

DRAFT MINUTES

BOSTON CIVIC DESIGN COMMISSION

The meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was held on Tuesday, April 5th, 2016, starting in the BRA Board Room, 9th Floor, Boston City Hall, and beginning at 5:24 p.m.

Members in attendance were: Michael Davis (Co-Vice-Chair); Deneen Crosby, Linda Eastley, David Hacin, Andrea Leers, David Manfredi, Paul McDonough (Co-Vice-Chair), William Rawn, Daniel St. Clair, and Kirk Sykes. A poignant absence was Lynn Wolff. Also present was David Carlson, Executive Director of the Commission. Representatives of the BSA were present. Michael Cannizzo and Sara Myerson were present for the BRA. Jim Doolin and Juan Carlos Loveluck were present for Massport.

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 Friday, March 18, in the BOSTON HERALD.

The first item was the approval of the March 1st, 2016 Meeting Minutes. A motion was made, seconded, and it was duly

VOTED: To approve the March 1st, 2016 Boston Civic Design Commission Meeting Minutes.

Votes were passed for signature. MD called for a moment of silence in observance of the passing of Lynn Wolff, FASLA. (Images of her favorite work started scrolling on the screen.) After this moment, MD spoke: Lynn was a landscape architect, a founding partner of the Copley Wolff Design Group. She has served on this Commission since 2004...Lynn passed away on March 20th. John Copley's message to us was that she *treasured* her time on the BCDC. Well, we treasured her time with us as well. She embodied everything that this Commission aspires to be. She was supremely dedicated to this City and to design excellence in the public realm - she was active even in February of this year. She was brave and forthright with her opinions. A fond personal memory is how we would exchange a playful glance when she would say, "I'm not an architect, BUT..." Lynn was always insightful, always objective, and always constructive with her comments. She was an outstanding design professional (as evidenced by these images on the screen). She knew the City, knew the Projects, and knew her profession. Following in the path of Carol Johnson [and Susan Child], she helped define the role of the landscape architect in Boston's public design review process. Her contribution to the BCDC was very

substantial. She was a colleague and dear friend to us all, and she will be missed. The BSLA will be establishing a scholarship in her name...

Deneen Crosby (DC): Another thing that was extraordinary about Lynn - is that she came to all the meetings, and subcommittees, over the last two years...we knew nothing [of the seriousness of her illness]. And she contributed so much outside her work.

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Indigo Block Project**. David Carlson (DAC) noted that this project, on the Fairmount Line near Upham's Corner, was similar in approach to the recently seen Cote Village Project. Being over the BCDC threshold at about 123,000 SF, review was recommended. It was duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed Indigo Block Redevelopment Project off of East Cottage Street and interfacing with Beckwith, Harrow, Hillsboro and Groom streets, along MBTA Fairmount Line tracks, in the Upham's Corner area of Dorchester.

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Harrison Albany Block Project** in the South End between East Canton and East Dedham streets. DAC noted that the Project was over 700,000 SF, well over the BCDC review threshold, and in the area recently rezoned as part of the Harrison Albany Planning study. Review was therefore recommended.... It was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed Harrison Albany Block Project (and proposed PDA) on the block bounded by East Canton, Albany, and East Dedham streets, and Harrison Avenue, in the South End neighborhood.

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Waterside Place Phase 1B Project** in the South Boston Innovation District on Congress street adjacent to the recently completed Phase 1. DAC noted that the 1B Project had been modified substantially since last seen in 2010. Review of future phases was a condition of approval of Phase 1, and additionally this Phase was over 340,000 SF, well over the BCDC review threshold. A confirmatory vote to review was recommended; this was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for Phase 1B of the modified Waterside Place Development at 501 Congress Street, on the Massport Core Block parcel bounded by Congress and D streets, World Trade Center Avenue, and the Silver Line, in the South Boston Waterfront District.

David Manfredi (DM) was recused from the next item. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **150 Seaport**

Boulevard Project in the South Boston Waterfront District. DAC noted that the Project was over 280,000 SF, on a key waterfront location, and review was recommended. It was duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed 150 Seaport Boulevard Project (and proposed PDA) on the parcel bounded by Seaport Boulevard, 100 Pier 4 Avenue to the west, Boston Harbor, and Commonwealth Pier to the east, in the South Boston Waterfront District.

