

MINUTES
BOSTON CIVIC DESIGN COMMISSION

The meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was held on Tuesday, January 8th, 2013, starting in the BRA Board Room, 9th Floor, Boston City Hall, beginning at 5:18 p.m.

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

The Co-Vice-Chair, Michael 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 Friday, December 21, in the BOSTON HERALD.

The first item was the approval of the December 4th, 2012 Meeting Minutes. A motion was made, seconded, and it was duly

VOTED: To approve the December 4th, 2012 Boston Civic Design Commission Meeting Minutes.

Votes were passed for signature. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Greenway Parcel 14 Carousel**. David Carlson (DAC) reported that the Commission has reviewed essentially as an advisory body the various park improvements along the Greenway, including the Armenian Heritage park on Parcel 13 and more recently the Boston Harbor Islands Pavilion adjacent to the Carousel site on Parcel 14. As with those reviews, comments are welcome, but no action is necessary; a vote to review was suggested as also in keeping with established protocol. It was duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the design for the proposed Greenway Parcel 14 Carousel, north of the Boston Harbor Islands Pavilion in the Wharf District section of the Greenway.

Bill Rawn (WR) and David Manfredi (DM) were recused from the next item. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Harvard University Institutional Master Plan**. DAC reported that Harvard University had been working on a new Master Plan which, similar to that seen recently for Boston University, took into account future campus development strategies but limited itself to a more typical 10-year span (as opposed to the longer span attempted a few years ago). Harvard and the BRA have been working with the community, and some projects - the Science Complex, Tata Hall, and some warehouse renovations - as well as a private project at Barry's Corner - will be active but were previously (or will be separately) seen and are not included in the current IMP. As with BU, over a million SF is contemplated. A fresh vote to review this new IMP is strongly recommended. It was duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the new Institutional Master Plan for the Harvard University Campus in the Allston neighborhood.

WR remained recused and Paul McDonough (PM) was recused for the next item. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **40 Trinity Place Project**. DAC reported that the site, within the area included in the Stuart Street Zoning Study, was consistent with those guidelines. It has some significant neighbors, including the Hancock and the recently approved Copley Expansion tower. At nearly 400,000 SF, the proposal is well over the BCDC threshold of 100,000 SF. A vote to review was recommended. It was duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed 40 Trinity Place Project on the site at the corner of Stuart Street (including air rights over 426 Stuart) and Trinity Place in the commercial section of the Back Bay neighborhood.

PM and WR returned. DM was recused for the next item. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Fan Pier Parcel C Project**. DAC reported that the BCDC, in approving the Fan Pier PDA some years ago, had required as a condition of approval the further review and approval for each parcel, including parks. The currently proposed residential Project on Parcel C does allow for elements - such as streets - included in the Plan, as well as a good portion of Fan Pier Park. The current Proposed Project is about 245,000 SF, well over the BCDC threshold of 100,000 SF. A confirmatory vote to review was recommended. It was duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the Fan Pier Parcel C project and Fan Pier Park in the Boston Fan Pier PDA within the South Boston Waterfront District.

DM returned. Lynn Wolff (LW) was recused for the next item. The next item was a report from the Design Committee on the **Seaport Square Parcel K Project**. Daniel St. Clair (DS) reported that the design had improved and the Committee was ready to approve it. MD asked for a brief presentation. James Gray (JG) of ADD Inc. complied, noting changes to the tower facades and corner. He walked the Commission visually around the building, noting the facade was calmer, and elements more tied together. John Copley (JC) of Copley Wolff Design Group noted a lot of work with the BRA and BCDC, resulting in a full double line of trees, a series of planters moving in and out, steps and 'bleachers,' with the grade differential going from 0 to about 2 ½ feet along Boston Wharf Road. Deneen Crosby (DC) asked about the railing at the space at the end. JC noted that it was required unless the path was separated. DM: The hand sketches here helped a lot to alleviate my concerns. DC: You could shorten the length of the ramp rails; they may not be needed. No public comment was heard; it was duly moved, seconded, and

