

DRAFT MINUTES

**BOSTON CIVIC DESIGN COMMISSION**

The meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was held on Tuesday, October 15<sup>th</sup>, 2013, starting in the BRA Board Room, 9<sup>th</sup> Floor, Boston City Hall, beginning at 5:18 p.m.

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

The Co-Vice-Chair, Mike Davis (MD), announced that 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. This hearing was duly advertised on Saturday, September 21, in the BOSTON HERALD.

The first item was the approval of the October 1<sup>st</sup>, 2013 Meeting Minutes. A motion was made, seconded, and it was duly

**VOTED: To approve the October 1<sup>st</sup>, 2013 Boston Civic Design Commission Meeting Minutes.**

Votes were passed for signature. MD asked for a report from the Review Committee. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Commonwealth Hotel Expansion**. David Carlson (DAC) reported that the Commonwealth Hotel Project had been approved by the Commission years ago, and was due to its success and with a change in ownership expanding onto its rear surface parking lot with a garage, expanded event space, and more hotel rooms. The location was at once hidden and highly visible; at about 113,000 SF, the Project exceeded the BCDC threshold, and a vote to review was recommended. It was duly moved, seconded, and

**VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed Commonwealth Hotel Expansion Project at 552-628 Newbury Street in the Fenway/Kenmore neighborhood.**

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Innovation Square at Northern Avenue Project**. DAC reported that the Project was at the corner of Tide Street and Northern Avenue in the BMIP, and at over 350,000 SF was well over the BCDC threshold. A vote to review was recommended; it was then duly moved, seconded, and

**VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for Innovation Square at Northern Avenue Project at 316-318 Northern Avenue (6 Tide Street) in the Boston Marine Industrial Park in the South Boston Waterfront District.**

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Match Community Day Charter Public School Project at Neponset Field**. DAC noted that for the prior (Neponset Fields Residential) Project at this site, the Commission in 2005 had voted NOT to review because the site was such that there was little impact on the City's public realm, despite the Project being slightly over the threshold. Only Phase 2 of the Project, 30 units of elderly housing, went forward, and sites are reserved for

18 townhouses. The MATCH School has purchased the remaining property and the adjacent industrial property and intends to build a new modestly-scaled facility. At 70,000 SF, on its own it is below the threshold and would not normally have been brought to the Commission. However, a condition of the prior vote NOT to review was to provide information on the quality of life and relationship to Neponset River planning. A presentation is scheduled now; the recommendation remains NOT to review. MD called for a motion and it was moved instead to review, seconded, and

**VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed MATCH Community Day Public Charter School Project in the Hyde Park neighborhood.**

Gail Sullivan (GS) of Studio G introduced her associate Tamar Warburg (TW) and noted that the MATCH School, like most Charter schools generally, was mission-driven; this would consolidate and upgrade facilities for them in a K-12 setting. TW showed the existing conditions, then the old site plan, and then the new plan layout (the buildings were modest in scale) and views of the proposal. TW: The central open space is important because part of the program calls for about 2 hours daily of one-on-one tutoring, and in good weather that is often done outside. Jeanne of CRJA gave a brief description of the landscaping plan, noting the several open spaces, the playing field (likely artificial turf), the buffering at the edges (commuter rail line, nearby residential), and the relationship to the River.

Deneen Crosby (DC): There was at one time a DCR plan for a path along the River; I'm not sure what its status is with the Belnel Village community. Also, no fence should separate the grounds from the River, so that access is possible. TW: The pathway is planned for the opposite side. There is no objection to River access on the School's part. But the adjacent senior Housing and the Belnel community did NOT want access. DC: Are the School buildings available to the community? MATCH School official: Yes, they will be available. There are security issues to deal with, but we generally work with the community. Kirk Sykes (KS): What is the relationship to the supermarket nearby, and the traffic impact? KW showed the location of the supermarket and described the route to get there. GS noted that the proposed commuter rail station at River Street would allow easier access and easier access across in the future. Lyn Wolff (LW): It would be good if nothing precluded bringing the children and the elderly community together in the future. GS: That is the aim. Nothing in the plan precludes that. They can interface by choice, but it's not in their face.

