

DRAFT MINUTES

BOSTON CIVIC DESIGN COMMISSION

The meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was held on Tuesday, December 1st, 2015, starting in the BRA Board Room, 9th Floor, Boston City Hall, and beginning at 5:20 p.m.

Members in attendance were: Michael Davis (Co-Vice-Chair); Deneen Crosby, Andrea Leers, David Manfredi, Paul McDonough (Co-Vice-Chair), William Rawn, Daniel St. Clair, Kirk Sykes, and Lynn Wolff. Absent were: Linda Eastley, and David Hacin. Also present was David Carlson, Executive Director of the Commission. Representatives of the BSA were present. Michael Cannizzo, Viktorija Abolina, Mary Knasas, Lara Merida, Prataap Patrose, and Christopher Tracy 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 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 Thursday, November 19, in the BOSTON HERALD.

The first item was the approval of the November 3rd, 2015 Meeting Minutes. A motion was made, seconded, and it was duly

VOTED: To approve the November 3rd, 2015 Boston Civic Design Commission Meeting Minutes.

Votes were passed for signature. MD noted one Project would be taken out of normal order due to a scheduling conflict. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **100 Federal Plaza Project**. David Carlson (DAC) noted that the changes proposed by Boston Properties for the plaza area under the old Bank of Boston building would not trigger a Large Project Review, but would transform a privately-owned but very public space adjacent to Post Office Square. It was suggested that the review could be courtesy/advisory only, but the option to review was available to the Commission as a transformation of an important element in Boston's Public Realm. Any vote could be deferred to after the scheduled presentation later tonight. DAC also noted that there would be an informational presentation of progress on the BRA-led PLAN: Dot Ave process, at the request of the Commission, for planning background for the Washington Village Project.

Bill Rawn (WR) was recused from the next item. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Harvard Science and Engineering Complex Project**. DAC noted that the Commission had previously reviewed and recommended approval, but Harvard had stopped construction during the recession and was now proposing a related but modified program with the same architect on the same foundation. Changes were sufficient so that a fresh vote to

review was recommended. It was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the revised schematic design for Harvard's Allston Science and Engineering Complex Project (with an IMP amendment) on Western Avenue in the Allston neighborhood.

WR returned. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Goddard House Project**. DAC noted that, at 163,000 SF, the Proposed Project was over the BCDC review threshold and adjacent to another site ('Little Wanderers') along South Huntington reviewed by the Commission; review was recommended. A motion was made, seconded, and it was

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed Goddard House Project in the Jamaica Plain neighborhood.

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Government Center Garage Phases 1 and 2 Projects**. DAC reported that, like Boston Garden, BCDC approval of the overall Garage Project was contingent on review of each phase and interim condition. But the Project is also submitting each Phase as an Article 80 PNF, focused on design updates. These two phases are over one million SF; due to that and the condition of original approval, review is recommended. With that, it was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the new schematic designs for the proposed Government Center Garage Redevelopment Project, Phase One (WP-B1) and Phase Two (WP-B2), in the Government Center area.

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Boston Landing Residences Project**. DAC noted that, at about 300,000 SF, the Proposed Project was well over the BCDC review threshold; here too, review was a condition of the vote for the overall PDA and its amendments. Review was therefore recommended. A motion was made, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed Boston Landing Residences Project at 125 Guest Street in the Boston Landing PDA Master Plan area in the Allston/Brighton neighborhood.