Bill Rawn (WR) and DM were recused from the next item. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Harvard Soldiers Field Housing Renovation Project** in Harvard Allston Campus. DAC noted that, although the Project was over 400,000 SF, it was essentially a pure rehabilitation of a 70's Benjamin Thompson design, and a vote NOT to review was recommended. This specifically was suggested in the conditions of BCDC approval for the Harvard Campus IMP. However, due to the significance of the location adjacent to several other projects recently reviewed by the Commission, the Proponent has been asked to present to the Commission, and the vote should be deferred to that agenda item. MD: So, we will defer at this time.

DAC then noted that the **One Bromfield Project** appeared on the agenda; this Project would be coming in soon as an NPC/DPIR with a considerable change since last seen by the Commission and sent to Committee in December of 2008. Since the Project was in Committee, and should remain so after its scheduled presentation, NO VOTE was required of the Commission either now or later. Comments should be made. (This would be the equivalent of an advisory session or, more accurately, a Design Committee session.)

Daniel St. Clair (DS) arrived. The next item was a report from the Design Committee on the **32 Cambridge Street Project**. Kendra Halliwell (KH) of ICON gave a brief background and then noted the changes to the plan, including eliminating the connector, evening the building along Rutherford, moving the amenity spaces to flank and to animate the courtyard, creating a unique underground connection to the garage, and a simplified treatment of the design overall. She showed revised and new views, including both distanced views of the project and vignettes along the courtyard and pathways and sidewalks. KH noted the building materials, and reprised a fresh overview. Robin (landscape architect) showed more detail on the revised courtyard design, noting precedent, the paving/patterning intent, and trees here, and along Rutherford and D as street trees. Plantings were in carved out spaces - and also on the elevated terrace along D.

Linda Eastley (LE): A question about the stair to the elevated courtyard - it seems narrow, if open to the public. Robin: It's a new element, just added. We will look at the proportions. But it's not conceived of as a public space. LE: The stair should be more integrated. KH: Into the building? LE: Into the landscape, but could be both. It feels added on. MD: It *is* a new idea. David Hacin (DH): I agree with Linda on that. I want to compliment the team on how they have integrated our comments, with the space along the courtyard and the underground connection. Thank you. DC: Rutherford is much better. I appreciate your bringing the material down. Kirk Sykes (KS): I appreciate ALL the moves. I wonder if you couldn't go further with the pattern, make

it a kind of art. Robin: The intent *is* that it reads as a graceful space. With that, and hearing no comments from the public, it was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the 32 Cambridge Street Project near Sullivan Square, on the parcel bounded by Cambridge, Spice, and D streets and Rutherford Avenue in the Charlestown neighborhood.

The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **530 Western Avenue Project**.

David Snell of PCA presented the project changes. Snell: The question (task) was to make it feel more residential. We analyzed the area to understand that; we took to heart comments from you, the community, stakeholders, and the BRA. (Shows photos - first aerial, then of the site and area. Shows the modification in plan to the curb at Western, forming the extra space at the corner.) We've added about 3,000 SF of green space; we've shifted the parking, added infills, and moved the parklet on the other street. DC: Are you looking at the larger intersection? Snell: We are looking with others; that will be a larger process. (Goes to views, first showing a day and night view of the corner.) We've warmed up the building elevations considerably. We've worked to break the mass down, giving it more vertical proportions, and added bays. The retail has more depth and is better connected. (Shows a view from Western, then more views - up Birmingham, and up and down Waverly.)

MD asked about the rotation of the parking deck: Have the abutters benefitted? Snell: Definitely. Plantings have been added, but the existing planting is dense. We are adding more understory, and evergreen, with some trees. (Shows views without, then with plantings; shows a view into the new 'portal park.')

Bill Rawn (WR) asked to see the ground floor plan. Snell showed this, noting the grade change, and retail (spaces varied from 1,000 to 2,500 SF). DS asked about the accommodation of trash and deliveries; Snell pointed out the relevant areas. KS asked about the seatwall: How do you get people to occupy the space at the corner? Snell showed the detail in a closer view of the site plan, then showed the night view, describing the lighting ideas, especially around the soffit and piers. KS: I wonder if the central curved section might not have some augmentation. More intensity, or more uplighting.

