

MINUTES

BOSTON CIVIC DESIGN COMMISSION

The meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was held on Tuesday, March 6th, 2018, starting in Room #900, Boston City Hall, and beginning at 5:15 p.m.

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

Paul McDonough (PM) announced that this was the meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission that meets the first Tuesday of every month and welcomed all persons interested in attending. He added thanks to the Commissioners for the contribution of their time to the betterment of the City and its Public Realm. This hearing was duly advertised on Saturday, February 24, in the BOSTON HERALD.

The first item was the approval of the February 6th, 2018 Meeting Minutes. A motion was made, seconded, and it was duly

VOTED: To approve the February 6th, 2018 BCDC Meeting Minutes.

Votes were passed for signature. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Beth Israel/Deaconess Medical Center New Inpatient Building**. David Carlson (DAC) noted that the Project was the first new facility in some time on the West Campus and that the IMP change would trigger BCDC review, as would the proposed Project at ~345,000 SF. Review was recommended. It was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the BCDC review the schematic design for the Beth Israel/Deaconess Medical Center New Inpatient Building Project, and its associated IMP Amendment, on the BIDMC West Campus in the Longwood Medical Area.

The next item was a report from Review Committee on the **1550 Soldiers Field Road and 21 Soldiers Field Place Residential Project**. DAC noted that this site was in a pocket of land along a cul-de-sac (currently a small business park of sorts) adjacent to arterials familiar to the Commission, with nearby projects such as 530 Western and 70 Leo Birmingham. The Project was over 220,000 SF, well over the BCDC threshold. It was duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed 1550 Soldiers Field Road and 21 Soldiers Field Place Residential Development Project in the North Allston neighborhood.

The next item was a report from Review Committee on the **144 Addison Street Project**. DAC

noted that this was an East Boston site a little removed from everything, between McClellan Highway and Saratoga Street and adjacent to the old Maverick Mills building. The site was interesting topographically. At nearly 190,000 SF, the Project was over the BCDC threshold of 100,000 SF; review was recommended. It was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed 144 Addison Street Project, on Addison Street between McClellan Highway and Saratoga Street in the East Boston neighborhood.

The next item was a report from Review Committee on the **Massport Marine Terminal Parcel 6 Project**. DAC noted that this was next to the Stavis Seafood site recently reviewed and part of what had been the larger Boston Cargo parcel leased by Massport, in the Marine Park. Review was recommended (this is part of a series of MMT parcels) due primarily to size, at over 200,000 SF. It was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the Massport Marine Terminal Parcel 6 Development in the RLFMP in the South Boston Waterfront District.

The next item was a report from Review Committee on the Boston Garden Project Phase Three Office NPC. DAC noted that the Boston Garden Project was now known as The HUB, and that the office tower component had changed from that reviewed and approved from the BCDC. The overall SF (over 600,000 SF) was about the same, but the [zoning] height was about 70' higher, and the design had changed a good deal. A vote to review this change was recommended. It was then moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the newly revised schematic design for the Phase Three Office component of the proposed Boston Garden Project at 80 Causeway Street to the south of the TD Bank Garden in the North Station Economic Development Area.

The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **40 Rugg Road Project**. Architect Frank Valdez of DiMella Shaffer presented the updated design, first using the model requested by Bill, and noting the issues most discussed in Committee. Kevin of DiMella Shaffer then went through a visual presentation, starting with noting the 'wrapping' of the two existing buildings (and their uses), then their Rugg Road garage with common space on the top. He showed rendered facade views with a detail of the elevation (which suggested depth), and a series of images. Kevin noted the address modification: The lobbies are both now fronting on Rugg Road [but still with the ability to travel between the buildings' lobbies over a plaza]. We eroded the spaces on the top to allow more light into the space between buildings (shows views of space from within and above, then a view from the common space atop the garage). The garage facade (shows) now has an Artists for Humanity-designed mural. The brick base is now one story throughout. (Shows a view of the triangular park on Braintree Street, with art space.) Andrea Leers (AL): Thank you for the model, and your responses. The entries - all this is very responsive to our comments. David Manfredi (DM): It's a very good building. It has a very

good streetwall - it doesn't try to do too much. Deneen Crosby (DC): The artists' space next to the public space is a good idea. As you proceed, attention to the plantings in accordance with their solar access is important. Linda Eastley (LE): I like the small park. On the parking easement, I would still encourage sharing access. But otherwise, continue more in the direction of what you've begun to do there, with benches, etc. making it a real *space*. With that, and hearing no public comment, it was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the proposed 40 Rugg Road Project on the parcels bounded by Braintree Street, Penniman, Rugg, and Emery roads, and properties to the south fronting Hano Road, in the Allston/Brighton neighborhood.