Kirk Sykes (KS) and David Manfredi (DM) arrived; DM would have been recused from the prior item. The next item was a presentation of the **Goddard House Project**. David Chilinski (DChil) of Prellwitz Chilinski Associates presented the design. DChil: This is a 2-part project - an addition to the Goddard House, plus a new building adjacent to it. (Shows existing context photos, including the Goddard House. Notes the locus; shows the Guidelines diagram.) That study was completed before, and this Project conforms to those guidelines, which are now being converted into zoning. (Shows plans.) The existing building is difficult to convert to residential. Our additions allow more double-loaded corridors, and also helps with the structural

bracing of the original building...the additions are made out of steel to this end. The proposed new zoning has a setback off the JWay of 45', instead of the current 25'. Our addition mimics the wings of the original in scale and massing. There is a separation with the new building to allow a view through the site. There are many unit types, because there's a lot of eccentricities. And a grade change of 27', up to 38'. So, there is parking in the new building and in the addition that is 'below grade' as seen from South Huntington. (Notes relationship to the 70' Parks height constraint.) On the Goddard, we are restoring with brick, limestone, copper, etc. On the additions, we use a bronze metal panel. On the new building, we are using two colors of terra cotta. (Shows a series of before-and-afters with ghosted trees, taken from the JWay. We are adding a couple of gates for pedestrian access leading up to South Huntington.

Keith LeBlanc (KL): The first thing we did is have an arborist prepare an assessment. About half the trees are alien - Norway maples, etc. (Shows a diagram indicating the dying or invasive trees.) The parking lot was to the side, so the trees coming up on that side are all newer. On the JWay, most trees are oaks. (Shows the pedestrian access path plan.) On the path, there are new trees on one side; it's rocky on the other. It's not an accessible path. On South Huntington, we will retain and repair the historic fence. We are also saving most of the trees along the front. The fence is not across the entire site; we are using hedges to the sides.

Daniel St. Clair (DS) arrived. Lynn Wolff (LW): Did you look at an accessible ramp? KL: We tried, but that would require drastic interventions. LW: Show those when you return. Deneen Crosby (DC): Why not do the pedestrian connection with the view corridor at the driveway? KL: The driveway has a rock outcropping. For the building, it's hard to move that. LW: Just tighten the drive and put the path along the left. DChil: We really can't make it any tighter. WR: Where is the parking? DChil pointed out the two parking entries, noting that the parking was all residential, with no commercial program. LW: Where are the building entries? DChil: At the Goddard, through the original. At the new building, through the corner. Andrea Leers (AL): The strategy of parking down below I understand - it's good. On the new building, the entry seems a little squashed. On the addition, it would be better - it's a bit pinched - if it were open roughly as much as the space between the old and new. It feels reactive to the situation...but it's a question of balance. Goddard House as the center is good. What was the original purpose? DChil: In 1927, it was built as a Home for Aging Women.

DM: The disposition of the parts seems right. And the modern apartments, also right. But there are three building types - the existing, the additions, and the new. All are treated similarly, but I wonder if there might not be more differentiation. Laminated on the JWay side, too. I'm most interested in the connection between the Goddard and the new on the right...it could be like the Ted Williams bridge (off Kenmore Street). Show your scheme without the trees (for clarity).

MD: Maybe a series of pavilions. KS: I would like material boards to understand what you're doing. Maybe there should be a gesture, a canting to the view toward the park. South Huntington is cacophonous; it would be nice to understand this more. WR: This is a sophisticated and ingenious scheme. Some projects tried to get too much built on these sites. This is a credit to the owner. The inventiveness of the new pieces, a good scale - I question sending it to Committee. But questions arose. Let's see it without trees, and see what the garage looks like. DC: I'm not sure you would see it during the day, but you would at night, because of the light, and parking. AL: More space between the two - a step back is not the answer, but a simple volume. The really nice thing is that the heights have kept to the eave

height. And the space to the sides. DChil: I appreciate the nuance and balance. We're trying to get efficiency. Usually it's 82%; we're at 67%, and we could do six stories, but we're trying to honor the Goddard House.

MD: You're hearing a lot of support. Working with the Boston Preservation Alliance (BPA) is always good, too - we hope to see you back soon. Members of the public? Michael Rieskind (an IAG member): The design and retention of view corridors have been very well received. The concern is the 15 parking spaces within the 30' setback. The driveway itself is fine. The roof does not show utilities - how would those impact the design? And we hadn't seen the materials. We'd like to know if the view corridors are open to the public. Alison Frazee of the BPA: We are supportive. This has many challenges. This does a successful job of preservation, and the additions are deferential. With that, the Goddard House Project was sent to Design Committee.

