

MINUTES
BOSTON CIVIC DESIGN COMMISSION

The meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was held on Tuesday, December 1, 2020 at 5:15 p.m. and was held virtually via Zoom to ensure the safety of the public, staff members, and the BCDC Commissioners during the COVID-19 pandemic. Members in attendance were Deneen Crosby, Linda Eastley, David Hacin, Eric Höweler, David Manfredi, Paul McDonough, William Rawn, and Kirk Sykes. Absent were Mikyoung Kim, Andrea Leers, and Anne-Marie Lubeanu. Elizabeth Stifel, Executive Director of the Commission, was present, as were several BPDA staff including Matt Martin, Marcus Mello, Natalie Punzak, and Megan Richard.

David Hacin, who chaired the meeting, 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. Following a roll call of the present Commissioners, 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 Friday, November 17, 2020 in the BOSTON HERALD.

The first item was the approval of the October 6 and November 10, 2020 Monthly Meeting Minutes, and the Design Committee Minutes from the months of October and November. A motion was made, seconded, and it was duly

VOTED: To approve the October 6, 13, 20, and 27, and the November 10 and 24, 2020 BCDC Meeting Minutes.

Votes were passed for signature. The next item was a summary report from the Review Committee for 819 Beacon Street. The mixed-use proposal will include residential units and patient-family housing units in partnership with Boston Children's Hospital. Review is recommended. It was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed 819 Beacon Street project in the Fenway neighborhood.

The next Review Committee report was for Phase I of the Mildred Hailey redevelopment. The project includes seven new residential buildings at the southeast portion of the existing Mildred C. Hailey Apartments housing development. The scale exceeds the 100,000 SF threshold for review so review is recommended. It was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for Phase I of the proposed Mildred Hailey redevelopment in the Jamaica Plain neighborhood.

The next Review Committee report was for the 176 Lincoln Street project. The mixed-use project includes three buildings (one residential and two commercial). Elizabeth Stifel described the goals of the Western Avenue Corridor Study & Rezoning process as the project is within the study area boundary. She also mentioned other current development proposals in the study area and outlined next steps for the study. Given the scale of the project, review is recommend. It was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed 176 Lincoln Street project in the Brighton neighborhood.

The Commission moved to project presentations, the first being for the **1500 Soldiers Field Road project**. Eric Höweler was recused.

Caroline Shannon (Höweler + Yoon): The recommendation points the design team heard from subcommittee were to consider the goal of the district's urban design, to develop the proposal's urban relationship and exterior design, and to consider the proposal's relationship to Soldiers Field Road and Charles River Park. The stepping approach of the massing strategy to guarantees river views for most of the units. We are carefully considering hypothetical footprints of new development on the adjacent sites, and how this could affect the distribution of open space. We are making a programmatic change to retail on part of the first floor, and we have moved the building further to the east to provide an 8.5-foot midblock walkway to the river. The change in grade from Soldiers Field Place to Soldiers Field Road is a fully accessible pathway. We added some 3-BR units after engaging with the community, along with a roof deck, and are investigating the use of solar. The material palette includes ribbed metal panels with variations in color and texture to create a sense of depth. We will introduce warmth into the façade by using wood in the underbellies of the balcony areas.

Linda Eastley: Two things come to mind. First, I am thankful that you made the western link wider and more generous. Second, I am wondering if you can explore having the vertical staircases function in a more public way and not have them all in the middle of the building. Is this something that you have thought about?

Caroline Shannon (Höweler + Yoon): The core layout is really where it is in order to make the plan work and meet efficiency standards. A difficult question would be how to keep the stairs fire-rated, but also opened up. We are definitely looking to make use of signage and wayfinding to make the building's more visible.

Kirk Sykes: I would like to recognize the elegance of this project. I like that the stepping of the massing will clearly benefit the project and add light and air to the spaces. The only comment I have is regarding the retail area, and how the back of sidewalk invites the public in. Are there also ways to better invite the public to this space and to bring people down the walkway? I see you still have a grass treatment where there is a retail presence.

Caroline Shannon (Höweler + Yoon): Yes, we are happy to look at landscape treatments

here.