DM: I think you've done a lot of really nice things since we saw it. I still worry about the retail...1,000 SF will be tough to lease sustainably. Snell: We are working on that, and had the thought of a WeWorks or local innovation or maker space. DH: I agree with the comment on the architecture; it's better. But the parking still feels like a lot. It would be great to relax, and loosen up the retail, especially along Western. Anything the BRA can do - in zoning, etc. - to help would be good. DM: I understand the parking issue. Maybe you can do something with the 8 [spaces] along Western. But then, it's shallow. Snell: Maybe we could do more, with less spaces at the corner. MD: Reducing the parking and having better retail would help. LE: Thank you for your responsiveness on the open space. Everything we suggested, you've been able to address. I like the idea of a beacon [at the corner], but also an oasis for pedestrians. Snell: The

IAG was very pleased with the changes as well. Not hearing any public comment, it was then ``moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the proposed Western Avenue Residence Project at 530 Western Avenue in the North Allston-Brighton neighborhood.

DM and WR were recused from the next item. The next item was a presentation of the **Harvard Soldiers Field Park Housing Renovation Project**. Mark Handley (MH) of Harvard introduced the Project, noting that the 4-building project would happen in four phases. MH: The renovation is necessary; it's been 40 years since the complex was built. It's operated by Harvard Housing, and included in the IMP, so covered by that, and the community benefits are established. There have been no comments from the community. Steve Dube (SD) of Elkus/Manfredi presented the design, first noting the locus. SD: There are four buildings designed by Benjamin Thompson Associates, a total of 429,000 SF. The tallest is 9 stories, along Kresge Way (shows photos of the existing complex). The infrastructure is at the end of its service life; all will be replaced. The program has been modified along Kresge; all interior finishes will be re-done. All units have some kind of open space - balconies, patios, or terraces. As we move the amenities, we are opening up the ground floor more. I should mention the Kresge Way project, which is part of the Klarman Hall project, reducing vehicular traffic. (Shows a circulation diagram, then a landscape plan.) Each of the higher buildings has a central entry and a core. The fourth, along the river, has separate entries up or down to the duplex units. (Shows the ground floor changes and the entry enhancements.) We are using wood to express the idea of the entries as a warm expression.

Andrea Leers (AL) arrived. LE: Will the glass at the ground floor come out? SD: We'd love to do that, but we're not sure we have the FAR. DH: The visual weight of the building above...it doesn't feel supported. I appreciate what you are trying to do. It could come down in some ways, in some places. SD then continued to show the other entries, and views. Then the phasing. LE: It may not be doable, but because of the emphasis on Kresge Way, if there's any way to bring the glass out - it will feel like it embraces the Way. It would be a huge improvement. With that, the Commissioners moved, seconded, and then

VOTED: That the Commission NOT review the schematic design for Harvard's Soldiers Field Housing Complex Renovation Project in the context of the Harvard Allston Campus IMP, in the North Allston neighborhood.

DM and WR returned. The next item was a presentation of the **Indigo Block Project**. Cliff Boehmer (CB) of Davis Square Architects presented the design, starting with the goals of the DND RFP for the site, which sought a range of affordability on this heavily used industrial site. He noted the location, and the Upham's Corner stop. CB: We are providing a new entrance to the platform. On the other side, at the Kroc Center, there are stairs and a handicapped ramp (shows photos). The MBTA is happy with the new connection. The

site is very sloped, with difficult grading. (Goes through program.) There are 80 rental units, commercial space, the MBTA platform connection, and some small ownership buildings. (Shows site plan to describe program and layout more.) We have a 20-foot grade change. We have a total of 63 spaces for the rental units, and some more for the commercial space (notes the location for each program element, including the commercial/residential swing spaces.) CB noted the location of the platform's pedestrian access. He showed a view of the main building, pointing out its materials, budget constraints, and the grade. Then elevations. Then a view of the commercial building from East Cottage, showing its entry strategy. More elevations, plans, a view. Then ownership buildings views, and a site section. Using a SketchUp model, CB walked through the site, up the central 'street,' around the ownership buildings, looking up toward the T platform, etc.