The next item was an **Update on the PLAN: Dot Ave process**. Prataap Patrose (PP): While Viktorija [Abolina](VA)'s setting up, I'll give an intro. We're halfway through the study, so no conclusions are presented. VA introduced the staff and noted that this was an internal planning study, with no consultants except for a real estate analyst. She showed the area of study, process schedule, and a typical workshop setup; she noted three categories of values and priorities heard. VA: We discussed a network, connectivity - both existing, and potential connecting streets. We show a street grid parallel to Dot Ave with a connection to the Haul Road. The idea is to widen the sidewalks (but not the streets) along Dot Ave. We did an existing land use survey, then an exercise to assign the intensity of desired uses; this led to a land use concept. We preserve the industrial uses, but for the 21st century, against the tracks and highway. There are open spaces nearby; we identified needs, and are working on concepts. The Harrison/Albany work is a precedent for the study, using zoning tool concepts such as the PDA bonus. (Shows a list of potential benefits, then a diagram of this idea.) We use a set of Urban Design tools - stepping down, view corridors, and the like. And we have shown sketches for two concepts for density. (Shows existing/proposed projects map, then existing zoning, then a stepping concept at the edges, then the stepped concept.) There are variations based on the UD tools concepts, such as spacing between tall elements. (Shows the 'barbell' concept; Washington Village is massed in each.) PP: I'd like to reiterate two points. It's not either/or; these are just scenarios. There's been some discussion, and maybe even more height. No radically different options. We and the community are still digesting, and there's been no major push-back.

DC: Would you look at how open space relates to the buildings? PP: We will definitely consider that. MD: The space next to Dorchester Ave has height, and open space, and industrial uses. Can all co-exist? PP: One can visualize it as a series of discrete chunks, much like the Back Bay has done. One can imagine that looping to Dot Ave.... KS: How do you evaluate in the connection with Widett Circle? If I were to react, I'd prefer it more diffuse. You need an economic advisor, for the podium height, and building heights.... PP: We just got the economic advisor, so there's no answers yet. KS: You do not want to back into the Seaport model, where you're backing into maximizing heights. PP: There is more variation in the second [barbell] scheme. About Widett - if the Olympics are out of the picture, then it's not likely - and off our radar. We see it coming after, but not until the value has been established. VA: South Boston doesn't think about Widett at all. Or even the South End. There are few ways to get to the

other side.

LW: The Plan should give more due diligence to open space, and not just roadway infrastructure. You need a BIG dot. PP: There are two concepts. One is a Commonwealth Avenue type of treatment. The other is a series of spaces. One group did suggest a large quadrant as a park. The Parks Department would like that, but this is all private land. AL: I would echo Lynn. Bringing open space into the framework is really strong and sound. Moving to heights and volumes, you *must* have a strategy for what the green spaces are. We *know* all will be built to the max; the parks need to be there as intentional spaces. DC: Step back, and look not just at Moakley, but more - a network. WR: I'll build on everyone's comments. Think about volumes that *require* variety - height, bulk, and open space. Start working now to shake it up - learn from the Seaport. PP: I agree. We will be mindful. There is an opportunity for variation in the second scheme. It doesn't get granular enough, it needs to be taken further. DS: Are there any civic buildings, or schools? That's a lot of SF. PP: Not yet, and schools would require a lot of open space. AL: But that's a point. There's a whole layer missing - a network of open spaces, civic buildings, and more. Paul McDonough (PM): The Emerald Necklace. The Commission thanked the BRA staff.

MD noted a 15-minute maximum for Design Committee reports. The next item was a report from the Design Committee on the **5 Washington Street Project**. WR suggested abbreviating the presentation: We've all seen this recently. Tamara Roy (TR) of Stantech presented, showing the locus, views of context, views of the proposal as it stands now, the ground floor and site plan, upper floor plans showing the 'H' form, and mid and upper terraces. DC: Corey Street goes up a hill? You'll see the terraces? TR: Yes. (Goes through variations in the Project model, from a 'C', to an 'H', to more nuanced volumes.) KS: Materials? TR: Faux wood, interspersed with other materials. A motion was begun...the public spoke.