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

LW remained, and DM was recused for the next item. The next item was a report from the Design Committee on the **Boston University Institutional Master Plan**. Kirk Sykes (KS) reported that the BU team had endeavored to give the Commission more information and to discuss options; more on these topics was expected. DS added that on the Cummington back alley area projects, the first move was hard to understand without understanding the long term goals. KS: And, the nature of the River, Commonwealth Avenue, and Turnpike facades. Gary Nicksa (GN) of Boston University: We have more information on the Cummington area. The Student Village site is part of a separate PDA, and will be addressed there. It's in the IMP for context, really, as a part of the overall plans. Kishore Varanasi (KV) of CBT Architects then recapped the IMP principles and noted the ideas discussed in Committee, including the nature of Commonwealth Avenue. He showed the Central Campus view, noting the sites; they have principles for the Cummington area, and also anticipate air rights (over the Pike). KV: EE and DD are buildings contemplated in this area. We have adjusted EE to hold back slightly; it had been extended further. (Shows notion of, over time, shifting Cummington north to align with the alley behind the Photonics Center.)

KS: Once established, what does Cummington Mall do to activity along Commonwealth? KV: We don't want to take away from the energy of Commonwealth Avenue. This is more like a mews - less active - for students. DC: It will likely be mostly students there. GN: That's right - it's the science/engineering area. DS: So you will be converting or removing buildings. GN: (The existing) are repurposed industrial buildings. DS: What about the passage through Warren Towers? GN: That would be in the future. We will also need service. WR: This is much clearer, better. Is it included in the Master Plan? KV: Yes. Linda Eastley (LE): The service is important, how it evolves...a screened service area...if this expands over to that other (Audubon Circle) neighborhood. For these buildings, it will be very tight. Service bays are usually on the ground floor. KS: Where do you get across to the Esplanade? KV showed the two access points, one near the Law School, the other along one of the Central Campus north-south pedestrian lines. KV: The (Student Village) principles say - no wall along the River. Height away from Comm Ave. (Shows two studies of Student Village massings.) KS: There was an idea of *not* setting up a wall discussed last time. GN: The community did not want a wall of towers. Further discussion ensued regarding the Student Village site; WR expressed concern that the BCDC action on the IMP would set one choice or another. DAC: Technically the site is NOT in the IMP; it was simply listed to make a more comprehensive document. Comments are welcome, but the suggested vote encourages early work on projects, including this one, so that the BCDC is engaged early. With that, and hearing no comment from the public, it was duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: **That the Commission conditionally recommends approval of the Institutional Master Plan for the Boston University Campus in the Allston-Brighton neighborhood. The Condition of approval is that the major IMP and PDA Projects return to the Commission early - before designs are set - to allow full and robust discussion with both BCDC and BRA input as designs proceed toward Article 80 approvals.**

DM and LW returned. The next item was a report from the Design Committee on the **Nashua Street Residences NPC**. LE reported that the Committee focused on the experience of the pedestrian, and walking through the Project. The landscape had evolved quite a bit. Andrea felt,

because the building was essentially creating its own context, that it could be bold. MD: Alfred, can you begin? Alfred Wojciechowski (AW) of CBT presented the revised design, again using boards and a model. He showed the open space connections, the overall site, and then focused more on the property itself. AW: We focused on pedestrian movement - roadways which lead in and out, but creating a *place* with emphasis on the pedestrians. LE: The discussion was limiting the circulation of trips across (the pedestrian path), and drop-offs. AW: That remains, but we have raised the area up with paving, so that pedestrians go straight across, and cars go up and down. LW asked to see the traffic circulation. AW showed an aerial photo and pointed out the existing garage, Tip O'Neill Building service, Garden elephant ramp. AW: What will happen - is that a second ramp (from the garage below) to the east will alleviate the traffic coming out of *this* exit. Commuters will simply walk across the connection. AW then showed the site plan again, noting the idea of minimizing the blacktop across the area. He noted (with an LE prompt) also the north garage exit, best for vehicles traveling north. AW: Otherwise, from the south exit, the vehicles can also go straight. It's a matter of management; travel across (the pedestrian path) should be infrequent.

WR: What about the building ramp? AW: They can go where they wish. Avalon Bay (AB): Only about 8-10 cars are expected in peak hours. WR: Where is the car path? AW noted the bollards, which limit width for cars, and compared it to the North End or Rowe's Wharf. KS: That's the least attractive part of Rowe's Wharf. Can you get less than three lanes? AW: We're already just two. LW: Do you need that much, for that amount of residents? AW: We're trying to manage different loads. KS: You've made such a thing out of the pedestrian experience. If it were major car circulation, I would understand. I'm not sure you aren't setting up a conflict. What is the nature of the pedestrian space? AW emphasized the minimization of the drop-off activity. He showed the landscape model, noting the connections. AW: It's a pass-through place. A moment of respite - the trees and berming creating a sense of place, and trellises for scale, an extension of the arcade. DC: The pedestrians moving along the (Nashua) edge don't have a clear connection. AW: A good point, that should be stronger. We can do that. DS: It's important in the future. DM: So there's a connection now through the parcel directly. AW: Yes, it's different (shows prior version).