DM was recused from the next item and left. The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **1000 Boylston Street Project**. Kevin Lennon (KL) of Elkus/Manfredi presented the updated design, first noting the issues discussed (and showing a slide of same), including developing more views, treatment/section of the podium, a surrounding context datum analysis, the plantings along Boylston, the experience under the canopy. He showed a view of the single, faceted tower. KL: The sense of the tower will change as an observer moves around it; there'll be an interplay with sunlight. (Shows a site plan, notes the elements of the sidewalk.) The sidewalks are 18.5', about twice the width of the existing. There is no parking ingress off of Dalton as before. The community has expressed a concern about any *additional* street furniture (shows examples) blocking the sidewalk. (Shows a vignette from the sidewalk looking down the street, then an elevation, noting the canopy separating the retail [from the garage].) The parking exterior has now taken on some of the language of the tower - faceted, with etched and fritted glass. KL then showed more views, a detail of the tower showing how the folds are accented, then details of the main facade showing variations in the glass treatment, including shadowboxes.

AL asked for a view of what she had last seen. KL: We didn't bring a view of the two-tower scheme. DAC: What was last seen in Committee *was* this single-tower scheme. DC: Do you have a view of the church relationship? KL showed a sectional drawing in response. Daniel St. Clair (DS): The treatment of the garage - is it open or closed? KL: It's closed, and has glass with the frit treatment. DS: Will you see headlights? KL: It's valeted, and the frit will help. LE: This is an elegant project. I was part of the November Committee meeting...we were all convinced that it worked really well. At St. Cecilia's, the concern was the loading...thanks for showing that relationship. The chamfering at Dalton Street helps...the sidewalk is narrow, but the corner allows spilling out and connecting. Finally, I hope you get to plant the hornbeams in those planters. It's even more important without other street furniture. DC: Is there parking there? KL showed the site plan along the street. DC: Is the canopy for the wind? KL: In part. DC: I agree with Linda, there's a warmth to the project. And I agree with her on the trees. With that, and hearing no public comment, it was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the proposed 1000 Boylston Street Project on the expanded Turnpike Air Rights Parcel 15 site in the Commercial spine area of the Back Bay neighborhood.

DS was recused from the next item. The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **One Post Office Square Tower and Garage Improvement Project**. Jonathan Ginnis (JG) of Gensler presented the updated design, first going through some of the issues discussed, and how

they were evolved and resolved. He showed a 1980 view compared to the current design, then the diagram for their facade treatment approach. JG: The transfer elevator floor has a recent allowing more of a sense of space, and views. We have a lantern at the top, celebrating the architecture. (Shows a before and after on Oliver Street.) The mechanical garage and floor heights allow floors on the top, which are at a height related to other buildings in the area and offer a transition to the tower. (Shows a view of the ground floor plan, noting retail; shows a before and after view of the new retail along Pearl. Notes the changes in the base, recalling the complexity of the earlier design.) Our treatment now reflects the transparency of the top coming down, lightening up the ground floor. The overcladding detail will allow light to equalize on the facade. There are four primary facade types (shows details and samples, notes their locations on the facade). JG then showed a lantern view, and noted the high level tenant open space.

DC: What is the lighting at the base? JG: We are working on an ambient lighting strategy. At the top, we'll have lighting on the fins. AL: I appreciate the further development of the body of the building...my concerns about the competing facades have lessened. I like the porch. On your diagram of the massing, it was wise to resist the [garage] massing going higher - we should remember that, for Winthrop Square. On Milk, there's still a lot going on; the Park facade is more successful. JG noted the strategy comparison they'd shown. AL: The heights vary, the treatment varies - I understand your strategy. LE: I was in the last meeting. The raising of the retail [datum] really makes a difference. I appreciate the care evidenced in the presentations. I think the red color really helps the playfulness to read. With that, and hearing no public comment, it was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the BCDC recommends approval of the schematic design for the proposed One Post Office Square Tower and Garage Improvement Project in the Downtown Financial District.