Eva Webster (EW): I acknowledge that the massing has improved. But no one has noted how close this is to the street; the SF is dumped at the corner, a corner where pedestrians, women with children wait to cross. This is too close; in the original design, there was more distance. You are looking at this in isolation, while talking context. There is structural soil on Corey, but I bet there won't be any trees. And in general, we are seeing the same style all over Boston. In some areas, you can get away with new design. Here, all the neighbors prefer the traditional. We keep asking, but we are ignored. The system doesn't work well; this goes to the Committee before the neighborhood sees it. (There were some questions about the sidewalk property line; TR noted the setback.) EW: If the corner had a diagonal...we always have to fight from a position of weakness. TR noted the sidewalk width, and added that Eva is but one voice. DS: If you don't build incrementally, the neighborhood will never evolve. If the sidewalk is able to support trees, this seems appropriate to me. I hear your point. EW: Brookline has all the good things; Corey has nothing. DS: It does hold the street wall well, and I find that appropriate. MD: Eva, thank you for your contribution. We have to move on this Project. With that, the motion was completed, seconded, and it was

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the proposed 5 Washington Street Project at the corner of Corey Road in the Allston/Brighton neighborhood.

WR was recused from the next item. The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **Harvard Klarman Hall Project**. Andy O'Brien (AOB) of Harvard introduced the Project, noting the discussion of the G2 Pavilion in Committee. AOB: Cliff Gayley (CG) of William Rawn Associates will speak to the architecture. CG: We appreciate your comments in October and November, and continue to try to introduce the contemporary into a traditional fabric. This is more Ledoux than Greenberg. (Notes changes in the building, and shows views with the changes annotated.) We have lowered the ellipse (dome) and simplified the elevations. (Shows a night view of the updated design.) There are a few key things to emphasize. We have maximized the transparency, and created a curtainwall on the Green - as you move closer, other elements recede. (Shows a quick 4-panel view of the design progress.) We are learning from Ledoux, and have incorporated many of those ideas.

AOB then showed the G2 location/size diagram, noting that the gray color indicated the original proposal extent. AOB: We've brought it back from that; there is no design, and no donor, so we have defined a 4800 SF site. DC: We had talked about a view to show the relationship. AOB: We don't have that. Our inspiration was Safdie's chapel. LW: It's always good to see buildings in context; I'd like to see that. MD: The notion here is to approve this, and see the G2 Pavilion as a condition, when it is designed. AL: What I'm interested in - is this a building, or a pavilion? If it's a pavilion, I'm not worried about it. AOB: The chapel would fit in the box [we've drawn]. That's 3500 SF, this is 4800. The key thing for us is the break-out space below grade. (CG shows the condition without *anything* on the surface.) KS: I challenge you. My feelings about the site shown, is that if it's transparent, it's good. Like an Apple store/pavilion. DC: there needs to be enough space around it so that you can make it like Andrea suggested. DM: Can we see the older red rectangle? Adrian of Reed/Hilderbrand: Architecture matters here. It's best to have the site and building working together. DM: What we're being asked tonight is about some of the limits shown. We will see the building in the future. MD: We should not have G2 hold up Klarman.

LW: Let's get back to the building. AL: Side by side...? The windows and the other changes are good. Really, to what level can you abstract traditional architecture. Harry Cobb really defined subtle niches [in the courthouse]...the details are all very skillful, but it maintains a level of abstraction. Here, the south facade is more successful. On the other facade, you're struggling with a shaped wintergarden element. It competes with the dome, and carries a more decorative theme. KS: It would look different if the roof were transparent. CG: We started there, but we have to be practical. We heard that comment in Committee as well. This needs a roof element. AL: Could it stretch higher? Or, if more a conservatory, if it's stretched, like the other side, it would create a nice space. CG: It's low-iron glass, and has a transparent wall behind it. It was then noted that the notes should be reported to staff, and it was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for Harvard's Klarman Hall Project in the context of the Harvard Allston Campus IMP, in the Allston neighborhood, with the condition that the G2 Pavilion return for review/vote before that element goes fully into design.