LE: Thanks. I appreciate the complexity with the smaller residential and commercial. I appreciate the lane. I like your narrative about enlivening that street, but I'm not as convinced by that with the building. If the street could meet the building in a more public way.... I was struck by the amount of parking seen from the lane. DC: That lane...is there a way to design it so that it feels more like a public street? Some of the existing streets, even the disconnected public streets, offer better connections. KS: It's a big building. The base seems larger, more institutional. It has a long porch; I'm not sure where that fits in at that size. DM: I agree with the comment. It does feel like it should be a street going through. I understand the neighborhood concern; it should be designed for pedestrians. Paul McDonough (PM): The (ownership) triple-deckers feel authentic.... MD: The connection to the T station is a major public benefit. But it doesn't feel like it *is* that; it feels secondary. It should be more legible as that benefit. More distinct than the other pedestrian paths. AL: It's an interesting opportunity to integrate. I'd like to know more on the uses in the commercial building. There are three things on the street, connecting - the architecture of the three is very distinct. It could be drawn much more together. Like the industrial - can't it be more frank, open, given its high floor? It suggests more a residential use now. Can't the triple-deckers be more consistent? You're creating a kind of village. There's confusion about where the entries are, there. I would favor the ones on the new lane, and diminish the other entry. And I'm not convinced by the one that's turned. CB: There was a lot of input. AL: I would look at the opportunity to look at the buildings - to make something different. KS: The whole site plan.... DH: Tie them together, the thread of an idea. This is an interesting idea; I like the sale. But maybe they *could* turn their backs. And they feel a little spread out. With that, the Indigo Block Project was sent to Design Committee.

WR left. KS was recused from the next item. The next item was a presentation of the **Harrison Albany Block Project**. Bill Gause (BG) of Leggat McCall introduced the Project. BG: We are here to talk about the accumulated site - we feel the highest and best use is multifamily housing. We have spent a year looking at the urban design, the program, and the zoning, and have decided on something which frees up the site for other improvements, for additional height. We have socialized that with the neighborhood; they are willing to listen. This is an expanded PNF. Alfred Wojciechowski (AW) of CBT noted the locus using an aerial photo, and highlighted the context. He noted the rough site strategy, and pointed out East Canton Street, lined

with historic tenement buildings. He noted pedestrian connections. AW: Strategies which might have a space in the center - that may be reflected on the next site (block). (Shows a site section, noting the stepping up and down.) Both new buildings step down to 70' (at East Canton); the height across Albany is allowed to be 200'.

DH: What height is allowed *here*? AW: 120'. But there is also variation in the neighborhood. (Shows the site and ground floor plan.) There is the notion of a two-sided street along East Dedham, with retail and varied uses. (Shows a series of elevations, half a block at a time - coincident with their phasing, not mentioned.) East Canton is at a lower scale to carry across the notion of the other side of the street. (Shows more views, including one from Harrison looking down East Dedham.) This is not some kind of wall of a building, but a kind of silhouetting. There is spillover space for artists in the center. (Shows black & white line views. Then back to color views, in the center.) There are stoops on the streets along East Canton.

DH: The extent of the swap, I get. But I'm confused by the retention of the Gambro Building. It's not a good use there, and it's out of synch. On the Cathedral housing side, the street is already very eroded. It would be better if a 70' street wall was continued - which might eliminate some of the shock of a 200' building. I'm not convinced by the space at the corner; I'm more convinced by the greens. I would love to understand why the [Gambro] tenant has survived. We worked on Albany Street, on 601.... You are right on the tenement buildings. I would like to see the development respond to the character of the buildings across the street. Stoops, but more direct. Create a street with something of an asymmetrical nature. DC: I would like to understand more of the pedestrian ways and alleys in this area. AW: This sets up cues for their continuation. DC: We should discuss this in Committee. Another question is the center.... AW noted that they were setting up a view of 'Chimney Row' a block away. DC: Also, the depth of the garage is the key to your planting. AL: On the site plan, I appreciate the thinking, and setting up zones. I especially like the pedestrian green - I would minimize the other two. I want to echo what David said. Take some volume from [building] A, and give it to the intermediate scale along Harrison. That space doesn't seem so valuable as a park. And the 120' building works so much better. 200' is overwhelming. MD: We need to back up a bit, to understand the zoning. What's as-of-right, what's allowed - so we can appreciate the changes. I'm not convinced of the height. DM: Those connections go all the way up to Mass Ave - I'd like to see the larger diagram. I echo the other comments, but won't repeat them. I appreciate the distinction between the streets, but then I want to see more of the strategy along Dedham. Large lobbies, tiny retail...make a stronger gesture. Really set it up. MD: Public comments?