Deneen Crosby: I agree with Linda and Kirk's comments. Having the additional 2.5 feet on the western edge really helps. Moving forward, I would really anticipate the property line on west side, especially if you consider this to be a public way in the future, in terms of grade challenges, and planting; just be ready for it. My other thoughts have to do with the city and the state coming together to create crossings over Soldier Field Road. Other than that, this is a great project, and you have done a great job with it.

David Manfredi: I'll just say that there is a complexity here that shows a lot of sophistication. The consistency of the sophisticated restraint, and the overall complexity makes this a really great project.

Benjamin Tocchi (IAG member): I want to reiterate that the location over the building is prominent, and it is a gateway. There are some attitudes that Allston-Brighton is a student ghetto and a pass-through neighborhood between Downtown and Newton. The building stands on its own, and I hope it is as beautiful when built as it is on paper. It is important that the building makes a statement when people come to Allston-Brighton.

Dolores Boogdanian (lives in Fenway neighborhood): Thank you very much for inviting me to speak. I live in the Fenway neighborhood. Are there any views of the project from the river

Caroline: This could give you a sense of what the view from the river could look like.

(Presented a view of what it would be like.)

Dolores: I always like to see some grace and lightness when near a space like the Charles River. I know that many have found the design pleasing, but I think it looks a little block like, just my opinion.

Hearing no other comments, it was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommend approval of the schematic design for the proposed 1500 Soldiers Field Road project in the Brighton neighborhood.

Eric Höweler returned. The next report from the Design Committee was for **2 Harbor Street**.

Jacob Citrin (Scape): I am here to present the project team, and I would like to express thanks for the BCDC Commissioners.

Natasha Espada (Studio ENÉE): We will discuss the site/context, where we were and what we heard in January and then in July, and the design evolution. We have studied the location of the project in the context of the Seaport, and the syncopation of buildings along Northern Avenue. (She showed the site plan from the EPNF from Nov. 2019, and showed what they heard from the BCDC monthly meeting in Jan. 2020. She showed the evolution of the project, and the proposal the design team presented to BCDC in Jul. 2020. She then showed what they heard from that subcommittee meeting.)

Mark Klopfer (KMDG): We have made vehicular changes to the site, and taken into consideration the realignment of Haul Road. The revised design of circulation accommodates a potential Phase II build out. We have worked to shape the on-site material character, and we think the building should feel like it is part of the heritage of the Seaport.

Seth Riseman: The building changed in how the lobby relates to the plaza. The massing shifted slightly and the height was reduced due to Massport regulations. The open space is transformed with the multiple zones of the plaza. We have made some changes to the articulation, and added more facets to pick up light and shadow.

Linda Eastley: I really appreciate you showing how a realigned Haul Road would affect your site. The pedestrian sequence to the main entrance was clearer in the last scheme. I am wondering if you can keep the strong diagonal and connect it more strongly to the main entrance. It also feels like there are two different zones to the plan.

Mark Klopfer: The line of trees is permeable, and the plazas will be linked. The dimension of the plaza was squeezed, but we still think it is right-sized. The pavement is also connecting the plazas, and the street is not intended to read like a roadway, but a connector.

Deneen Crosby: This is a very big space. I'm happy to see the tree planting because the scale will be an issue when there aren't a lot of people here. I hope programming works, and that contextual developments will happen make this area feel more like an urban environment. Breaking up the open space to allow for this programming will be important.

William Rawn: At the intersection of Haul Road and Northern Ave, it looks like there is a big area of traffic. Can you share how the traffic gets around the circle? It is certainly not orthogonal, and it looks like it could be potentially confusing for traffic coming into the intersection space.

Seth Riseman: We have been dealing with two other exercises. One is the city's redesign of Northern Avenue to add bike lanes and prioritize Silver Line traffic, and tighten up the carriageway. We have been working with them to make sure that our design dovetails with their improvements. The would become a more traditional signalized four-way intersection.

William Rawn: It is a little alarming, and the amount of open space could be confusing to the pedestrian and cyclists let alone the trucks and buses.

Elizabeth Stifel: This is EDIC property and we are working with Massport. The point you are raising is why we are looking at this intersection.