WR remained recused from the next item. The next item was a presentation of the **Harvard**

Science and Engineering Complex. Kevin Casey (KC) of Harvard introduced the Project, noting changes in the neighborhood since this was originally seen. KC: The BCDC has seen the Harvard business School projects, and Barry's corner, and Charlesview. Across from this will be an enterprise campus; the area is being remediated now. The community meetings before the filing were very positive; this harkens back to the prior proposal. Matt Noblett (MN) of Behnisch Architekten presented the revised design, first noting the locus and the rough sense of future roads. MN: The Project also includes the rehab of 114 Western (the old WGBH building), but that's not really the focus tonight. Originally this was four structures, and now it's a single one hugging Western and preserving the south of the site for future development. The exact use and size of that are not defined, but the courtyard will remain. (Notes the program shift.) The site will be fully landscaped. The program has become more complex, and includes more collaborative space. Before, it was more research. Now, it's about 1/3 research, with more teaching, and more a mix of uses. (Shows diagrams indicating the breaking down of the massing, while still giving the SF needed for lab floors.) There are more academic uses below. The teaching spaces are at street level and below, and the research floats up; this allows more transparency at the base.

On the site plan, the climate change strategy deals with possible water incursion, and so it's bermed up on the south. The landscape is one of four overlaid characters. (Describes and notes the notion of trees planted that could be moved off-site in the future. Shows views and elevations of the landscaped area. Shows the circulation on the ground plane, noting that the building program allows public circulation, exposing the teaching, and using a retail space as well.) The atrium extends up, and down into the basement area, and out, into the [courtyard] space. (Notes other connected spaces, another atrium. Notes structures remaining from the original construction.) The berm begins to swallow these structures to some extent. (Shows an image of the atrium space, sunken courtyards. Then building views.) A glassy plinth opens to the garden. The upper facades are clad with a sunscreen, with a certain abstraction to it, placed over the building details. (Shows side-by-side comparisons with the 2007 scheme...massing, elevations.) The mass is comparable. There's a difference at the back; it's more stepped down, less urban. The facade screen is architectural, but high-performing. (Uses model to describe.) The intent is to make the screen visually transparent, with variation by orientation and daylight responses. (Shows views.) Heliostat mirrors are mounted to reflect sun down the facade, onto the sidewalk.

AL: I'm delighted that this has come back to life. I'm glad you've re-thought it. I like this better - it feels like a building of parts, rather than parts of buildings. The Baltimore Law School building [by Behnisch] is even better than envisioned. There, there is a different daylight strategy on each face; that was interesting. Here, there are smaller variations. A really clever strategy - I would encourage looking at more differentiation. On the inside, it may be over-articulated, over-terraced - it just seems like a lot of edges to protect. On the whole, it's very interesting. MN: We can expand the variations; that will be the next step in the facade. PM: Will there be solar? It looks like it's heading to that. MN: We will look at that. KS: This is very good, the most forward thing we've seen. MD: Looking at Baltimore now. In some ways, this is more progressive. As a case study, the skin is fascinating. LW: The stepping in back is a nice treatment. DM: I agree with all; I just wish there was a little more retail along Western. But this is a fabulous project. MN: We are trying to find a balance; retail will come later. And there will be some in 114, to extend activity. DC: Are there any places the public can walk through? MN: Right now, the public can walk through; it's conceived as *very* public.

It's more private above. With that, a motion was made, seconded, and it was

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the revised schematic design for Harvard's Allston Science and Engineering Complex Project (with an IMP amendment) on Western Avenue in the Allston neighborhood.