Cindy Stoner: I live on East Brookline Street. You said the height would reflect the buildings on the other side? There are none. AW: There would be, in the future. Ken O'Donahue: What's there now, is 7 stories. Down Albany, those are 9 stories. At Cathedral, 13 and 10 stories. But the Cathedral project, especially with the height in the South End, is ONLY used as a bad example. MD: Clearly there's a need to understand the zoning. DH noted it was less here than the area north. Derrick Valentine: I like the idea of the leafy, tree-lined feel of East Canton. This falls short; it would be better with a continuous row. This area suffers from a mix of residents and other uses...green spaces can suffer if not appropriately managed or controlled. Helen

Simmons: There *is* a residential building on East Dedham, it's not completely commercial. With that, the Harrison Albany Block Project was sent to Design Committee.

KS returned. The next item was a presentation of the **Waterside Place Phase 1B Project**. John Drew (JD) introduced the project, noting the presence of Jim Doolin and the Massport team. He underscored the notion of differentiating this from the first Phase, and noted the location. He also noted the planned Massport garage. JD: This will complete the Congress Street edge. David Nagahiro (DN) of CBT presented the design, first showing a longitudinal section that illustrated the services, Silver Line, parking, and all the program elements above. Individual photos of the context were followed by an aerial axon, with DN pointing out elements of the context, and noting (Massport) garage entry locations. DM: What is the height of the garage? Jim D: 8 levels. DN showed a perspective of the existing building, then the idea of extending an active podium - and their second floor garage. DN: The tower is set back in part, but it comes to the street. We got advice on scaling elements from [Massport consultants] Tim Love and David Gamble. (Shows a maxing volume diagram, then axonometric floor layers from bottom to top. Starting from the ground, DN noted program elements, and the connection to the Massport Garage on the second floor. Shows the lower amenity spaces, then the ones at the top, and the 'softer' open roof. DN: Our fenestration strategies - there are crafted details in the area, and strong industrial volumes. The tower is metal, with accent pieces. We have angled panels in deeply inset windows, which enhance the light, and are more glowing. There is a 3-story treatment along Congress.

DM: Can you walk us through the streetscape? What's to the left of the parking entry? DN: Loading. (Notes other site constraints.) DS: Could you shift the facade? It's a little relentless. DM: It would be good to understand both sides of the street. Really this, and the site to the west, are the last chances to introduce uses. DH: When you come to Committee - if you could bring a model going several blocks around. You know the planning. Unfortunately, the problem is ALL of the buildings are maximizing their volume. You're doing a better job breaking them down, but still it's a series of graphic rectilinear volumes. There are not too many opportunities left to address the issue. I would like to see any other strategies that introduce something unexpected. I appreciate the depth of the window frame, and the detail. That has a lot of potential. If there's a way to introduce an angle.... MD: What is the depth of the windows? [6 inches.] The relentless flatness of the Waterside Phase 1A - we just *wish* this building would go different. The punched windows have some value, but we would like to see more. AL: We'd like to see the other sides, and what your intentions are. With that, the Waterside Place Phase 1B Project was sent to Design Committee.

DM was recused from the next item. The next item was a presentation of the **150 Seaport Boulevard Project**. Robb Halter (RH) of Elkus/Manfredi introduced himself and the Project, noting the program. RH: Currently it's three sites, including ABC and the Whiskey Priest. There's a limited parcel area...we're the little postage stamp on the corner that was left out of the planning. We are now going through the Municipal Harbor Planning process. Howard Elkus (HE)

showed a photo of the existing conditions. HE: Cronin had gone to the Chamber of Commerce speech, where the Mayor encouraged a bolder building. What's interesting about *this* street is that this is where I-90 comes out. It goes coast-to-coast; this is an iconic moment. WE use the architecture of the Harbor itself for inspiration - sails, ships. (Shows sketches...the inspiration.) This is a building that twists on the site, and opens up. We are expanding and completing Harborwalk around the site. (Shows a series of views.) When you're looking at the building, you're looking at the Harbor. (Shows the view from the Harbor.) The lower two floors are very active. The same staggering is on the back. (View down Seaport Boulevard.) The building is staggered, stepped up, over your head, to invite you around. (Shows the plan of the ground floor, showing expansion of the Harborwalk, with a water feature, and the restaurant and residential lobby entries.)