MD: What is the topographic relationship to the River? TW: It's a 15-20' drop, precipitous, with the 25-foot no-build zone. MD asked about circulation and drop-off, and this was discussed. Bill Rawn (WR) asked about the relationship to the train tracks. TW: They are elevated, with a strong buffer. Linda Eastley (LE): The main site is all together, but the Poydras building seems alone - the link isn't strong enough. TW: The drive is not much used. The younger kids are led to and from the bus; the older kids are in the Poydras building. WR: I think the buildings are located well, it's done in a very ingenious way. David Manfredi (DM): There's a nice sense of location; it's logical, with the buildings placed against the River. David Hacin (DH): I agree, and move approval. This motion was seconded and it was duly

**VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the proposed Match Community Day Charter Public School Project in the Hyde Park neighborhood.**

Paul McDonough left. The next item was a report from the Design Committee on the **Commons at Forest Hills Station**. MD: Most of us saw this. If you could just focus on the improvements made, in your presentation. Matthew Littell (ML) of Utile went quickly through the changes, noting the massing changes. ML: The mass has been moved away from the residential uses adjacent, and we have re-oriented the building to the south to create more clarity about the bars. We have

adjusted the open space. The massing setback on the north building allows great terraced views of the City. We have reduced the parking spaces; the space between the buildings allows a connection through as a pedestrian, and has trees at the front. The potential bike path at the rear and connection to it has been provided for. (Shows views from either end along Washington.) The building entries have seating outside, making them more public, as opposed to the more private studio entries. (Shows ground floor plans, which maintain retail, deeper studios convertible to retail space in the future, and parking. Shows a view of the 'shared street' idea, partially convertible to a street market, etc.) We have set back the townhouses, and the mass above, so that the sidewalk is wider, and the masses read clearly. We have clarified, and are more rigorous about the use of materials (i.e. brick at the base, panel above). ML then showed the view down Washington of a possible future condition with the Yards project ghosted in across the street.

LW: I have been at all the meetings; I think the team has responded well to all the comments. The streetscape is personable, the lobbies resolved. KS: I will defer to the Subcommittee. MD: I know the site well. The scale is entirely apropos; this is exactly the right Project. It was moved by several, and seconded and

**VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for The Commons at Forest Hills Station Project at 3593-3615 Washington Street in the Jamaica Plain neighborhood.**

KS was recused from the next item. The next item was a report from the Design Committee on the **BUMC IMP and 3 Phase One Projects**. MD reported that this was essentially an IMP; the larger Projects will return to the Commission for review and votes. This Phase has additions to buildings we've seen, and improvements to the public realm. Rick Kobus (RK) of Tsoi/Kobus showed the IMP Plan and a diagram showing the proposed Projects. He showed the changes, beginning with the canopy adjustment to the Moakley Addition on East Concord. He note the simplification along Albany, with less curb cuts, an ambulance drop-off, and details in the ED courtyard. He noted circulation and plan details for the ED along Albany. He showed an elevation with the reduced section of the Bridge, noting utilities were now going in part below grade. RK: The transparency is maxed out now; it has a slimmer, lower profile. RK then showed views in the ED courtyard entry behind the Shapiro. He showed the Menino Pavilion modification, moving the glass out under the deep canopy, flanking the entry.

LE: The Bridge piers have turned 90 degrees. How are they encountered at the pedestrian level? RK showed a plan: The feet go down off of the sidewalk travel path. Andrea Leers (AL): The Bridge change is substantive. And the ED entrance clarity is much improved. DH: I agree, this is much improved. I was worried about that. MD: And it gets these things off of Albany Street. WR: I encourage you to lighten up the Bridge. In terms of its lightness, the Liberty Mutual bridge is very successful. I hope that the BRA design staff can achieve something similar here; it would be a great sign for the hospital. KS: We spent a lot of time on the Liberty Mutual bridge. This could be a great expression. DH: A Gateway on Albany. MD: You could give us an update when you come in on your next Project. AL: Unlike the last time, you have legs on the Bridge. These too could be elegant - the subject of design, and not just engineered. With that, a motion to approve with a caveat about the Bridge was made and seconded, and it was

**VOTED: That the BCDC recommends approval of the amended Boston University Medical Center Institutional Master Plan and the Moakley Addition/Menino Adjustment, Bridge and new Connector, and first phase of the Inpatient Building as its first three projects, in the South End neighborhood, with the conditions that all future IMP Projects return to the BCDC for further review and approval, and that the Proponent work on the design of the Bridge so that it becomes as transparent and elegant as that of the Liberty Mutual bridge across Stuart.**

WR complimented the BRA staff on the outcome of the Liberty Mutual bridge. DAC acknowledged the compliment and noted that he would pass it on to the design review team that worked on it.