DS: Is it open below the building 24 hours? AW: Yes; one is moving through the space, then under cover, then into paths to the west or north. KS: Do you have views of the space? AW showed vignettes of the space entry area, then the arcade (notes retail), then ideas of daytime and nighttime experiences, the ceiling treatment, lighting creating a series of portals. (Shows precedent ideas.) MD: So the ideas are not yet proposed; these are precedent ideas. AW: Yes, we are developing the ideas. LE: One of our comments was that it should be clear coming in from the park that it's a public portal. From the other views, this is less clear. Also, the possibility of wind mitigation. WR: On that subject, there is something we didn't raise. The old Prudential and Holyoke Center projects were windy and cold, very uncomfortable. Have you thought about conditioning the space? The ideas are wonderful, but one-sided - this could be cold and unpleasant. AW: I remember the Pru very well. I'm not sure what the real answer is. This is meant to be more public than private. Doors suggest that it is someone else's. And when people come out of an event, or commuters - they are a *lot*. We've taken the attitude of no doors.

LW: I missed Design Committee, but I remember asking about night views, and working on portions of the facade. AW: The model wasn't here before (shows). AW noted the new view

from the Zakim. He showed new elements they had introduced - curtainwall at the corners, for example. AW: It's a 3-D experience, how you approach this. (Notes the precast and glass areas, the oculi, the balconies on the east.) LW: I'm very interested in the lighting of the building. Shouldn't there be something more exciting up there? AW: (Notes angle at top.) One idea is to take the notch up, to create an identity, to differentiate between the building pieces at night. A physical change in materials, emphasizing the mass, and inserting a light strip in the reveals. MD: I'd recommend a strengthening of the Nashua Street edge, ensuring the plaza favors pedestrians over cars, anticipating the dynamic quality of the arcade, climate control, and lighting. WR: To be fair to the Proponent, the only issue for me is climate control, for BRA staff to ensure. LW: We aren't seeing what we're seeing on other projects. LE: They focused on the landscape and public realm because we told them to. DM: I agree with Bill; the arcade could be a real problem. It's at the essence of the BCDC mission - and a very difficult problem to solve. Holyoke, but also the Hancock Garage, (are) not successful. KS: I agree entirely. There are other concerns, but the pass-through, and T shape...the Devonshire (pass-through) works, but that's different. WR: They have the information. DAC: The BCDC could vote with a condition to return on these issues. MD then reprised his list above as the issues, and with that condition, it was duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the new schematic design for the proposed Nashua Street Residences Project, west of the Boston Garden in the North Station Economic Development Area, with the condition that the Proponent return to show resolutions on the issues of the Nashua Street edge, plaza pro-pedestrian provisions, arcade design and climate control, and lighting schemes.

The next item was a report from the Design Committee on the **415 McClellan Highway Project**. DS reported that the design was good and well received in Committee. Leanne Marshall (LM) of Marshall Properties stated they were prepared to show responses to three items, two of them on the site. WR: We felt it was good, I don't think there were any issues. LM noted the area around the pad, and the roof forms. Bohler showed the site plan, and the BMA Architectural Group showed the simplified porte cochere and facade details. WR asked DS if he liked the response. DS: Yes. KS asked about the brackets on the elevation. BMA: The detail was requested. On the facade, gray colors have a modest sheen, the rest is flatter; the stone color is slightly textured. All are cement panels. No public comment was heard; it was duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the proposed 415 McClellan Highway Mixed-Use Development in the East Boston neighborhood.