RH: We are working with BTD on the straightening of the roadway. We gain site area, but it's also a better sidewalk. The 115 KVA line is a constraint. The restaurant is two-story, with a deck on the second floor. We are addressing FEMA at grade, so the mechanicals have to move up, and the building will be adaptable. Part of the third floor is an amenity space; the upper floors have variations (doing the twist). (Shows a section.) Parking is below grade on 3 levels. (Shows the Seaport Boulevard plan, noting universal accessibility around the entire edge, noting ramped conditions [for FEMA]. Shows precedents.) There is very little ground here; some of this is over water. (Shows more views of the pedestrian level, around the sides.) Stanchions support overhead lighting. There is a 10' wide sidewalk, and a 9' car pull-off in addition behind that. We see the connector space between the buildings as a 'little pocket park' with an art wall.

LE: I'd like to know more about the cars on the sidewalk - how they move, and more detail on the areas - how they are articulated - that flank the connector space. DC: And the grading. RH: We are taking advantage of the street work to raise the utility issue. LE: Bring the warmth of the ship's planking further forward. DH: It would be useful to find how your ground plane works in conjunction with that next door, and further out the Pier. RH: Understood. We deliberately didn't show that, and wanted to distinguish our car area. LE: It's an opportunity to do something interesting. DC: The continuity of how it works down Seaport Boulevard...are you sure about the dimensions? DS: The largest open space is most opposite the water. I wonder if there's the opportunity to shift. The dynamic of the building is so strong - I'm not sure how it translates into glass. RH: We are extending the glass out to that point. AL: This is an ingenious way of using a tight site. I would need to understand more about the whole site. Sadly, so much of the water view is thrown away for service space. Angling toward the street is a wonderful invitation - I'd like to extend it all the way around. DH: The small footprint of the building is a blessing in the context of the neighborhood around you. I appreciate the sense of arrival. The torqueing is a genius move; it can make its neighbors look good. I'd like to see a model to understand how tight that space is between the buildings. And there is a ground floor interface. I'm not troubled by your cantilevering out, but I want to see it in Committee. KS: This is quite elegant. But I am troubled also about the ground plane, if it can open up more. The two floors at least look interesting; more there might make it more interesting - it looks cut off. A gentleman in the audience stood up and gave a simple 'thumbs-up.' With that, the 150 Seaport Boulevard Project was sent to Design Committee.

The next item was a presentation of the (very early) **One Bromfield Project**. MD clarified to the audience and Commissioners that there was NO vote necessary - this Project essentially remains in Design Committee. Shadra introduced herself as head of Design at Midwood. Shadra: The property was acquired in the 1990's; a PNF was submitted in 2008. We are here for your input - the architects are now Adrian Smith and Gordon Gill (GG) of Chicago. GG noted the model. GG: My colleague has been working in Boston for decades - he did [with SOM Chicago] Rowses Wharf, and the Manulife Building. (Notes the site, and the LaGrassa's building which is not part of the site.) We consider the alley NOT that; we have no back side. (Shows a height/program diagram. Gives stats, including the 119 condo unit and 300 rental residential programs, 683' height, 235 parking spaces, 30,000 SF retail, 420 bike parking spaces. 59 stories total, 6 in the podium.) Our process - we try to understand our environment well. Wind is a factor in Boston, even more so than Chicago. This is positioned as a point tower, because it gives less visibility from those around us. Sharp corners create vortexes, etc. - curves shed wind. Cutting away at the lower levels reduces the wind coming down, and gives opportunities, and more daylight at the ground plane. (DS left.)