Kirk Sykes: Can you take us through areas where you can sit and relax?

Mark Klopfer: At the line of trees going from the rotary to the building, there is a landform with a number of benches. The lawn area and path at the northwest corner of the site have a number of seating options. Along the connection to the Silver Line station, there is also seating.

David Manfredi: How do you think about the tenant space? You have some activity across the street and there is opportunity.

Seth Riseman: The tenant space itself is raised as a resiliency measure, and we have

included an interim zone between sidewalk and building along Northern Avenue to work with the grade change. We have changed the façade at the ground floor and made the copper-colored grid more dense at the ground level. The single-story tenant space is all glass, not opaque.

William Rawn: I am still a little concerned about pedestrians coming out of building and taking the diagonal. The diagonal is a strong design move, but I don't understand the alignment and I don't know if it works for pedestrian access to the sidewalk and rest of the Seaport.

Mark Klopfer: We have been trying to balance the existing condition with how to reconcile a future possible condition. We would change the curb line along Haul Road and try to use paving to make people move towards crosswalk and not bee-line across the site.

Hearing no other comments, it was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommend approval of the schematic design for the proposed 2 Harbor Street project in the Seaport neighborhood (with the clause that if the project changes significantly, the BCDC will want to see it again.)

The next report from the Design Committee was for **135 Dudley Street**.

Dan Cruz, Jr. (Cruz Development): We would like to focus our time on the architectural design. We have been at this since August of 2019, and we were asked in December of 2019 by the BCDC to start over. We have been working for 11 months to try and get this right, so we are trying to move this ball forward. We have unfortunately been put back as we did not get approval of funding from the state.

Michael Liu (TAT Architects): The Commissioners were pleased with the new massing approach, and recommended the design team to develop the plaza in front of the condo building. They were also asked to resolve the strong directional form of the nearby courthouse, and we chamfered the back of the building to create a recognizable geometry. We have also added terracing along the rear, and developed the corner to preserve views down Malcolm X Boulevard.

Kirk Sykes: I attended both subcommittee meetings. This is a very difficult site with hard geometries and surrounding municipal buildings. One of the recommendations were to better recognize the entrance to the site, and to create improvements to the entrance the condo building. The design team did this, and stepped the building back to improve air and light. They also made changes to the landscape.

David Hacin: There is a real clarity to the rental building. The massing of the project is significantly clearer and improved and creates a more urban condition that looks like a collection of buildings.

Eric Höweler: I wonder about the relationship of the project to the courthouse. There is a

super awkward moment where the point of courthouse is pointed straight at the building. I'm not sure the chamfer actually solves this. At the ground level, there is still an awkward berm and terrace. The public realm doesn't seem resolved at all. The topography, the paving, the grading, and shape don't feel resolved.

Deneen Crosby: Some of the in-between areas look unresolved. There is a lot that can be done with terracing and better treatment of the landscape to make for comfortable spaces. The connections between the plazas are as important as the plazas themselves.

Linda Eastley: I feel like there is a real front to the building and a real back to the building. The back of the building feels really unsolved, and I wonder if there is a series of simple moves that creates visual interest to help resolve issues of surveillance discussed earlier. I think the front plaza is working well. I really understand the relationship now of these proposed buildings with the library and I appreciate the response to the T station across the street. This, for me, is the most successful part. The edges don't feel like they've been worked out and we haven't talked about how you access the courtyard itself.

David Hacin: Clearly a lot of time has been spent on reorienting the buildings, but we haven't heard a lot about the landscape responses. Perhaps this is an area where further development and review could be focused.

Katya Podsiadlo (Verdant Landscape): We have a service drive for loading, and there is a ramp to the courthouse.

Michael Liu: The courtyard is elevated from the service drive by about 15 feet.

Katya Podsiadlo: There is a slope down to the basement level access area. We want to continue to allow pedestrian circulation around the courthouse. There is an elevation change from the courtyard plaza up to our new plaza. We have some competing land use and property ownership interests.

Linda Eastley: To clarify, the area between the library, courthouse, and new building is paved and not used as a primary entrance to any of the building, so it is leftover space?