DS returned. AL was recused from the next item. The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **Harvard Enterprise Research Campus PDA Masterplan**. Kevin Casey (KC) of Harvard introduced the revised Plan, first thanking the Commission for the meetings. KC: Really this is a first step, a Masterplan PDA. We want to have some level of control as we move forward with Proponents. Per our last meeting, this interfaces with the Harvard IMP to the north. We've already done a lot of work preparing this area - 77,000 tons of soil have been treated. For the Masterplan PDA, we've had 7 meetings in the community, and 2 subcommittee meetings. (Shows new plan images.) We feel we've been responsive. We're trying to strike the right balance, and we will advance the discussions as we move forward in the future.

Elizabeth Sisam (ES) of Harvard referenced the materials given to the Commission, noting first plan comparisons - the long-term IMP vision vs. the IMP + ERC, i.e. - then the 10-year IMP Project diagram with the ERC added. She noted the SF of those components. She showed the open space framework, with the 2013 IMP, the Framework Plan, then the current revision. ES: We've added two acres of open space, which lend a clearer legibility and direction. We've committed to 20% of the area as public open space. DC: What's included in that? Are streets? ES: No, just open space - green spaces and plazas. (Shows their current proposal and two BCDC-suggested studies.) We looked at the 'shift south' and 'straight Science Drive' options before proposing our current diagram; we look forward to working with you as the projects move forward. (Shows a Principles slide.) We are emphasizing the connection from Mellone and

Rena parks to the River viewsheds, and connecting to plans being discussed in the Interchange (I-90) Project. DC: Is there anything which prevents you from getting to the River? ES: Soldiers Field Road (SFR). We are waiting for the Western Avenue Bridge project. DC: Then to that edge. ES: The existing Genzyme building...but nothing prevents us from getting to SFR eventually. ES notes the Principles, which include legible and continuous green space. ES: We recognize the need for (temporary) implementation [one of 5 related points]. (Shows an illustrative E-W site section, with representative heights.) The section also illustrates the Greenway continuing [on the north of Science Drive]. ES showed a last slide that showed the historic transformation, and that over the last 15 years.

DS: Will you get to specifics, or leave the details to the developers, using your Principles? ES: We will develop those Principles and control their process; we'll own the land. DS: It feels to me like the Principles should be articulated sooner rather than later. DC: You have new diagrams. We don't know yet which is better; we don't know the massings. ES: We will work on that; the shift allows for some flexibility. LE: I appreciate the work you've done, and the response. Cattle Drive, not shown here, is a really good, salient part of the project. I appreciate those two diagrams we asked you to do, and the Principles. On the Framework - we will really want legible open space that connects to the River. That will important as things work out. KS: That's important. We can be responsive to you and the community, but also be flexible with developers. LE: As long as we know what's important in moving forward with that flexibility. KC: The future parcel along the Charles we've noted will have a direct connection, through our negotiation with Houghton Chemicals to abandon their rail spur. DS: Taking your design Principles seriously is key - otherwise, I fear that the economics of a Project will overwhelm them. If you lose one piece in a chain, it reduces the effectiveness of the whole. ES: Note Harvard's actions such as the 72" sewer installation, which allowed a doubling of the green space at Ray Mellone Park. There's a real commitment to keep to our vision. KC: We have this input from you and the community, which will inform our conversations with our partners - they're not just developers. DC: When are you going to get into details on the open space? ES: When projects come in. There'll be more information not only on what is being proposed, but also updated information on other open spaces. KC noted the efforts Harvard has invested in: We've been walking and chewing gum along the way, constantly improving our plans.

Tony Isidoro: On behalf of the IAG and community, thank you for your comments. This is high on the list of our concerns. Open Space is a critical concern, and will be on the table as things move forward. DS: What now? DC: We'd vote contingent on more information on the open space framework when they return. LE: I'd like to see the principles on open space for the whole when you return with buildings. Principles, design, how it can be achieved. DC: And how the spaces are related to building mass and height. With that, it was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the PDA Masterplan for the new Harvard Enterprise Research Campus in the Allston neighborhood, with the requirement that all Projects within the ERC return with refinement of the ERC Principles (including mass and height relationships) and Open Space designs, as well as review and approval of the Projects themselves.

AL returned. The next item was a presentation of the **Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center New Inpatient Building Project (BIDMC NIB)**. Walter Armstrong of BIDMC introduced their team, including Kevin Sullivan (KS) of Payette. KS: It's early, as you see from our model.