The next item was a presentation of the **Carousel on Greenway Parcel 14**. Linda Jonash (LJ) of the Greenway Conservancy: We're delighted to be here to share with you the design; it's been through public meetings for 1 ½ years. We had a rental carousel for three years to test the idea. Donors have stepped up, and it's now a two-fer: a carousel inserted into an enhanced Park landscape. We did an international search for a carousel designer, and the most recommended

person was Jeff Briggs of Newburyport. The company that did the Brooklyn Bridge Park Carousel is doing the frame and tent around the carousel itself. We have bid documents, are pulling estimates together, and expect to start in the Spring and open on Labor Day. Gary Hildebrand (GH) of Reed Hildebrand: The carousel was committed to some time ago. Boston school children's sketches were used as the basis for ride designs for execution; we have always been mindful of the carousel's position on the Greenway. (Shows precedents.) Given the narrowness of the site, we felt it was our task to create a *space*. Not unlike French notions at Bryant Park or the Smithsonian. The notion of a carousel in a grove also allows for the leveling of the carousel platform itself; the site drops about two feet. (Shows existing site plan, compares with proposed modification.) We were conscious of the continuity of the path on the City side, and Mothers' Walk (to the south). We provide universal access, and water and drainage for the trees. The experience of the carousel is inwardly focused, but excluding its important context. (The Walk to the Sea also has the old City Wharf outlined in granite.) We're using walls in the same way as on the south side (Boston Harbor Island Pavilion area); this allows us to hold the grade so that the paths are comfortable.

LE: Is the carousel raised? It's not evident in the section. GH: Yes. And you're right, but that's necessary. We have tried our best to clarify the materials and organization; there is nothing new. The carousel will be in place year-round. (David Hacin [DH] arrived.) It will be inactive in the winter season. Utile has developed a series of polymer panels of varying translucency to give it an interesting aspect in the winter. KS: Does it age well? GH: That's under investigation. It's translucent so that scratches and mars are not as evident; we are investigating aging over time. DS: How do the panels work? GH: They are not used when the carousel is active. DM: What is the surface under the trees? GH: Pavers, like on the south side, over a sophisticated system of structured soil. Paul McDonough (PM): Tree species? GH: We are likely using two, Black Gum and one other. LW: What is the diameter (of the carousel)? LJ: I can't remember - maybe 34' - but it's the same as the 'existing' rental, with a 5' clearance for a railing around the edge.

KS: The Harbor Islands Pavilion is a subdued structure, but the Carousel looks like a carousel that landed on the Greenway. LJ: We did not want a historic carousel, and the existing rental is a carnival carousel. We wanted contemporary - color, an attractive experience - but we wanted a park, and not a carnival experience. KS: Maybe what I'm reacting to is the yellow and white canopy. The other precedents you showed are calmer. LJ: This is timely feedback. There are a lot of opinions; some want to pop it out more. GH: We tend to agree with Kirk. We have calmed the landscape - so, in a way, the carousel itself is a setpiece. DC: I have a similar concern; it's a small parcel. I like the idea of the grove of trees; it's open enough for visibility. Are the graphics accurate as to tree placement? It works well. I agree with the calmer roof color; it makes the ride sculptures stand out more. LE: I agree. Like the weathered copper color shown. Right now, you show stripes. LJ: The sounding boards are sculpted by Briggs, and have color. DS: A deeper color would ground it more...less sky. KS: Neutral color elements, then bling. Along the Greenway, a theme. DM: A great job; you've cleaned up the circulation. PM: Will there be calliope music? LJ: Different kinds will be played. DS asked about cutting into the outline of the Wharf. DS: It seems to say, this is *mine*. GH: That's a topic of discussion. We had ended the project at the line before, but wanted more trees, and so to promote uniform growth, a uniform soil condition. LW: To have the new intersect with the old is a part of Boston. The Commission thanked Linda and Gary; the proposal was a nice project.

DM and WR were recused from the next item. PM left. The next item was a presentation of the **Harvard University Institutional Master Plan**. Kevin Casey (KC), Associate Director of Public Relations for Harvard, began the introduction while the team was setting up. KC: Most are familiar with the earlier version of the Harvard master Plan. What you'll see is the emergence of a plan coming from the Committee organized by the President, the Harvard Work Team. They took a little bit of a different approach in scale and scope. We were urged to take early action on getting the Science Center Project going. The Work Team were interested in improving the area, and so we were urged to work with a developer to get development going in Barry's Corner. And the Conference Center. We hold the Charlesview parcel as an important academic site, but need to wait until it is clear. We have heard from the Task Force. We began to force-feed ourselves into a 10-year window; we are approaching that in a way that creates a place, with all the ideas there, but in the 10-year frame.