GG then showed an image of their fit into the towers of the area, in skyline and related view/diagram forms. He noted sustainability was always a factor in their designs, and noted the different aspects they are considering. GG: The facade is considered from a comfort point of view, but also a visual one. A triple silver glass is proposed. We will achieve at least a gold LEED rating. The elevations are modern, not necessarily contextual, but the building understands its role in the City. The roof of the podium is considered as a fifth facade. On the ground plane, the retail is fully around the corner. There are two lobbies on Bromfield. (Shows the parking lane strategy.) We are working out the best circulation with the City. WE don't want any part of the project **undesigned**; we see the lanes through as a court, the public art of the building. In the retail zone, we are picking up on the character of the area [in the podium], relating to the neighbors in that way. The parking is not simply screened. It's mechanically ventilated...we've designed a pocket which sets back, lit with a fritted glass, warm. It's a warm palette. We are using metal, or a terra cotta baguette, or stone to create a texture...the texture is beginning to get there. (Shows a series of view studies.) We like the warmth; it relates to the City. The steps in the building are orchestrated by the context, as they are shifted around. The experience of living is distributed around the building, even lower down. Very few buildings allow you to look up or down on yourself. A gentleman in the audience (the 'thumbs-up' guy): This is one of the sites where we can build tall - let's do it!

DH asked about the as-of-right noted. GG explained the relationships to the context in terms of shadows, etc. GG: The base zoning is 155'; this needs relief. LE: The zoomed-out view.... The texture of the pedestrian realm. Walk us through that experience, and the *laneway*. DM: We need more discussion on the laneway. Two movements were mentioned. It would be very interesting to know how it fits into the bigger context - they may all remain the same, or change. It's not immediately clear. KS: I have a question about the height. Compared to the as-of-right...what are we doing? This is five-and-a-half times that.... DAC: This started in 2008 at about two-and-a-half times. That's just a multiplier. That older zoning (which may need updating) also

had a series of sites on which to consider more height. Nearby, for example, we have 33 Arch and Filene's. PM: We haven't shied from height. MD: We have relied on advice from the BRA. But we should have a discussion about the public value in the architecture - this is a beautiful building. DH: I agree with the notion of a beautiful building, but I'm not sure about the other PDA sites. Preservation is often associated with height, in the New York City preservation tradeoffs. How does this fit into the context, for example, with the Ladder District? AL: As for the tower itself, we've been asking for a slender tower of height and beauty; this is it. My concern is that podium - does it fit into the City or not? In New York, some buildings are not built to the lot line; spaces were made to attract the public. I would ask the Proponent to consider a major public space on the lower floors. You are right on the 5th facade. It's got to be fabulous. But the treatment of the first 3-4 stories is critical. MD recognized the public.

Deborah Blair: I live at 45 Province. I have been an early adopter of Downtown Crossing, and appreciate the effort the BRA has made. The zoning is from the 1960's; the Ladder Block, from 1998; there should be a moratorium, unless we can revamp. The sites along Washington, and Bromfield. Accessibility, open space, (circulation,) and traffic on the narrowest streets in the City. Lovejoy Wharf has NO parking. We need a plan for the Ladder District. Alexander: I think the area is well built out. Greg Galer of the BPA: I'm a little frustrated that this is here. We had a comment letter that I'm holding...I think going to the BCDC is not a good step in the process. How can this be assessed without planning in process? This will unleash a rash of tall buildings along Washington...they all came with benefits. How can we consider Washington etc. without revised planning in place? Ed Logue, looking at the Seaport plan, asked Where is Bromfield Street? This does not help Bromfield. It's a great tower, but at the wrong place in the City. We need to think about these things differently. Will you see the sky? How much? The street level engagement is important. I'm concerned about the upper level parking. In short, if this moves forward, zoning has gone haywire. PM: We're also concerned [about Bromfield]. Sam Blessing: I'm a trustee of 333 Washington, abutters. Is it possible to bring up the plan? Province is jammed all day long. How much will be added? It's tight, and will get a LOT tighter. Cyrus Donovan: I'm an architecture student. The secondary volumes reading - what they are might help the legibility. Is there not a way to use the parking from Province? GG: There's no direct access. (A discussion ensued, which also included Adrian Smith.) MD: We've also raised concerns; these will be addressed. The Project remains in Design Committee.

There being no further items for discussion, a motion was made to adjourn, and the meeting was duly adjourned at 9:41 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was scheduled for May 3, 2016. The recording of the April 5, 2016 Boston Civic Design Commission meeting was digitized and is available at the Boston Redevelopment Authority.