Katya Podsiadlo: Yes, this is left over space. There are security concerns about adding landscape features to this area due to people hiding drugs and dangerous in the plant beds.

David Hacin: Perhaps this should be a secured lower paved space that allows the building to abut. I wonder if the berm is making all of this more complicated.

Deneen Crosby: That is one approach, I think another is to make a better transition that connects these spaces. The patio doesn't have to be aligned with the berm. Even though you don't want people loitering here, it can be designed as a space that feels more designed. The berm isn't really accessible from either side. It needs further development.

Linda Eastley: I don't know enough about some of these project pieces to make an informed vote tonight. It is really complex and you wish you could be in a room with a model. The geometries feel forced and it needs more resolution.

Hearing no other comments, it was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommend that the schematic design for the proposed 135 Dudley Street project in the Roxbury neighborhood will be sent back to

subcommittee (with a focus on the landscape.)

The Commission moved to project presentations and reports from Design Committee, the first being for the **819 Beacon Street** project.

Marcus Mello, BPDA, presented the staff slide.

Elizabeth Stifel offered a brief introduction in lieu of the BPDA Staff who are unavailable: This project has been under review for a bit with BPDA urban design staff. The primary issues we have been discussing with them include the compatibility of building height and massing with the neighboring context, height reduction of the East-West wing, and activation of the ground experience along Maitland and the multi-use path.

Andrew Flynn (Scape): We are pleased tonight to propose a project including housing for workers and patient families of Boston Children's Hospital. From our standpoint, we have received feedback from BPDA urban design team, community groups, and the IAG. We are grateful to respond to this feedback in the coming months and driving alignment for all stakeholders involved. This a challenging site, but what is most important is how we treat this as a transition site and create a connective tissue between the more mid-rise residential fabric of Audubon Circle and the emerging commercial buildings in Fenway Center.

JF Finn (Gensler): The shaping and massing of the building allows us to provide open space for the residents, and to provide for the neighborhood. We do view this as a transitional site, and as bridge between the high-rise buildings to the east and the midrise buildings to the west. A big site constraint is the D line that runs underground. This evidences itself in a vent in the north of the site. We have pulled the massing back from the tunnel back and placed to the south and east part of the site. As we have pulled the building back, we have opened up some expanse between the Audubon neighborhood and the newer developments arising near Kenmore Square. Another challenge is the topography. It dives town Maitland Street, but allows us to create a green plinth to hide the parking below. Since 2013, we have been able to slender out the building, and have reduced the ground floor area by 33,000 square feet. We are now doing three stores of below grade parking instead of five stories above. As discussed the high point of the site is on the northeast corner of the site, and this is the primary entry for residents and Boston Children Housing patient families. The open space plaza is accessed from the northwest corner. There is a protected bike lane on Beacon Street, and the multi-use path is a full 16 feet below Beacon Street. We are also installing a raised two-way bike path along Maitland Street. The aerial views show how the various open space pieces fit together to create and activate the open plaza.

Alexander Fernandez (Gensler): This is the board-approved project in 2013. We have reduced the massing, and lowered the southern wing. We are looking at a palette that has

a variety. We have a warm tone at the entrance, and a diverse set of materials facing Beacon Street. We have two types of gray brick.
Richard Curtiss discussed interior spaces before wrapping up.

William Rawn: One major thing I'd like to see is shadow studies. The open space component is very impressive and a major public benefit of this project, but it might be in shadow for a large part of the year. If you can show shadow studies at design committee meeting, that would be very helpful.

David Hacin: Thank you Bill. Unfortunately, we can't have physical models given the current situation. I would like to see some views of the project from the neighborhood, the different streets surrounding it, and perhaps photos of a physical model to show how it relates to the buildings around it. Someone else?

Deneen Crosby: I agree with trying to see street level views, particularly on Beacon Street. The MBTA vent is in an unfortunate location. I would also like to better understand the level changes and where they are. I also want to know if the T tunnel has any effect on what can be done on the surface, as it is not reflected in the surface landscaping. The entrance into the plaza from Beacon Street is important.

Linda Eastley: I also want to better understand the topography and how the park is working and in what direction. I also want to understand how the building meets Maitland Street.