We're the first new building on the West Campus in 20 years. (Shows an aerial with the site; shows a view of the Rosenberg Building.) We want a calmer expression along Brookline. (With photos, notes a contrasting East Campus 'feel'. Notes Project program/overview. Shows an axonometric diagram with uses; notes connecting corridors.) KS: The pedestrian corridors connect to sky lobbies - which connect to all floors. We are moving the helipad from next door - the same flight path, just 70' higher. The courtyard at level 6 provides space between the two buildings. (Shows a view from the Riverway with the Palmer building - last in the Farr complex - removed.) We are playing with the palette on the site - thinking a reddish granite and the base, and a lighter stone or terra cotta above. (Shows a closer view, then an elevational view along Pilgrim Road, then a view of the lobby and base.) The building is bookended by Francis and Deaconess streets.

LE asked for a clarification of what's new on Pilgrim Road. KS noted that new program would go over the existing, in part. He showed a view from Brookline and Francis, noting the simpler expression, the fins. He showed precedents for the stone panels and ribs, and compared the idea to the new BU building by Payette [610 Commonwealth]. He showed the streetscape, noting the loading dock was for the *entire* [West] campus. He noted the parklet on Brookline, and a linear park along Francis. KS: On the Courtyard level, there are significant public spaces accessed via the Connectors and elevators. (Shows a view of the landscaped corner with street trees.) We want to emulate the East Campus (shows 2 vignettes). Some of the Project drivers are the mechanicals, the radiology connection on the 3rd floor, the Connector level, and the Family Space [part of the vertical Connector stack]. The surgery floor (4) also marries the floor uses. (Shows inpatient floors.) The Courtyard includes a 'healing garden.' (Shows site context and neighborhood elevation drawings.) Along Brookline, we are stepping up the Rosenberg arcade and maintaining that plane. (Shows sections - points out new program along Pilgrim - and elevations.) AL asked to see the 3rd and 4th floor plans again; KS complied.

LE: When we see you in Committee, let's talk about vehicles over sidewalks. I understand the emergency area. But on Brookline, that's such a dominant facade. Show us how it's treated, the doors, the streetscape. And more about the layers, how the indoor/outdoor experience works with the Courtyard. And the Connector (PM: A bridge.) - more about that experience there. We don't know enough about that yet. DC: More information on Pilgrim and the nature of that area. When you're on the street, does it feel like you're on the hospital campus? LE: As refinements have been done, what are the elements of the campus? What is being extended? - Open space and landscape as well as the building materials. And talk more on your idea of relating to the East Campus. AL: I really appreciate how complex the design is. And how simple. I appreciate the material, and the angling/depth of it. We're at the beginning of a terrific project. The real issue is Brookline - you need to take a hard look on how to relieve that. Perhaps a small planting zone or a variation in materials. I like the reading of the sky lobby, and like the fins. But they obscure and confuse the reading on that floor, when it's a corridor. Maybe it's just the 3rd floor, a patient sky lobby. At the base, I'm not sure red granite is the best choice. It could be glass. Come back with alternative choices. DS: How do people get to the building? KS: No parking is added, we'll use existing garages. It's inpatient, so less traffic. DS: The architectural approach is great. A modern read, an articulated base. The horizontals are a little 'stripey.' But a good job. With that, and hearing no public comment, the BIDMC NIB was sent to Design Committee.

The next item was a presentation of the **1550 Soldiers Field Road (SFR) Project**. Nancy Ludwig (NL) of ICON presented the design and introduced the team, including Ian Ramey (IR) and John Copley of the Copley Wolff Design Group. She noted the locus, a small spur off of

SFR, and showed images of the context, then the site. NL: Boston Landing is spurring a lot of uses - residential, office, etc. - because of the new commuter rail station, a 12-minute walk away. With the River adjacency, that makes this a nice site in the area. (Describes project, showing the site on an axonometric, then an aerial, then a closer view.) The H-shape allows an entry court off of Soldiers Field Place, and an amenity court to either side. Elements suggest the River beyond. The garage is half a level down, pushed down at the corner to allow an at-grade entry. (Shows a series of sections to show how it works, then a perspective showing the two landscaped front yards. A section toward SFR shows how the landscape mounds up over the garage to buffer the traffic while allowing views. Then similar views of the condo building.) We have left the potential to provide a path up to the property above. (Shows more views of the two buildings from Soldiers Field Place, noting their entries and details such as the 'fishscales' and wood-like treatment. Shows a view of the space alongside the condo building, noting slats that obscure the parking behind, and the space at the rear.)

