One thing about this campus: It's disorienting. Along the River, along Baker Library - that will be gold. Same for the athletic fields....there's a connection across North Harvard Street. You've set up such nice geometries. It would be good to emphasize that connection as well. GH: I didn't discuss that; we do have that curve in. Academic Way, and Longfellow Path; a diagonal which continues to the Greenway. This could be described more strongly. LE: That would be helpful. DH: There's a potential orientation element on the axis of Baker Hall. LW: I move our approval. With that, it was seconded and

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the of the new Harvard IMP in the Allston neighborhood, with the condition that all IMP Projects that are not simply total rehabilitation return to the Commission for further review and a vote.

DM returned. LE and DH were recused from the next item. The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **South Boston Hotel**. DM: Everyone liked the hotel building. The perspectives were very good. The conversation was almost entirely about the porte cochere. We felt it wasn't necessary; Lynn and Andrea were there too (DAC: Bill was a dissenter on that opinion.) Vincent James (VJ) briefly recapped the building description, and showed a view of the lower public spaces. Tim Pappas (TP): The IAG input describes crossings, sidewalks, improvements. Guy Busa (GB) of Howard Stein Hudson showed circulation diagrams, both current and projected in the future, comparing the operation of the proposed porte cochere. He showed more plan details, and compared them as well. All were completely flush from the columns and facade. TP: There is another consideration; when the Red Line closes down, the MBTA buses line up on both sides *here* (points). Which shrinks the effective width of Dorchester Avenue more. That was another community issue.

DS: Was our concern traffic, or the cars crossing sidewalks? DM: Sidewalks. LW: Lose your adjacency to the door. I asked that we see the option, which is also not so good. TP: It's urban. Pick your poison. We wanted to avoid jockeying cars with a valet, for hotel and restaurant. Also, the volume/width of pedestrian space is wider to cut through to Second Street along the face under the arcade, than would be left as remaining sidewalk if we placed a curb drop-off outside a filled-out base. KS: How do you keep the cars or taxis from queuing on the road? TP: The community wants a cab stand along West Broadway - not just for us, but for Stefi's and other uses. We are doing this at the community's request. DS: Which option does the community prefer? TP: The porte cohered. It's why we push it. DC: What is the use of the ground plane? TP: Mike Blier's intent was to make it very active, and allow the seating to spill out from the restaurant onto the sidewalk. DC: Lighting, material? TP: the material is

continuous, outside to inside. The lighting here will be like we did at MacAllen. DM: I am not a fan of the drop-off. But I like the building, and want the project to move. So saying, DM made the motion, it was seconded, and then

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the proposed South Boston Hotel Project on Dorchester Avenue (at 6 West Broadway) in the South Boston neighborhood.

LE returned. DH was again recused from the next item. LW was recused and had to leave. The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **Seaport Square Parcel L1 Project**. DS reported that the Project was well-regarded. The major issue became the treatment of the space, and how the building spilled out onto that space. Charlie Leatherbee (CL) introduced the team, and Jonathan Ginnes (JG) of KlingStubbins. JG noted the issues of Harbor Way, the glass, and the southeast corner. He showed a glass performance chart which had led to their selection (samples were on the table). He showed a section, and the channel detail at the floors, and noted the north and south building details and shadowbox. He showed a section at the base, noting the use of a zinc panel material, which heralded back to seaport material - galvanized metal. He then showed the area of the NStar vault. JG: We decided to add an integrated texture on that wall, augmented by planters. JG then noted the role Harbor Way played in the larger plan, and showed their design change. There were now stronger plantings at the street edges, and it was more open along the block on the inside. On the corners, we hid the column at the retail corner.

LE: The view down the pedestrian corridor to the park - I wonder how that feels? Do you have a sketch? JG: (Looks.) I don't think we do. LE: The question remains the same. At the Autumn Lane corner, it's so blank, it's not inviting. This is a very dense space. JG: We have recalled your comment, and walked around the City. There are many blank walls that you walk past. We have retail partners, but they don't think that displays are viable. LE: The other buildings aren't there; this will function as a gateway. JG: It's not a gateway; there is no other building. LE: Exactly my point. DM: Walk around the building perimeter. What are the uses? How active are they? Does the location of the parking relate to the Master Plan? JG: Yes. (Shows on boards and the model.) DS: Do the locations of the loading and parking relate to the Master Plan? JG: Yes. LE, pushing on other relationships: And, to Parcel K? JG: Yes. KS: You brought a lot of glass with you, I want to understand the transparency. JG showed the detail and noted the transparency in the sketches, comparisons to other buildings, and transparency at the base as well. DM: I am disappointed at the corner. It's an important portal; it may be a catalyst to cure the blank corner on the other side. CL: We have tried other locations for the transformer, etc. There is no other good space. DS: Have you tried shallow displays? CL: Our partners (WS) don't think they are maintained well, and won't work. DS: Could we hear more on your development team? JG: Responded, and noted the change from the prior design (extra detail) and a change in the landscape plan as well. We really DID explore this ad nauseam. DS: Why are the plantings the same? JG: They will be different. DC: It will be a pedestrian space. You have a lot to activate it, but I'm not yet sure about (the width)? LE: I'll add more; you should study the corner. DC: The condition at that corner... should be further designed to activate the open space. The open space should be further studied to encourage circulation down the corridor. With that, a motion was made, seconded, and it was