LW was recused from the next item. The next item was a report from the Design Committee on the **1350 Boylston Street Project**. BK Boley (BK) of ADD Inc. presented the broad changes, noting (using a large model) that the proposal was 17' lower than that seen earlier. BK: We focused on little, gritty issues. Tamara Roy (TR) of ADD Inc. recalled their Romeo and Juliet inspiration: Juliet is up on the balcony, atop Romeo down below. There was an issue with the (proportion) of the interstitial element. We did a series of studies with the dimensions the same, but a number of visual approaches. We have decided on one which narrows the windows (bedrooms are the interstitial's program). WR: But the opening is the same. The window and metal will read the same. BK: We were thinking a bronze metal, not matching the Falun red below. TR also noted the retail at the street, with frames that help to define it. AL: So, the 'zip' (interstitial) goes down to the street. TR: Yes. (Notes other modified details.) We have worked on the pop-up townhouse expressions; they have moved in. DH: Have you worked on the blank wall? Mark McGowan (MM) of Skanska noted that they do not own that wall. MM: It's not a party wall. Our talks with that condo owner do not allow us to touch it yet. TR: So we are restricted in what we can do. DH: It would be good to have BRA staff work to help accomplish that; it's not something we can force on you. Shauna Gillies (SG) showed the streetscape plan and a detail of the corner. LE: Does it turn the corner? DH: What is the width? SG: No; the width (along Kilmarnock) is about 8-10'. AL: A lot has been clarified. I have a concern about the element at the top (seen on the model) - I preferred it cleaner. The difference between the two pieces is confused by that element. TR: We thought we would show what is necessary, but we can work on that. DH: I think the attention to the 'zipper' (interstitial) ending in the entry is good, also clarified. The canopy relationship should match with that. KS: I wonder about the Swedish loft elements. AL: I prefer the 'innies.' KS: Also, the transparency at the base - this seems a heavy building. Where does it land? I'd just like knowing how it lands. DH: I agree. AL: I like that it floats; not everything has to come down. KS: It could be in the details. DH: True, if guidelines are not clear for the retail, we need to make sure that works. WR: What is driving the shift there? There are some opaque areas, not what David was suggesting. BK: We haven't decided yet, regarding the structural transfer, where the columns are. Either here, or above. AL: You have worked so hard to get to your idea - you could have the glass go in front. DH: Back to the guidelines issue. The area has the difficulty of all buildings in the area being too flexible with retail. LE: This is the first time I'm seeing this. Question - are we leaving enough dimension on the side street for the future? BK: Actually, it's about 12-15'. The overhang above comes out to 8' from the curb at its closest. LE: Lead up to the corner. Frame it. SG: We can look at that. AL: What is the space at the roof? SG: A green terrace. We haven't looked at the details yet. With that, it was moved, seconded, and

**VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the proposed 1350 Boylston Street Project at the corner of Kilmarnock Street in the West Fenway neighborhood.**

DS stepped out of the room. MD asked Tom O'Brien (TOB) to be brief - focus on the discussions, and confirm that this is a master plan, not a specific project, and will return to us for future review. The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **Government Center Garage PDA**. TOB: I'm happy to confirm that. We'll show the massing changes made (gestures). CBT will be the architect for the first phase - we will be back before you in early 2014, and the Zoning Commission has approved the site as eligible for a PDA. Some changes are consistent with the (Greenway) Guidelines; others were made pursuant to BRA and community input. Phasing changes - the most significant is earlier action on the

garage demolition over Congress Street, which frees up the next phasing step. (Shows an illustrative of the revised overall massing; a large lit model also stands in front of the table. Shows the east parcel plan, noting its relationship to the Bulfinch Triangle and the importance of Canal Street. Shows a more detailed site plan with retail spaces defined, precedent images, night and day views.) This will be a kind of lightning strike for changes at the entry to the Bulfinch Triangle. We will do sidewalk improvements around our blocks; there will be a piece of the building over the [extended] sidewalk on New Sudbury (shows precedents again).