Harris Band (HB), Director of Master Planning for the OPM at Harvard, introduced himself. HB: The IMPNF is really structured to be a first step to get input. The program is a healthy mix of activities, and type of construction. Almost all the projects contribute directly or indirectly to Barry's Corner. HB then began the presentation, noting the larger plan area, then focusing on the campus plan. He noted the major axes of North Harvard and Western, with Barry's Corner at the intersection. HB: It's a practical, get-it-done set of projects. The presentation is in three sections: a Framework, or set of principles; the Plan; Barry's Corner. The core drawings are layered (shows a stack diagram). The block (street) framework - the prior Plan had illustrative building patterns, but nothing more; it showed where the building sites are. Our Plan lays out blocks, not building patterns, and is broader than the IMPNF time limits. We break down the superblocks with streets, and create an open space network. There are a lot of linear spaces. The framework plan is an appendix in the IMPNF, and good to keep in mind. The boundary of the IMP area is extended modestly, with nine Projects; we have tried to make them synergistic.

HB: Kresge Hall will be replaced by the Chou Center, with an Executive Education program. Burden Hall's replacement will be a jewel box; the existing building has *been* a burden. There will be an Administration Building on the edge of soccer field. The Stadium will have a restoration, but also the addition of a new structure. There will be a new Basketball venue. Not big, not filling the site, and so wrapped on two sides by uses that help to activate Barry's Corner. Site 6, the Charlesview site, is envisioned with publicly activated retail at the first floor. There is a grove of trees now, but it's fenced, so we will maintain and improve it and eliminate the fence. A Hotel and Conference Center will serve not only the University and Business School, but also the Science and Enterprise campuses. And there are two rehabs: Baker Hall, and the Graduate Student Housing. Other projects embraced include Tata Hall, the Science Center, retail projects such as Stone Hearth and Swissbaker, and the Barry's Corner Project. That's the content in a nutshell.

HB continued: Barry's Corner (shows a rainbow diagram) - is not much of a place now. It's a crossroads between the University and the Community. HB then showed a plan focused on Barry's Corner, with building retail/active zones in red and a lot of trees lining new streets. He showed the existing conditions, then added the Science Center footprint; he noted the Harvard Education Portal program, Library Park, the I-Lab, and retail. The Harvard Ceramics Studio would move into a building south of the gas station. Other programs from 219 Western would

move into new 'Institutional Support' space at Travis and Seattle streets. He showed small civic spaces, and built up to the first diagram shown earlier. He showed a collection of local precedents, showing intent. The character of the grove would be, perhaps, like Winthrop Park.

LE: What comments would help? There isn't much information on the buildings. DAC noted that this should be sent to Committee, to get a better level of information - the rough massings, and more than just blocks and streets. We can ask for that, and we will see the Barry's Corner Project. LE: The mixed-use institutional site has active program uses (and housing?) on one side; I'm not sure that's enough to activate the space. I'm concerned about activity vanishing. HB: I hadn't thought of housing...there is retail there, and academic uses likely above. LW: I've seen the list of projects, but not in chronological order. It would help to get a sense of that. HB: There will be more of that in the IMP. We think it will be the Stadium, Chou Center, and Science Complex earlier. And Barry's Corner. DH asked about Boston College: I guess we will see that soon, while reviewing this. There is not much information here; it's hard to wrap my head around this. There are no building principles that I see. HB: We are working to do that; we've heard those comments. We intend building faces defining, and coming to, the streets. DH: Per Linda's reaction, open space is critical to making this successful. Adjacencies are *very* important. KS: You need to identify all the uses, etc. You may want Brigham Circle, and instead get a metro stop. Retail, circulation, trucks. Aspirations, and pragmatic needs. HB: The Charlesview Parcel is further in the future, so there is time to work that out. KC: We are a bit behind in thinking about it.

DH: If there's a model, an isometric...that would help. MD: It will be hard for us to gauge, say, the Samuels Project without that. HB: The alchemy of the place needs time to work. The bones of the place have got to be right. DS: You've done a lot of planning. Two things - You have a project outside of the IMP, and then a bunch of projects contributing to activation. You have to think beyond the borders, as with the BU plan. Showing the longer vision is critical. When you go to a space on the HBS campus, that's understood, we can fill (information) in well. When you go to spaces at the edge, then we understand less. Like Site 3 (Administration Building). HB: Agreed. It needs to be more thought out. KS: Which are the destination buildings, and which are day-to-day. I don't have a sense of distances, how far people move. Unlike BU, here you have whole cloth, and you are creating spaces - and walking distances. HB: Certainly we can look at circulation alone. MD: We should discuss this more in Committee. LE: What about the athletic areas, the playing fields within the 10-year plan. Is a lot of what you see under separate planning? HB: No. LW: What is the process looking at all these? DAC: There is no Article 80 yet on any of the listed Projects, but you will see them all. HB: The Science Complex.... DAC: And we will see *that* if the design changes. With that, the Harvard IMP was sent to Design Committee.