WR returned. The next item was the [advisory] presentation of the **100 Federal Street Plaza Project**. Mike Cantalupa (MC) of Boston Properties introduced the team, including Robert Brown (RB) of Perkins+Will, Mikyoung Kim (MYK), and George Needs of Boston Properties. MC: Our building - the 'Pregnant Building' - really has three major financial tenants, and we have the ability to reposition it right now, focused on the cafeteria and some common spaces in the basement. We want to bring them up - right now, the open space is not successful. The idea is to create a new space that is public, enjoyed by the users of the building for gatherings and food, and programmed like we do for the public spaces in Atlantic Wharf. We have asked the team to think that way. RB: This is an opportunity to take a part of the City and reimagine it. The site (notes) is adjacent to one of the most successful spaces, but has never had any spillover, and has walls on all sides. (Shows views of the existing, and diagrams of circulation/access, open/social spaces. Notes the new through-block connection, linking across Federal to the lobby through 75-101 Federal.) We have held back the corner of our structure, so there's an open connection to Post Office Square. The next space is glassed, open, and allows gatherings. Then restaurants. (Shows views - a birds' eye, then from Franklin, then an interior showing screens as background to a 'wonderful civic space.')

We are trying to pick up, in folds of glass, the angles of the building. (Shows views along the Congress edge, and of the landscape at the edge.)

MYK: The landscape here is a linear piece along Congress. (Shows close-up of the glass element.) Right now, it's symmetrical. A major move from the team is to make it asymmetrical. The solution at the corner is to take a water feature and tip it, with seating also in the area. The interior planters move inside to outside; on the inside, they are moveable planters. (Shows circulation diagrams, indicating how one can move through the building.) The planters might also have a stackable quality; they can shift to the side. RB: The space is really flexible; it can be used for charity gatherings, lectures, concerts, etc. (Shows Atlantic Wharf events as precedent.) The retail is being thought of as flexible; we are removing all elements from the roof and placing them in back. There is a crystalline quality, and a porosity.

LW: That's a huge area [roof] you're not taking advantage of. At the entrance from Post Office Square, the water feature seems to block it - it could be fractalized. DC: I agree it's not a successful open space now, but it's open space. Can it be a successful open space if you cover it? It has a '100,' so it seems like an extension of the lobby. Post Office Square - the green space is rare. If this were only better. And the back street [Matthews] I always liked as a passage, and the water feature there always had a few people. DS: This, as a complement to Post Office square, could be good. I'm looking at the glass vs. the solid space. Perhaps there is too strong a role as a continuation of the shape; it could be more a backdrop. When you come from High Street, the glass could be more forward.

WR: I applaud you and the owner for coming forward with a bold idea. I have confidence you'll

work out the architectural details. Can you show the view along Congress? This is part of the City that's booming, in terms of activity. I think the sidewalk is much too narrow. I'm not sure why the sidewalk shouldn't come almost right up to the glass. MYK: Looking from the inside out, the view is not good. MD: Bill's exactly right. The more proximate you can make those, the better - this is the alternate to PO Square. More [glass] shards along Congress. MYK: The sidewalk is sloping, so there needs to be some retaining wall. AL: What are the hours? RB: For the managed open space? Like Atlantic Wharf. KS: Will there be something at 9pm? MC: That's not decided yet. KS: One of the greatest contributions would be to provide a dynamic space that's active after 5. If it's a jewel box, it might have good Chihuly's. If it's programmed, that will increase the transparency. Display the environment. Get people out of cars. PM: Have you looked at the walls being moveable? RB: We looked at it, but the slope makes that difficult. AL: I'm a little confused by this side of the building, the restaurant. Is that not open to the public? RB: To be clear, we're not sure how it operates. We know there's a lot of back-of-house, so there's solidity back there. AL: The contrast suggests that the mass is of the building, and so more private. More shard is good. More glass, looking more like a continuous pavilion. The service.... MD: That has to pay for the space. DM: I understand, but this view (from Matthews and Congress) is the most disappointing. There could be more glass - bring it around the corner. MD: It can be all the active tenant program. PM: We could continue the conversation in Committee.... WR: That's worth considering. And there is *very* enthusiastic support here. Ted Landmark: I wonder if commuter buses are still stopping on the other side of the building. This could be a wonderful waiting area, and that could add to the program. After a brief discussion, the 100 Federal Plaza Project was sent to Committee - and it was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed 100 Federal Street Plaza Project in the Downtown Financial District.