WR: Do you have a picture of that? TOB: No. We'll be working on that as part of our submission next year. WR: Does the sidewalk extend into the roadway? Are you narrowing the street? TOB: Yes. We are working with the Police to move their parking into our garage. Kishore Varanasi (KV) of CBT described this further. DM: So, where does the building sit? KV: A few feet back from the new curb line, above (describes further). There is structure at the back; it's cantilevered. WR: I'm not against it - the narrower street is good, which is where I think David was headed. DC asked about the cantilever and street trees. KV: There will be room for trees. AL: I missed the in-between Design Committee. The east parcel has become a mid-rise block with pathways, it's very good. I'm glad to hear the garage is coming down sooner. The residential tower, and the east office block - stop there. I can understand the larger office building behind. But the third tower sprouting, troubles as an element. It could be more a mid-rise building, to resonate across the street, bring across the scale. DH: I think that the changes in height - certain aspects are unfortunate. Differentiation in the architecture is critical. If the buildings filled out in a more conventional framework, it would not be as enticing. I hope that the ambition evident in your model is carried out in the architecture of the towers. KV: Good point, it should be a family. It is not the intent to create a singular thing; the aim was to generate excitement and good design. AL moved to the model to show the intent of her comment. AL: Bring the mid-rise across. Celebrate your towers.

KS: The question can be debated. The Greenway, the removal of the Garage.... The treatment of the three could be compelling, as compelling as two. When you had the 'wickets' - not so much. TOB: We are working on this. If we get the east parcel right, it will boost the area and be a great asset for the City. LW: The sequence of timing - can you run through that? TOB: There is existing office atop the garage. The 3-4 tenants we have are in the east portion. That allows us to begin Phase 1. We have begun a process to see if we can get the tenants out. The longest lease is through 2022. The PDA says the Garage has to come down by 2023 - as soon as it (office) is vacated. Also, we are marketing the tower to possible tenants - which means that we could move immediately on the east parcel. MD: The interim conditions are a check in the box; you will be back. When it comes back, we will want to know exactly what that interim condition will comprise. TOB: When it comes down, it will also be complicated by an agreement with the MBTA. It will be well thought out. DM: You have made two very big moves. One is the massing. The second is the phasing commitment. The residential buildings will have slender floorplates. Like Kirk, I think that they could work. This is a lot better than when we first saw it. DH: It's important that it return. With that, it was moved, seconded (AL abstained), and

**VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the new schematic design for the proposed Government Center Garage Redevelopment Project and PDA in the Government Center area, with the condition that each Phase and corresponding Interim Condition return to the Commission for further review and a vote.**

KS left. DM was recused from the next item. The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **Copley Expansion Project NPC**. Galen of Simons introduced the team and Project. Galen: We have listened; we brought the

tower to the street and simplified it. Rob Halter (RH) of Elkus/Manfredi reminded the Commission: We have adjusted the entry details, and residential entries in particular. The treatment moves more around the building. We have shifted to allow a wider sidewalk width along Dartmouth. We had tried an extended canopy, but the elements were disparate; it works better to separate them. (Shows sidewalk plan; shows the changes along the Southwest Corridor.) The expression is simplified. The building comes down at the west; the retail cuts through, is more visible. We are working on programming the 'bay' element in this space. The architecture now comes around and engages the Southwest Corridor.

DH: A lot has allowed the clarity to read. The architectural expressions allow the tower to come down. The 'knuckle' (bay) looks exciting in the rendering. I look forward to having this happen. LE: We spent a lot of time on this; there is an amazing before and after comparison. It would be an amazing view out from that new retail. DH: This is really a jewel. AL: Thank you for taking our suggestions and improving them. The stretching the canopy, and your work on the residential entry, are good. And the storefronts, bringing the elements around. Thank you. WR: We have worked with you on the sidewalk width, Stuart and Dartmouth. The Simon Group found a better way to make the corner more a part of the City. LW: The architecture of the Winter Garden is more open, better. We talked about that. There is the mention of public art in our old vote; I think that stands. Galen: We are committed to spending one million dollars on public art at the Southwest Corridor location. With that, it was moved, seconded, and