DM returned. WR remained recused for the next item. The next item was a presentation of the **40 Trinity Place Project**. Gary Saunders stood and introduced himself and his brother Jeff. He noted Jordan Warshaw (JW) was their partner and would begin as Gary Kane (GK) of The Architectural Team (TAT) finished setting up. JW began by noting the locus. JW: This is the Hancock Conference Center site; we are taking air rights over the University Club. The YWCA is the third building on the (sub-)block. The building was originally built sequentially; the higher portion (the Conference Center) was built later. Windows are small in the existing building

(shows picture) and the first floor is 8 steps up. It's an ADA nightmare - for those who know it's here to begin with, against the wall of the Hancock Garage. One of the keys of this Project is to reanimate the site - so even the Boston Preservation Alliance has supported something new. (Shows section diagram of program. Points...) This is for the expansion of the University Club, although they are undecided on their program. Above that, parking. It's too expensive below grade, but also gives a better footprint above, in the cantilevered zone. Then hotel, then the sky lobby/amenities levels, including a restaurant and conference center. Condos are above. The plan (shows) is formed in part by shadow limitations, since the community is sensitive to Copley Square. The shadows are okay in summer and in winter; the shoulder season (and time, roughly 9-11am is at issue) is the concern. JW then showed the ground floor plan, and a typical hotel floor plan. LW asked about the cantilever toward the garage, and JW noted a property overlap. JW showed the sky lobby floor for the hotel, with a stair up to the conference center. JW: There is an outside terrace with views toward the South End. There are bathrooms with City views.

Michael Liu (ML) of TAT noted that they would show the PNF images, but that the design has evolved further with BRA staff, and Gary would show that. ML: The base is regular, doing 'urban design work.' The building footprint should be about 13,000 SF, but constraints at the base force it to 11,000. We bump it out to 12,000 with the core, trying to maximize it. We are trying to develop a form that distinguishes itself, but doesn't blur the reading of the Hancock. The curve does some work to reduce the shadow impacts, and the building is turned 'sideways' for the same reason, as well as visual interest. It takes its sculptural form from the curve. But it's also orienting internal views. That results in the faceting, which is the distinguishing characteristic. The YWCA and University Club both have punched windows; the Hancock is set back from the street. So there is a limited amount we can do for the street with our frontage. So there are lobbies, but light and activity in the restaurant, which is lively, and enlivening for the street. DS: Isn't the Simon tower blue glass? ML noted the graphics here are diagrammatic, showing curtainwall and metal-paneled areas. GK: The comment from BRA staff was to simplify. GK then went through a series of iterations, looking toward the (south)east from two altitudes. They had aligned edges, reduced fins, gone to two from three materials, and returned to a curve on both sides. GK then showed a quick fly-around 'just of the block, not of it in the City.' GK: We wanted to get the simplicity of the east and bring it to the west side.

DH: This is a really exciting project. The sky lobby could be great. The notion to simplify is good. I'm less concerned about the (SE) view down Stuart, versus other views (from the SE, from Copley). It looked bisected. The fly-around is good, but we really need to see a model in Committee. LE: Street-level views as well. It would help to understand the parameters. DC: The Hancock Building, and Dartmouth Street views. Trinity Place is like an alley, but think of it more as a connection. DH: Could that be cobbled? It would really transform it. JW: We have talked about that with Boston Properties, because it's also their garage entry. If they and the City are okay with it, we're in agreement. DS: Other projects should be shown in the model. It's confusing to have two roof forms going two directions, stronger to have one. KS: The faceting is a nice contrast to the angularity of the Hancock. Show views both day and night. We'll give lighting here more attention than we did at Nashua. On Stuart, think about how to make sense of that mishmash. On your ground plane, I don't quite understand how that works. MD: I'm not quite convinced by the ground floor yet, its faceting. Why not normalize it, and make the upper portion more interesting? You're losing what little space you have. Also - how it connects to the above program. You don't always have to hold the street edge, but I'm not sure why you're not.