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for Seaport Square Parcel L1 ('101 Seaport Square') at the corner of Boston Wharf Road and Seaport Boulevard in the Seaport Square PDA, in the South Boston Waterfront District.

DH returned. DS left. The next item was a presentation of the **Lovejoy Wharf NPC**. Peter Spellios (PS) of The Related Companies introduced the Project, noting the BCDC had seen it before, in 2006. PS: The change from residential to office on the east - becoming Converse headquarters - is pretty exciting. In 2012, with that change, we acknowledged that we needed to work on the residential portion. I have here Dan Lobitz (DL) of Robert A.M. Stern's office, Larry Grossman of ADD Inc., and John Copley (JC) of CWDG. We had to accommodate the change in connections, now that the residential was a solo building. DEP also wanted more work done on connecting to water uses. Traffic and the drop-off as designed were also an issue - and the garage was robotic. We have eliminated that.

JC presented the context and site, using boards fronting the Commissioners. KS asked him to shift them. JC pointed out the myriad connections on the site. He showed the site design. JC: We have the ideas of islands, like the Harbor Islands. There is a Harborwalk interface, with a grade change. There is a view through, and framed by, the building of the Bunker Hill Monument. We are working with our neighbor to have a table top, more of a driveway situation, like a shared space. DC: Where is the property line? What do you control? (JC indicates.) LE: Can you describe the pavilion, what it services? PS: That had been the visitors center. Now, it's used by Converse as the Rubber Tracks recording studio program. (Describes briefly.) It's a public use for new artists, and benefits them. DC: When you're on Beverly, there's a great view of the Zakim Bridge, and it's constantly used by people. But who uses the driveway there? JC: That's the idea; it's all shared. Dam staff and State Police use it. But the idea is that pedestrians use it freely; we extend the notion up here.

DL showed the building design. He first showed the old design, noting the entry at the far corner. DL: It turns its back to the City. The drop-off was tight, awkward; the entry conflicted with the water experience. (Shows newer model.) We wanted to create an inviting gesture. (Indicates larger model, also on table.) LE: How wide is the Bunker Hill opening? 10' on that side. It opens up to 16' wide, and is also taller. It's very inviting from the water side. (Notes the space on the larger model.) It orients to the view of the Bunker Hill Monument. On the water, we have a big, gentle move - a fold along the building. This embraces the park, with a gesture at the corner. (Notes connections to the pass-through, and the drop-off location.) There are many ways pedestrians can arrive.

DH: The faceted passage through is very interesting. The prior Project has a separation, with a connector building, and was strong at the corner. I'm interested to know more about that decision - why the tower isn't a different material. The brick goes higher than in adjacent buildings. DM: What determines the height? PS: It's the same as originally approved, determined through Chapter 91 and the zoning. DH: I think this is great. But I want to know more about the stepping. DL: We did choose to have the brick define the space. But also the gesture at the corner coming out of that was more dramatic. DH: I would ask you to look at the context a little more. The brick goes to a particular height. This may be fine, but it's a little less

clear. There's a significant moment as you come across the Bridge - you can't underestimate that significance. DM: It's an important moment as you come over the Bridge, I agree. I also like the cut-through, and the dimensions. But the corner is not as strong as it used to be. You have to solve Beverly, which is quite a mess. A nice resolution would be if the parking went away. If the entry came to the west, the corner would be stronger. I like the tower generally, but the geometry could be stronger. The building could be used to help the space, which might come later. DL: Those comments might be at odds, if the building is broader, due to proportions. (Shows more views.) This is a meaningful gesture. DC: I like how the space relates to the bridge. The whole waterfront becomes more accessible. PS noted the differing opinions on the use of the roadway. DL: I can add to that, a visitors' center. DH: We can discuss - in Committee - how the horizontality can resolve in the tower. KS: Is there a reason why the lobby is not more glass? It could be more transparent, have more life and light. On the wharf side, too. Why come here? This is not the easiest place to get to; it's a different kind of place. DL showed precedents, context, and some longer views. LE: I like the connection; it's not large enough on this (City) side - 10' - I would like it a bit more generous. And it should be animated; *that* should invite you in. The space is intriguing. But this is the entry into Charles, so the Islands are more on the other side. I'd like to hear about the evolution of all that, and the geography. With that, the Lovejoy Wharf NPC was sent to Design Committee.