DS left; LW was recused from the next item, and left. The next item was a presentation of the **Government Center Garage Phases 1 and 2 Projects**. Tom O'Brien (TOB) of HYM introduced the team, including David Nagahiro (DN) of CBT (architect for residential) and Doug Mann of HYM. TOB: Pelli Clarke Pelli (architect for office) could not be here tonight. (Shows locus, site aerial, and parcel diagram.) What was approved was six buildings; what we agreed to at the time was that each would return for a public design review. So we have submitted updated PNFs for these two phases and will return for four more. After Phase 1, half the garage will come down, and then the office will proceed, then the east parcel, and then the residential completing the cover of the garage on the west. On the office, they want to position themselves with the design review now, which will make it the **ONLY** approved office structure [in the market]. (Shows earlier version changes, then a plan of the full Project. Notes how garage will be covered. Shows future site plan, then existing condition photos. Shows a pedestrian problem diagram, then roadways redone, with before and after views.) I apologize for the long background presentation.

DN presented the design, starting with the residential tower. He noted the trees on the site plan.

DN: The office tower is far more dynamic, so we did not want to compete, but set up a familial relationship discussion. (Shows the evolution of the massing strategy for the residential. Shows an amenity space diagram, with lower space at the garage roof level, and an upper creating a shelf and massing shift, then stepping down toward the Greenway.) We're using a

glazing system differentiation to accentuate the [massing] breaks. (Shows an elevation diagram indicating 'activities' - the entry and three amenity spaces, the last at the top. Shows variations on the single and multi-story expressions, and on window widths. Shows massing, then rendered views, with some blowups. Shows the New Sudbury change, removing the police cars. Notes massive bicycle storage.) We are maxing out activities at the edge, and reducing garage lanes, but we have to retain three loading bays. (Shows a typical floor plan.) Dirtworks is the landscape architect. They've redesigned Bowker Green and the sidewalk, which will be 16' at a minimum, and up to 30'. (Compares stats to the PDA numbers.)

DN: On the office, the corner is the origin of the ellipsoid massing. It's a composition of curves. (Shows daytime and dusk views, noting a bold presence on the skyline. Shows a rendered view, then a detail, noting the use of three types of glass.) It's very transparent at the base. There's a restaurant and café at the corner of Bowker - and a high, open lobby zone. (Shows the existing ground plane, with the helical speedramp drum and other ramp accesses. Shows the proposed ground floor and site plan.) The office blurs the line between the sidewalk and the lobby, with multiple entries. The Garage lobby remains on Congress.

DC: What is the timeline? TOB: The residential, asap. That will take about 36 months, and then half the garage will come down. We must take down the garage by 2022. DC: And the [Congress] corner? TOB: We envisioned that as the last building in the process, about 7-8 years out. On the east, that will go before that time. And when we have marketed the office, there is interest in having that done. AL: A result of the (prior) review - to lower the heights, and make them closer in height - maybe that can be discussed. That said, I like the strategy for the residential, to break it down, and the stepping. Versus the sculptural strength of the office tower. The residential has too much going on in comparison to the office, it's not as quiet as it wants to be. Quiet it way down in terms of its skin. But the massing is great. One of the things that differentiates this from Boston Garden, is that each comes down to the ground; they have integrity. MD: I agree entirely. The residential was strongest with the diagram. The more that was added, the more clarity was lost. It doesn't appear to me as though the buildings are in conversation; you could craft that more. Otherwise this is fabulous, and the ground plane is great. DC: Can the heights change? TOB: There were a *lot* of conversations with the community over a 4-year process.