DC: The treatment of the SFR side as a parkway - what does that look like, how does the circulation work? How do you get to the River? You can't cross SFR. NL: There are improvements in the works at Leo Birmingham Parkway and at Western. DC: That edge seems closer to the [SFR] parkway, even with the setbacks. LE: I'm still wrapping my head around residential *here*. But I agree with Deneen - provide more information on the setback. You have the offramp, and SFR lanes - there's a lot of lanes there. The garden is nice, the berming clever. We'll need a garage section detail with the trees.... IR: The trees are just outside of the wall. LE: On the spaces...the lighting, how that feels. At the loading area next to your neighbor, perhaps a planting strip. DC: The State did a Masterplan for the River and Parkways - take a look.

AL: The site is unlikely for housing. Your ability to make it a *place* is great. The buildings should be more equal...the condo building feels like the building that was left over. Maybe even three buildings of equal heft and weight...that will help with the transition. Make it something else with *conviction*. It does feel close to the parkway. On the H building, the crossbar is in the wrong place. It should move to the River. Give more priority to public space rather than private...I encourage you to look at that. On the architecture, I really like the corners a lot. I wish the architecture of the rest were as enthusiastically modern. You don't need to use wood, etc. We haven't seen the woven corners before, there's a new residential language here - I encourage you to develop it further. DS: It's like the Dutch waterfront. The H shape is timeless; it works well here. LE: In Committee, show us what people are looking at. Establishing the rest of the street could really help; as you're entering [Soldiers Field Place], two sides rather than one. With that, and hearing no public comment, the 1550 Soldiers Field Road Project was sent to Design Committee.

The next item was a presentation of the **144 Addison Project**. Amy Korte (AK) of Arrowstreet introduced the Project team and design, showing a process slide. AK: This is a 3.3-acre site in East Boston, currently a 900-car overflow parking lot. We're proposing 270 units with a 0.65 parking ratio. Adjacent is Brandywyne Village, an affordable housing project, and the businesses in the Maverick Mills building next door. AK then noted the buffer toward Brandywyne, and showed a broad view of the context, then context photos, noting the streetscape out from the Project area. She noted their provision of a driveway serving the rear of 5 residents, who don't even have a curb cut now. Showing old mapping slides, she noted the history of the site, and showed flood risk assessment maps for sea level rise (site bottoms out at

8'; 19' is nearby, and protocol calls for 21.3' of elevation). She then showed massing studies. AK: We started with a traditional 5-over-1 scheme, with 1 being a sacrificial garage. We thought of ways of minimizing our impact on the site...then the idea of weaving the landscape through, and under the buildings. Then amenity platforms. We can't fill the site, so we need to improve it for stormwater retention. (Shows how the parking comes in, goes to the current design.) We have a 3-story height along Addison, with a court. LE: What is that? AK: Mostly a drop-off court. AL: Where are the entries...how do you arrive? (Some discussion ensued to try to explain.)

AK resumed, showing precedent views and a long site section. Then an axon perspective showing the approach from McClellan, a view of the 3-story Addison piece, a refined sketch of the same, a before-and-after in the form of a photo, a photo-inset, a sketch. The same sequence was used for an approach from the driveway. John Copley (JC) of the Copley Wolff Design Group presented the landscape scheme, showing first the historic site and then current conditions - asphalt, with volunteer tree species. JC: We are minimally affecting grades to keep as many of the existing trees as possible. There are pathways under the [platform deck] bridges, and trees which shape the paths and grow between the decks. We're not worried about [flood] failure. On the east, we have a more traditional lawn, and are planting more tree species from the precedent list. (Notes variations on the entry drive.)

DC: This is interesting. It doesn't look like the landscape flows through... AK: The parking vs. the landscape isn't defined... is blurred. LE: This is clever and bold. I like the premise that the landscape ties it together. I think that the travel through the landscape is forced. If the crossover were used less frequently...if one building used the McClellan driveway, and the other used Addison in and out. It would be useful to see that. AL: There are a lot of terrific ideas here, in the building and the site. The shaping of the buildings is very beautiful. The community will benefit from the shared use. The big problem is, how you find your way in and through. I don't think it works that you have to figure it out. Why not have a presence? You could do a lobby from the driveway. You can't see the front door from *any* public way. You've done so many clever things; this is solvable. The scaling, the architecture, the landscape with the parking...all good. DS: This is incredibly cool and innovative. You've solved so many problems. The circulation and approach are one issue. How has this come to be the best solution? The 3-story piece is a leftover. It feels like a corporate structure - beautiful, but don't go there. It could be a part of the neighborhood in a more demonstrative way. If you did *more* of these things, how would that work? AK: We have considered a way of connecting [to Addison]...it's not intended to be separated. (Some back and forth ensues.) AL: The green space is positive, maybe use that.