Kirk Sykes: It would be helpful to have elevation studies of the three blocks going back. This is an important building in the block, and it would be helpful to understand how you are responding to the buildings around it.

William Rawn: Is it possible that the design team build a model so that we can then see more of views?

David Hacin: There have been teams doing this during COVID, and this project potentially warrants that. The proponents are describing this project as a bridge, but I think the concept here is that the green space is more of the bridge.

Eric Höweler: It was described as a buffer and a bridge, and those are two different things. I understand the logic, but this seems more like a bookend, in relation to the building next to it. The street experience is something I want more on. While the park is generous, it feels like something is missing and it feels quite set back. I want to understand this in the context of the street wall as it is interrupted here. You would almost want to put a small building or a pavilion over the MBTA vent. The streetscape here seems to be the most important urban gesture and can be more articulated.

Dolores Boogdian (President of Audubon Circle Neighborhood Association): Thank you so much. I am the President of Audubon Circle Neighborhood Association. I will start by saying that we are happy about new living space is being put here and that it is something other than a parking lot. I am a little disappointed that the design of the building hasn't really changed since talking to community groups. I appreciate the comments the Commission members have made about the building acting as a more of a bridge. You

might remember John Rosenthal stepping his project down towards Audubon Circle; now, we have a larger project coming up that is a 15-story wall proposed on the site. There is incongruity here and I was looking to see something different. The open space is a positive aspect, but doesn't change the wall-like nature of the façade that has been proposed. I would like to see design that is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and I look forward to seeing something better than what we are seeing tonight.

David Hacin: I do, too, remember John Rosenthal discussing this, and I hope this is something that we can continue to discuss.

Councilor Kenzie Bok: It's such a pleasure hearing you bring design feedback to the city and I want to appreciate you for all of this. I will keep my comments focused on the urban design aspect. I definitely want to second Dolores's comment about the wall. There should be a way of thinking to have the building be shorter at the Beacon/Maitland Street corner, there is something we have to be sensitive to there. I think the park is an important benefit, but I think the multi-use path is also an important space. Maitland Street is a street that may be used more in the future and we want to think more about its function as a connector. We would appreciate the BCDC's feedback on ground use on Maitland Street and along the multi-use path. The last thought I have is a materiality question. There is a strong material quality to the existing brownstones, and the transition to a panel-like material feels harsh. The building didn't feel like it was made of brick in the views you showed. Having conversations about the bridging and transitioning in terms of materiality is also important to this project.

Michael Simons (member of IAG): Thank you very much Councilor Bok, and members of the Commission. I am a long-standing owner in Audubon Circle. This is a high-impact, densely-packed building. It seems like a maximum build for the site. A building much smaller in height, size, and density, would be beneficial to area. The 725 Beacon Street building on the right is 8-stories and 80 feet. It was specifically designed to drop down in height. This building is a monster of a tower and it is looming. It does not weave into the fabric of the neighborhood. It does not consider the aspects of the brownstones to the west. It is quite industrial and you could find a building like this in the Seaport. The building is being built on three parcels of land and I want to know what zoning variances are being granted. The sound is something to be mindful of as they are already high for a residential area. I want to see this studied. We'd like to see a building that is more respectful to the context and the neighborhood. The final thing I will say is that this building was proposed with 75 percent studios. It is over 500 units. I want people to step back and get a sense of how much impact a building of this size would have.

The project will continue in Design Committee.

The **Mildred Haley Master Plan (Phase I)** in the Jamaica Plain neighborhood was the next presentation. Kirk Sykes was recused.

Meghan Richard, BPDA, presented the staff slide. Some of the big urban design goals of the project we have discussed are to integrate the project with the existing neighborhood fabric, have a variety in the architecture and massing, and create connectivity through a green network.

Tamara Roy (Stantec): We are going through the Chapter 121A designation process, and we will seek zoning variances for the project. The context includes active uses along Centre Street and the Southwest Corridor Park. I also want to show you some of the architecture types that exist in the surrounding neighborhood. One highlight of the master plan is a network of new street connections that will improve the disconnected, diagonal orientation that exists on the site. Our goal is to have a new robust public realm. We have put in active uses along Centre Street, and all of our entrances are along main streets and not hidden. We have a new street (Lamartine Street) between the buildings that can connect to the nearby Stop & Shop.