DM: what you've done is incredibly good, a lot of good, surgical work. I think you're going to make [the garage] disappear with a thousand cuts, as with David Copperfield. Walk us around the base, and tell us what the dimensions are. DN: We are pulling out the curb into what is now a lane; we have to make room for the core, etc. (Shows the 16' and 30' widths.) It telescopes - it tightens, but it opens out. TOB explained further, giving a bit of the tale of moving the police parking that enabled this move. KS: Quieting down the residential is not a bad idea; it's easier than making it fizzier. I do think there's a bit of a disconnect between the heights on the east and west; that was better in the earlier diagram. Stepping down as an idea - if you can think about that a little more. DN: The building on the east did get dropped a little too much.

AL: The gesture at the top of the office may be too much. DC: When you come down New Sudbury from Cambridge to Congress, what do you see? The building comes forward. DN: We've been discussing that. We are carrying the glass around, and looking at other strategies. AL: It's not necessary to being the stepping from above all the way down. TOB: We're constrained along Bowker; we can't change that. WR: But you agree that the sidewalk at 16' is

minimal, tight. I'd like to know more in detail about the dimensions, vs. the existing edge. DC: Look from up the hill. An IAG member noted that getting rid of the ugly garage was important to the community. I was in many meetings; we are totally in support. And I can speak on behalf of the Downtown North Association, who also support this. With that, the Government Center Garage Phases 1 and 2 Projects were sent to Design Committee.

PM left. DM was recused from the next item. The next item was a presentation of the **Boston Landing Residences Project**. Keith Craig (KC) of New Balance introduced the Project, noting first the locus. KC: This project allows us to finish the street, and the public improvements along it. We have started (on 10/13) the commuter rail station. We hope it's operational by the end of 2016, or early 2017. Mark Sardegna (MS) of Elkus/Manfredi presented the design, showing the locus again, then the overall site plan. MS: The headquarters building opened September 7th, and the rink will be open in October of 2016. (Talks about several site strategies.) The basic premise of the site is that it maintains the visual porosity discussed since 2012, with a future Hichborn Street coming through. The taller portion aligns with Hichborn, and offsets the hotel massing. It completes the framing of 1.5 acres of open space started by the Headquarters Building and Parcel C3. (Notes access to transit, shows ground floor plan.) We have retail at the base, with residential amenities along Hichborn. The second floor of parking above the retail emulates the facade. (Shows the upper floor plans, photos of existing conditions. And views - of where the rail headhouse will be; looking toward the SW, with the lower building element in the foreground; a closer view looking along Guest; another, along Arthur; from Parcel C3, looking SE toward the tower; from Hichborn. Shows site sections.) Carol Johnson Associates are the landscape architects; we are maintaining 16' sidewalks (24' at the bulbouts), conforming with Complete Streets, and installing raingardens along the street. There is a garden at the podium roof terrace.

WR: I want to compliment you on the fenestration, and on the presentation. You've broken the monotony of the building. The only question is the treatment of the garage on the second floor. MS: We're happy to discuss that. We're looking at perforated metal; we need to balance that with the free air flow. AL: The strategy of the tower perpendicular to Guest - the relationship is good. The shape at the end [the corner at Arthur] seems undecided. Go to a square corner, or make it curved; it's not persuasive. While I am appreciating the study of the window types, this needs more than the a change of material and windows. I found myself wondering what makes this look residential, vs. office. Balconies, as an example. I find myself thinking of the Ink Block, which says, '*live here.*' But you are in the process of creating a whole neighborhood - good. KS: There's so much flat surfaces. That might help, if you consider more relief, balconies, etc. It's great to put this in context, so you understand how it sits. AL: we should be seeing the hotel with this, as well. DC: On Arthur Street, that will be the main corridor until Hichborn opens. How can that connection to the T be more intuitive? KS: Work on the lower corner of the residential building. Is that a sneaker? With that, the Boston Landing Residences 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 10:02 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission

was scheduled for January 5, 2016. The recording of the December 1, 2015 Boston Civic Design Commission meeting was digitized and is available at the Boston Redevelopment Authority.