**VOTED: That the Commission recommends full approval of the schematic design for the Copley Place Expansion Project NPC modifications, with release of the conditions in its vote of November 1, 2011.**

DM was again recused from the next item. DH was also recused. DS returned. The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **Seaport Square Parcels B&C Project**. John Hynes (JH) of BGI thanked the Commission. JH: We are back again, opposite the Courthouse. We have taken to heart the conversation in Committees. The last one was 4 weeks ago; we worked on: the relationship to the Courthouse, and improving the entire public realm, including the connection to the T; and then, the architecture and expression of the buildings. Gary Hilderbrand (GH, of Reed Hilderbrand) will present the first two. We have had meetings with Judge Woodlock as well. GH: First, the site plan, and differences, between then and now. The sidewalk plan is the same, and the *idea* of passage is the same. The escalator entry has been narrowed and brought back into the building, widening the aperture. And the building opposite has also been drawn back. And we have advocated the tabling of the street between this and the Courthouse entry. I think it's a safer zone. This has created a 105-foot-wide area, which aids in Woodlock's eloquent expression of procession - for those who *choose* to work there - on the path from the T station to the entry. (Shows series of views: the perspective idea, a sequence of views in the procession, a view from above looking west over 'Courthouse Square,' a view back from the Courthouse.)

WR: Is this the same seen on the 17<sup>th</sup>? GH: Yes. John Martin (JM) of Elkus/Manfredi: We have widened it slightly from what you saw. WR: WE can look back and see the path from the Courthouse. Why can't we see the whole arch? JH: You can now see 85% of the arch, vs. 25% of the arch, which you saw. The shift of the wall makes retail that much more difficult. WR: You're so close, a couple of feet. JH: If you move 5 feet to the right.... DC: If there were any way to move the wall, open it up more. LW: The space is really dynamic. It's just one corner that bothers me, at the escalator entry, or next to it. You might be losing some retail, but at the corner, you could see through the escalator. LE: Not necessarily a different angle, but rounding the (other) corner. It would be just enough. The overhead light you show - I would wish for a lighter catenary. GH: They are drawn thicker than you would ever see. But we have two layers of them, with transparent scrims that could change. A dazzling floor, light furniture, a transparent ceiling, minimum 50 feet wide. LE: I am complimenting the catenary.

Why do you have to navigate around the vertical light poles? Could you eliminate them? LW: The lines give you direction. DC: Are there lights in the pavement? GH: Yes. AL: Consideration of the procession has changed this. Woodlock is as strong a fan of architecture as you'll find in this area. Two things which that thinking suggests - one is a curve as a smooth transition from flat to flat could make a big difference. It will make the intent of passage *fluid*. I do appreciate what Gary has explained, it could be beautiful. And two, even if the archway is gradually revealed, I start to wonder about the canopy zone. It presents a kind of layer into that view. Seeing the form without an upper element - I wonder if those two ideas aren't in conflict. LE: That will change in the light of day. At night, the catenaries are critical to people wanting to be in the space. AL: It's just a question. It changes things when that (procession) becomes a goal. GH: We have held the trees back in two directions. WR: I think that corner is the issue. We're not meant to design these things, but it would really help.

JM presented the building designs, starting with a view from above. JM: We are using interlocking 'Ls' as a design strategy. The idea is to make the elements different - not twin sisters, but related. (Shows more developed views, with glass on B, and metal and glass on C, with a lighter and a darker wing.) Building C is separated from the podium at the base. It's a metal unitized system. (Shows elevations, notes balconies. Shows the innovation units atop the cinema zone, expressed in its own block [frame].) The darker area has a more uniform expression. The lighter (north) wing has a two-story expression which also differs. (Shows a building facade diagram.) We have varied the wall types to break up the expression. (Shows a series of upper detail perspectives to show those differences, moving around the buildings, starting with B.) B is mostly glass, with the floor slab expressed (metal). The C building is metal and glass, the innovation component too. We have upped the ante on the walls; we have shaped the innovation pavilion; we have brought the Project to the ground.