Shauna Gillies-Smith (Ground, Inc.): In addition to creating wide sidewalks, we have created new green connections. For example we have extended Parker Street down to Centre Street. We have also observed that not all residents want widely publicly accessible paths, so we need to be mindful of this.

Tamara Roy: Here is our phasing plan, which is extremely complicated and took many months to work out. The goal here is to accommodate on-site relocation and minimize disruption to residents. The plan is to construct 1A and 1B on the site where there is the least amount of building on the site currently. It is kind of a leapfrog type of approach. We have also advanced two scheme options that contain different building footprints and different types of greenway connections.

Mark Eclipse (PCA): You can see in the two views of the model that the first two buildings set the stage for the development. We have different sides to the buildings as Building 1A and Building 1B face different directions. There are three public spaces created by the buildings, and their layout reflects the interlocking hands logo of the tenants association. The buildings step back both along the SW Corridor Park and the new Lamartine Street. The Anna Mae Cole community center is on the corner of Building 1B and very accessible. The buildings both have a lot of rhythm, movement, and color.

Deneen Crosby: One question I have is how the SW Corridor Park meets Centre Street. This is one of, if not, the most important piece of the public realm, and it has to be comfortable and accessible. Lamartine Street has a lot of interesting possibilities. Each one of the blocks will have some closure to it, and this will have exciting possibilities for walkability. I question if there is some way you can make the entrance to the SW Corridor Park more visible, and if you can provide space around the T building. That could add a lot, and there

are important spaces between the buildings that can be developed.

Linda Eastley: I have three comments. One of the most ingenious part of the plan is the spaces at the intersections. I think those have a really nice flavor. There is a lot of thinking about the larger look and inclusion of open space. My second comment is that it feels very tight between Building 2 and the T-station. There could be an opportunity here – is it about creating something more private for Building 2 or something more public? It feels like you have to wiggle through a tight area by the station. Lastly, I want to better understand how the massing of Building 1A and 1B reflects the programming.

David Hacin: One of my concerns is that there is a real compression that exists on Centre Street bordering the site. You have an opportunity to change the sense of scale on this street. Is it possible to set back Building 5A/5B, Building 4, and Building 2? I also want to make sure that the flipping of Buildings 1A and 1B makes sense and complements the syncopation and experience along the SW Corridor. I want to better understand the ground floor programming to assess where setbacks should go along SW Corridor.

David Manfredi: I like the master plan. The configuration is largely driven by new versus existing, and I like that kind of organic quality. There is a logic that may not be obvious, but gives it a character that might be different. The plan speaks to the power of streets to overcome separation and isolation. I also wonder if the metaphor of the linking hands translated into buildings works architecturally. Does one open space flow into the other? In subcommittee I really want to understand how you are thinking about the taking the big scale of the massing to a smaller scale and filling in all the steps in between.

William Rawn: The design composition of elements on façade of 1A and 1B are intriguing and lively. I want to see more detail on the interplay of graphics and materiality in the elevations.

Alison Pultinas: I live about four blocks from the site and walk this way from Heath to Jackson often. My comments are about the relationship of the street level of buildings to the corridor. How would someone living in Building 1A and 1B walk to facilities and avoid cyclists on the SW Corridor path. It looks like the area between 1A and the courts is completely fenced off. More clarity on that would be good. There are also existing community gardens and I wonder if they will be included in the project? Lastly, I'd like to see more thinking about the intersection between Lamartine and Bromley Street and how to make this a less dangerous intersection.

The project will continue in Design Committee.

The **176 Lincoln Street project** in the Brighton was the next presentation.

Elizabeth Stifel presented the staff slide. The focus of the discussions have been on the

relationship of the building to the adjacent neighborhoods, permeability of the site from all directions, and transportation to and around the site.

David Nagahiro (CBT): We are working to integrate office, lab, residential, active retail, and arts-related programming on the site, and to add to Allston-Brighton's vibrant arts culture. We are trying to tame the traffic along Lincoln Street, improve Teleford Street, and add New Street. Building B contains commercial and retail, Building A contains residential and retail, Building C contains commercial and retail, and we have included a maker court, and underground parking.