An Addison Street abutter noted that a 1993 ZBA decision (for the existing parking lot) required the site NOT to use a curb cut off of Addison. It's detrimental to the neighborhood. Another abutter, John Fitzgerald: The Project is too large; it doesn't fit into a highly populated community. They've got to go down more than 30 units. 98 apartments will not have parking; we know they'll go to the city. You need to find a better number. With that, and hearing no further public comment, the 144 Addison Project was sent to Design Committee.

PM encouraged (after a brief discussion) fast presentations, as the BCDC was behind schedule and Commissioners had to leave.

The next item was a presentation of the **Massport Marine Terminal Parcel 6 Project**. Eden Milroy (EM) of Pilot Development gave the presentation, first noting that he and his firm had

been active for some time in seafood development in the area. EM: Boston Sword & Tuna (BS&T) is nearby, at 8 Seafood Way (another MMT parcel) - and they are growing, and will soon be too big for that location. They need a new building to allow their growth. Then we propose a second building for another seafood processor. And a garage...everyone arrives at work too early for public transportation, so a garage is necessary. Now, they park all over the area (notes the water's edge in front of 8 Seafood Way). (Goes through the parking requirements for the MMT area, focused on their 3-subparcel site. Notes the artifacts in the area.) Beth Lassel (BL), the architect for BS&T, showed a view of the BS&T design, noting how the work functions drive the design. BL: The blue signifies their entry. The height helps with resiliency, but also conforms with loading dock heights. (Shows a Harbor view, then a series of views around the building, then elements of the facade by the entry.)

PM asked for the other site elements. EM: We have no design for the middle building, that will depend on the business. For the garage, EM showed images of precedents and an initial design view. LE: Bring info on the garage [to Committee]. Why not include *all* of the parking in a bigger garage? EM: It's not economic.... AL: The face of the building BS&T is in needs to be visible from a distance. It should have strong legibility. Think of the whole building as signage. BL: The idea was to highlight the entry.... AL: I understand, but think about using the whole building. With that, and hearing no public comment, the MMT Parcel 6 Project was sent to Design Committee.

The next item was the **Boston Garden ('The HUB') Phase 3 Office NPC**. Giuliana DiMambro (GD) introduced the modified Project, first giving a quick update. GD: The podium is under construction and will be delivered this year; the supermarket will follow in 2019. The residential tower will also be completed in 2019, the hotel, in 2020. We've revised the office tower design to respond to input from the marketplace. Doug Gensler (DG): We were here in 2014, were approved in 2016, and are here again in 2018. The customers don't want to be in a tower. They want to be in an environment that's scalable and hacked...less a singular tower, more a collection of pieces. (Shows the 2016 design.) We're really at the same height, but this is a building for makers, inventors, innovators. The 'mohawk' had no real function. We have lifted the occupied space up; the foundation is set, we can't add more SF. We like how the building sets itself up as a collection with a quiet space in the middle. These diagrams show the identity of the building. For Canal and Causeway streets, it's an expression of the structure. The customer, again, does not want to be in a tower. We consider the chassis as an industrial box; the texture of the building is reminiscent of the neighborhood. The bottom has an honest expression of the structure, with a 2-story frame. The top has 'porches' and 2-story pavilion spaces...'zero energy spaces,' ventilated porches. In the quiet zone, there is glass. At the top it's lighter, with more expression. (Shows a closer view and diagram.) At a distance, the quiet zone sets itself up as a plinth for the tower above.

AL: This is a big step forward from where you were. I like that they [res and office] are the same height. The cap at the top, and the grid, are working well. The ins and outs at the corners work okay. Your 'quiet zone' is the ordinary piece. It doesn't work. A different zone is okay, but the bulging out doesn't work. It's ungainly as a massing, and not helping the overall. Even if the volume ends up being expressed, its height should relate to the hotel. It should be one thing with parts in it, not a thing of parts. DC: When it came down before, it really helped to emphasize the portal; this changes that. (Some discussion of this ensues.) AL: I'm all for the height - the lower part, not so much. DS: It feels like a girdle. PM: Another pregnant building.

AL: Let's have a work session in Committee. Don't just explain why it *has* to be like *this*. With that, and hearing no public comment, the Boston Garden Phase 3 Office NPC 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 9:22 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was scheduled for April 3rd, 2018. The recording of the March 6th, 2018 Boston Civic Design Commission meeting was digitized and is available at the Boston Planning and Development Agency.