LW asked about the height of the podium. JM: It varies. (Points.) That's 55'. DS asked to see details of the base, and JM obliged with elevation details. MD: The retail is more coherent, more tectonic. JM: It's of the same hand, and language. AL: Some of the early studies in the PDA showed a more direct relationship across Seaport Boulevard. It is not as set back as shown then. We are past that. The densest part of Parcel C is close to Seaport Boulevard. That denser treatment perhaps could be glassier. It's the only long facade, and it's *very* present. JH reprised the decisions made: If you reversed C, then the rectangles would be together, and all would cram together. Seaport Boulevard is very wide - wider than Boylston Street, or Northern Avenue. AL: I didn't suggest that. Just a calmer expression; simpler, quieter. It is where it is. DS: You'd have to change the material.... AL: I don't think so. Simpler.

MD: There (seem to be) a number of conditions; you could either come back for an informational presentation, or we could allow BRA staff to carry forward our thoughts. Would the public - Judge Woodlock? - like to add anything? Woodlock: 'Does government work any more?' I think this evening shows that it does. I'll tell you a story. Harry Cobb goes through this process. He considered the courthouse building as a cloister. Joan Goody asked him, 'Where do people stand when they come out with the verdict?' To Linda's point, the curve brings something closer to drawing you through. Some of my colleagues don't like something tall defining the 'Courthouse Lozenge.' But I was impressed, back with Harry. And by your comments tonight. MD noted a list of conditions, and it was moved, seconded, and

**VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for Seaport Square Parcels B & C in the Seaport Square PDA, in the South Boston Waterfront District, with the condition that BRA staff work with the Proponent on: rounding the corners; improving the transparency of the catenaries; possibly re-thinking the vertical light poles; and, studying changing the facades to 'code' differently.**

DH and DM returned. LW was recused for the next item. The next item was a presentation of the **Commonwealth Hotel**

**Expansion Project.** Bob Ryan (BR) introduced himself and the Project team, noting that the development team had acquired leasehold rights on both the hotel and the surface parking spaces. BR: The hotel is under-parked now, due to its success and that of its restaurants. We plan 216 spaces, incorporating the 132 on the site now into the new structure. Antonio Donato (AD) of Group One presented the design, noting first the locus, then the plan, and the importance of the parking. DS: What are the total keys? AD: 243. DS: Spaces? AD: 216. Another priority was to expand the conference space. We are adding 94 rooms - any more, and the existing hotel infrastructure couldn't handle it. (Shows a section, which denotes a high space at the west - part of the event space.) The public alley (*sic*) had to be maintained. The BRA made us add an entry to the event space at the corner. (Shows plans, then views.) The addition will be visible primarily from across, or on, the Pike. (Shows elevations.) The function level is very glassy. The rooms are punched, but very open, with 7-foot wide glass, floor to ceiling. The parking floors have a mesh, with muntins as above. (Shows more views, both of the building and outwards from the function space toward Fenway Park. Notes the event open space, and green walls on the garage. Shows detailed perspectives.)

DC: What are the elevations (grades) along the property? AD: The alley dips, but Newbury and Kenmore are flat along the property (shows more views). LE asked for the elevation: I like the idea that the taller space could be a beacon. Also - offer some thoughts on the open space. The noise would be a distraction. Did you consider an atrium? AD: It's partly green. LE: But the noise would make it uninhabitable. MD: A model is needed for a project this size. DH: I'm delighted to have the back of the Hotel Commonwealth covered. It's unfortunate that a portion is still visible; that might have to be a part of this proposal. The mechanical screen could figure in the composition more. A parapet might give it more presence. And show us a window detail, to make sure it gives an upscale look. MD: There's a danger of it being suburban - we just want to be sure. AL: What you said, is that you want to do something in contrast to what's there. But you are particular - two colors of panel, the glass, etc. Why not all glass? Make it *totally* different. A glass bar over the screened garage. Radically different ways of wrapping (the program.)