JW: These are similar to the BRA comments; we have concentrated on floors 6-33. The top and the ground need work. DH: There are a lot of buildings that have *craft* in this area. I would be interested in discussing the curtainwall - how it makes its breaks, walls, angles. Especially with the Hancock as a simple, elegant backdrop. KS: Think about the entry procession into a big (tall) space, like the Langham in Hong Kong, for a relationship to the sky lobby. JW: We're thinking about that for the restaurant, 'hanging' that so that the spaces interact. Like the Dana in Chicago. The massing here is generally done in accord with the Stuart Street Planning Study. With no other comments, the 40 Trinity Place Project was sent to Design Committee.

WR returned. DM was recused from the next item and left. The next item was a presentation of the **Fan Pier Parcel C Project**. The Fan Pier Team set up a large context model. Richard Martini (RM) introduced Richard Bertman (RB) and Jim Monteverde of CBT. He noted the progress on the site; Parcels A and B would be 'occupied one year from now.' Noting the model, RM pointed out the massings on the Louis site (Parcel D, housing) and on Parcel E, which is either a Vertex option or housing. RM: Parcel H will likely be an office and hotel mix; we will return to the BCDC. Parcel C is 175' with 20-foot mechanicals. We have also begun to design the park behind this (Fan Pier Park); this is not required to be done with this parcel, but we will design the whole and build half with this Project, so that this side gets done. RM then described the park concept plan, with steps down into the Harbor, and a mound up to a viewing point. RM: We are within all shade and shadow requirements; we checked that with DEP staff.

RB presented the design. RB: The building relates to the form of the Pier, with a rounded first floor. There's a drop-off at the corner. The restaurant is toward the water, with outdoor seating. The garage is entered via the Vertex Parcel B building. We are trying to take advantage of views.... It's either a glass-and-glass or glass-and-metal building. The opaque portions of the building are expressed in an 'other' material. The building is designed from the inside. On the roof, the HVAC goes back to a rounded form. At the base, we are trying to get the restaurant away from the residential above (by projecting it out).

DS asked about the parking access. RM: It's via Parcel B. It's all a contiguous garage below grade. DH asked for views down Fan Pier Boulevard (only elevations were shown, no views) and upper floor plans (which weren't brought). WR: What was the relationship to the retail podium we worked out before? Wasn't it a 2-story expression? Some discussion ensued around this point, given the Commission's past discussions on the topic. The expression is more one-story here, but possibly some expression could be given to continue that datum. DH: The strategy for the skin is very nice. It creates a scale new to the area, a residential scale. KS: The water side, and the City side...consider bringing (the scale of the high podium) to this side; it doesn't have to turn the corner. Within the facets, bringing something out helps. DH: Perhaps if the stack of balconies were related...face to face. LE: Something a little more is needed to frame the view water to water, down Liberty Drive. It would be really great. LW cautioned about the rise to the overview. DH: But that is a great view spot. RM: We realized that you couldn't see through the wave attenuators at the other proposed viewing spot. There is a strict FAA cap, which limits variation at the top. KS: Work on lighting. It's an end building, so you could treat the top a little differently.

DS: There is a nice flourish at the (NE) corner, but that takes away from the simplicity (variation in the balcony). DH: A sense of stepping and overlapping is implied. The transparency, piece to piece, could be nice. MD: Some buildings - the ICA, the Federal Courthouse - have a large scale gesture toward the Harbor. Does this have that capacity? DH: I don't know about that; those other buildings are institutional. RM: When we had a version that was bolder and slicker, it looked more institutional. DH: Other cities - residential buildings at the water have a certain grain to them. A grain, or pattern, seems right. WR agreed with that notion. LW left. WR: The datum is important.... What's beautiful about that is bringing the scale into the City. A second story expression, not taller. It really is nice. It was lost on the next Project in (Seaport Square Parcel C). We should discuss this more in Design Committee. And with that, Fan Pier Parcel C (and Fan Pier Park) were sent to Design Committee; it was thus made so.

There being no further items for discussion, a motion was made to adjourn, and the meeting was duly adjourned at 9:35 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission is scheduled for February 5, 2013. The recording of the January 8, 2013 Boston Civic Design Commission meeting was digitized and is available at the Boston Redevelopment Authority.