Mark Klopfer (KMDG): There are two acres of open space on the site, and we want to create a set of diversely scaled spaces. We are including building complete streets along the streets bordering the site. There are a number of small spaces that are all related to the surrounding community. David: Design principles – block has been impenetrable for last 30 years. Want to create series of walkable pedestrian friendly scaled spaces.

David Nagahiro: The idea of this block needing to be right-sized and broken down, and welcoming the neighborhood in, is something we are really interested in. We want to create a porosity on the site, and create buildings that look and feel rooted in the neighborhood. We are very interested in building upon community planning goals and guidelines.

Vicki Alani (CBT): We are trying to put pedestrian-friendly uses and make a more porous entrance on Lincoln Street. We are trying to pull people up from Everett Street to Lincoln Street. We have split the loading docks so there isn't a front or back door on the site. Between Buildings B and C, we have created an atrium that can easily be activated. Building C has a large tenant space to keep the area active. From the Everett Street bridge, you can see the whole site and relationships between the buildings.

David Nagahiro (CBT): We like having multiple entrances on New Street so that artists have opportunities to open their spaces. We want to create a productive street for the neighborhood.

Vicki Alani (CBT): We are including different types of units to create a mix. The maker court is really an active space; the idea is that it is residents, lab tenants, and community members who can use this space as a real asset.

Eric Höweler: Will any of the existing structure be reused? The on-ramp creates a sort of artificial grade that affects how you are placing the plaza. How do you explain the kind of artificial topography of the courtyard?

Vicki Alani (CBT): Our main goal was to make the parking disappear, and we worked really hard to put this under grade. It was a choice between an above-grade garage, or a garage topping level that connects to Everett Street. We thought it would be good to have a rise to the middle of the site.

Deneen Crosby: I am interested in two things: seeing this in the larger context of the planning study, and also seeing how this fits into a network of connected spaces leading towards the river. I appreciate you walking through all of the streets, and we will be looking for more specificity about this in subcommittee.

David Manfredi: The site sections would be really interesting. It feels like there are a couple pinch-points on Lincoln.

Linda Eastley: I'd love for you to zoom back and refresh our memories on the different types that meet this site. New Street feels like a wall facing more industrial uses, but if we're aspirational this will be something different. Is there a way to have an opening that gets you to the level of the courtyard?

David Hacin: I have two architectural comments. One is about Buildings B and C as they're seen from the pike. The pike has become a dynamic architectural entry point into the city that speaks to the energy of Allston-Brighton. The volumes are pretty straightforward, and I wonder if there is an opportunity to celebrate the buildings from the pike and also from across the Boston Landing site. The second is that I am not totally convinced about artist live-work lofts as interacting with the street, and I agree with Linda's comments.

Jo-Ann Barbour (IAG member): One point that has come up is traffic and parking, specifically on Lincoln Street. The second thing, along with that, is looking at what kind of incentives can be made available to decrease the amount of parking that may be necessary on the site given the proximity to Boston Landing. The third point is that it will be really important for the developers building in this area to work together through the mitigations that will need to happen on Lincoln and Everett Street to make this a safe area for families moving forward. Lastly, extending Teleford Street all the way through is very important.

Tim McHale (resident): I find that the buildings are kind of big and boxy and feel more flashy than they are interesting. It could feel more interesting. Building A doesn't scale down to the neighborhood. This is an opportune time to get housing in. This is a superblock and does not connect to neighborhood grid. The townhouses feel like they are tacked on and not a good segway. The two-story glazing pattern is overwhelming; it feels like Manhattan. For a transit-oriented development, this project needs to connect people safely to Boston Landing. Everett Street is a horrible bridge to navigate and there needs to be a safe way to get to Boston Landing.

The project will continue in Design Subcommittee.

There being no further items for discussion, a motion was made to adjourn, and the meeting was duly adjourned at 9:05 p.m. The next full Commission meeting was scheduled for December 8, 2020. The recording of the December 1, 2020 Boston Civic Design Commission meeting was digitized and is available at the Boston Redevelopment Authority.