DS: The streetscape here may not want two levels of parking. It's part of Kenmore, not like Newbury Street to the east. But do something - like retail, etc. - that would help life along the street. It's a great place to come. Bring the retail to the back, 360 degrees. DC: Newbury Street - I am thinking of it as a 2-sided street. If anything could be done on the opposite side, that would help. DM: Daniel was more ambitious. But it's an important view corridor. 100,000 people see it every day. I want to see a detailed model of what that would look like. I'm not sure of the entry at the back, it's likely a back-door entry. Oyster Creek turns the corner (along Kenmore) all the way to the alley. And in the opposite direction is a beautiful copper bridge, where Ted Williams used to live. WR: What is the distance from (existing) windows? Harry Wheeler: There are premium rooms along the Pike, so we have arranged the rooms so that 80% of the views are oriented there. 20% are facing the alley. DH: Maybe it's not just the facade, but screening, that makes the alley something. WR: What is the view down the alley? You have bridges. We are against the bridges, everywhere. We have to be convinced; that design is important. DM: You are taking your most valuable rooms, and making them not very valuable. The original plan, although unlikely, was for a tower here. With that, the Hotel Commonwealth Expansion Project was sent to Design Committee.

LW returned. The next item was a presentation of the **Innovation Square (6 Tide Street) Project**. Tom Miller (TM) introduced himself and the team from the Kavanagh Group. TM: This is one of the largest remaining parcels in the Boston Marine Industrial Park. It was home to the JJ Daly Company. The building was vacated; EDIC took it down; we were designated as developers and entered into a ground lease. The parcel is four acres, and industrially zoned. It's part of a MEPA-approved Master Plan and in a Chapter 91 License area. This doesn't require water-related uses, but only research and/or industrial space. We are staying within zoning requirements, at an FAR of 2. The parking freeze limits us to 60

parking spaces on the site; the rest will be in the garage 300' away. DM: Is office a non-allowed use? TM: It's not allowed. John O'Brien (JOB) of EDIC: 5% of the entire BMIP is allowed to be office uses. TM: Research is allowed; when I was at the BRA, I helped to bring Dana Farber's research in. We looked at purely industrial uses. Or union. And now mostly research and development.

Joe Mamayek (JM) of HDR presented the design. AT LE's request, he re-oriented the boards so that more Commissioners as well as people in the audience could see. JM noted the locus and context. JM: The World Trade Center and BCEC are headhouse buildings; that's what we want to do. (Shows site plan.) There are pedestrians along Northern Avenue, so we have recessed the building there, creating space. LE: The Silver Line stops there. JM: Yes. There is retail space fronting that sidewalk. The upper floors have garden space at the junctures, which allow divisions for multiple tenants. There's a light well into the interior of the building. The floor-to-floor height is 15', 18' at the base. (Shows elevation.) The headhouse is glass, with conference rooms. The base recess gives a nice expression. We are breaking up the length; it's very long along Tide Street. (Shows the Northern Avenue elevation, and notes the curtainwall.) Besides curtainwall, we are using a composite panel system. Metal, or veneer.

LE: Do you have any landscape ideas? JM: Because of the legibility of the building, everything is quite low. There are trees at the edge, strong along Tide especially, but along the edge. MD: We will send this to Committee; you'll need a model. DC: What is the context - related to street edges, not just buildings - in the area? I'd like a better sense of circulation. LW: There must be a Master Plan for the area. DAC: Not on my desk.... DM: It would help to know how it ties in with the Design Center revamp. LW: What is the premise of the lobby? Should it face the water? What is the use of the Drydock? DH: The sidedness makes it feel placeless. It's all too much related. If you could tie the architecture more into the district...you might emphasize the frontality. AL: In plan, it's a really nice plan, there are 3 elements, sculpted at the front. But I can't for the life of me decide why you've treated them differently. They are treated with variety, not consistency. The front's the front. Be rigorous about the things you've decided. MD: Why can't we have *real* innovation (in innovation square)? There's not much building envelope here. The old warehouse building, a bare bones facade, then drape things around it. Layering, sun controls, in relatively small portion. Glass, metal - everyone's doing that. Break from that.

JOB: To the point being made about circulation, we are trying to invite people down to the area, but as an industrial district. The Commission suggested the extension of Tide Street into the Boston Cargo site. And Harpoon Brewery is nearby. The area is open, yet safe. We are rebuilding the infrastructure, trying to address its condition - not all now, but over about 10 years.

With that, the Innovation Square Project was sent to Design Committee.

There being no further items for discussion, a motion was made to adjourn, and the meeting was duly adjourned at 9:41 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission is scheduled for November 5, 2013. The recording of the October 15, 2013 Boston Civic Design Commission meeting was digitized and is available at the Boston Redevelopment Authority.