DM was recused from the next item. The next item was a presentation of the **Landmark Center Project**, which had set up an elaborate model. Peter Sougarides (PS2) introduced the Project, noting recent development in the area. PS2: We think redevelopment here could be a linchpin that ties all that together in the area. And ties better to the MBTA and to the work done on the Olmsted park by the Army Corps. When we acquired the property, we looked at the Landmark Center and the City around it. We decided that the non-historic parking garage had to go. And we wanted to open up the existing building - to have a passage through, with a food court, anchored by a Wegman's. Chris Milne (CM) again (see first project) presented the design, noting: Density proximate to jobs; Permeability through the building; Fullerton Street as an active, urban street; improved Pedestrian experience; and, new Public Space (~2.2 acres). CM: How the building connects to the City - and Fenway as a space - has not been taken advantage of. We think of the building as another institution linked to that space (shows diagram). CM then showed existing conditions, noting the potential opening up of the corner at the Kilmarnock view. She noted the multi-use path, and showed a pedestrian/vehicular connection diagram and a massing diagram. She noted further the T connection through a connector building - they were otherwise raising the grade of their lot to the current level at the main entry (about 3'). CM: One of the big realizations we had as a team was that we had to move the parking (about 380,000 SF) below grade. That adds permeability on all edges. (Shows a section, and the pathways through the building itself.) The office lobbies are all pulled down to the entry level as well. CM showed the garage level, and the cinema level, noting the move. The second floor was retail. CM: Above that, there is green space for the residential towers. (Notes relationship to Miner Street at the corner, shows elevation.) The tower on the plaza comes down to the ground, and is an attraction in the area. On the others, it's mostly masonry. We step to the neighborhood; we have moved the loading to the center. (Shows a series of elevational views.)

KS: Why are there so many parking spaces? PS2: There are 1500-1600 now. We have 1500 below, so there are really not any new, and we are adding uses. The spaces are not utilized now,

and we will now be closer to the zoning requirement. CM showed a view of the connecting space in the building: 'Fenway Market,' with boutique restaurants and shops. Keith LeBlanc (KL) began to present the landscape design. LE: I have to leave now, but when you return, I'd love to see how you can stitch together the pedestrian crossing, where the mouth of your access road lands. So that there are less barriers. DH: It's important to understand the pathways. CM: We can show what's being built. LE: It's great to see Fullerton Street as something other than what it is now. How do pedestrians navigate it? KL: Quickly, the open space is over 2 acres, when you add the corner and remove the parking. (Describes nature of the various spaces.) We are adding one more plaza. On the edge along Park Drive, we are working closely with the ACE work on the other side.

DH: You may have to repeat what you just said in Design Committee. I appreciate the view framing the Sears Building as a historical jewel. I'm not at all concerned about the level of density. But we need to know what we're approving, so we can focus on the issues. The building on the plaza side is exciting. As you're moving around it, how is it NOT like a fortress or a monolith? You have it experienced around the building. And everything is distinctly different from the yellow brick of Sears. The plaza at Brookline is really exciting; it could be one of the premiere gathering spaces in the District. Its character - how do you make it not episodic, but *memorable*? PS2: The intent is to get the okay of (it) all. DH: Then present it in such a way as to digest it. It's hard to come by a meeting and see six different buildings. Perhaps separating them, by design topic or focus - would make things easier.

DC: I agree with Linda about the drive, but it may be that's not how it's approached. I'd like to understand more about that. The landscape along the park - I agree with relating to that. I understand the relationship to the Point - you don't want to detract from that - but I want to understand more about that, too. This is an opportunity for a major connecting street (Fullerton).

DH: It's an opportunity to help service that institution (HVMA) as well. The Landmark Center just feels so far away now. These connections are good. KS: The scale - we need more perspectives to understand it. But also we need to know more about the use of the edges. The architecture - the diagram was telling, nodes along the Fenway. That character should be acknowledged. I'm not sure you create a riot around the edge, more a family of buildings. It's a challenge above the podium, in terms of your character. DH: I like the corner relationship to Kilmarnock. We should talk more about that plaza. Understand the design - how it compares to other spaces. How it functions. With that, the Landmark Center Expansion Project was asked to go to Design Committee.

There being no further items for discussion, a motion was made to adjourn, and the meeting was duly adjourned at 9:25 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission is scheduled for October 15, 2013. The recording of the October 1, 2013 Boston Civic Design Commission meeting was digitized and is available at the Boston Redevelopment Authority.