

DRAFT MINUTES

BOSTON CIVIC DESIGN COMMISSION

The meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was held on Tuesday, April 7th, 2015, starting in the BRA Board Room, 9th Floor, Boston City Hall, and beginning at 5:22 p.m.

Members in attendance were: Michael Davis (Co-Vice-Chair); Deneen Crosby, Linda Eastley, David Hacin, Andrea Leers, David Manfredi, Paul McDonough (Co-Vice-Chair), William Rawn, Daniel St. Clair, Kirk Sykes, and Lynn Wolff. No one was absent. Also present was David Carlson, Executive Director of the Commission. Representatives of the BSA were present. Michael Cannizzo was 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, March 19, in the BOSTON HERALD.

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

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

Votes were passed for signature. David Manfredi (DM) and Lynn Wolff (LW) were recused from the first item. MD first asked for a report from the Review Committee on the **AC Hotel / South End Project**; David Carlson (DAC) noted that this was a project proposed on the parcel otherwise containing the Ink Block in the Harrison/Albany Plan Area, like the Ink Block buildings not taking advantage of the enhanced zoning in the area. Nevertheless, the Project was nearly 100,000 SF (the BCDC threshold) and at a highly visible location; review was recommended. It was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed AC Hotel / South End Project at 223-237 Albany Street in the South End neighborhood.

DM and LW returned. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Congress Square Project**. DAC noted that this was a project proposed on the parcel generally known as the Fidelity Block, a group of buildings offered for sale by Fidelity Investments and purchased for redevelopment by Related Beal. Although the project contains a lot of rehabilitation, a good deal of new building elements (over 90,000 SF) and a transformed public space are proposed, and the total SF at 458,000 SF well exceeds the BCDC threshold. Review was recommended.

It was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed Congress Square Project in the Downtown Financial District.

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Clippership Wharf Project NPC**. DAC noted that this was a project seen and approved by the BCDC in 2003; a new lead developer (Lend Lease) and a new architect (The Architectural Team) proposed some modifications to the prior design. The program was similar, but with some shifts. At over half a million SF, a new vote to review was recommended. It was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the revised schematic design for the proposed Clippership Wharf PDA NPC in the East Boston neighborhood.

DM was recused from the next item. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Fan Pier Parcel D Project**. DAC reported that this Parcel was one of the last remaining Fan Pier parcels for review and at an important corner on the Harbor. Review was recommended because the Project (at over 250,000 SF) exceeds the BCDC threshold, is a significant presence in the public realm, and review was a condition of the original vote recommending approval of Fan Pier. It was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed Fan Pier Parcel D Project in the Boston Fan Pier PDA within the South Boston Waterfront District.

DM remained recused. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **375-399 Chestnut Hill Avenue Project NPC**. DAC noted that the Commission approved this project in 2013; a new developer (National Development) and a new architect (Elkus/Manfredi, with Stantec as landscape architect) proposed some modifications to the prior design. The program was similar, but with a shift in the residential component to elderly residential. A new vote to review was recommended. It was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the modified schematic design for the proposed Cleveland Circle Mixed-Use Project NPC at the Circle Cinema site at 375-399 Chestnut Hill Avenue in the Brighton neighborhood.

DM returned. The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **3200 Washington Street Project**. Andrea Leers (AL) reported that good progress was seen in Committee - this was a good project - the main change that was positive was the shifting of the auto entry. Kevin Deabler (KD) of RODE Architects noted a change in massing due to community process input; the strategy on the Iffley side was now similar to that on the other. (Changes were shown on an

axonometric diagram and on a revised model. KD then showed a plan with the change in the garage access, and views looking up, then down Washington.) KD noted the change in the view from the north, and then showed the view down Iffley: We were looking for ways to bring the sense of the main Project up into that. We have modified the entry - it's now very glassy. The view through is stronger and the entry is less recessive, but still discrete. (Shows another plan and a new section.) There are no people on top, because that portion [of the roof terrace] is right outside of units.

Linda Eastley (LE): Can one get into the space? KD: You can find your way if you are a resident or a visitor. It's like a backyard. There's a pathway, not a barrier. We had a stair down to the street, but that was *too* connected. DM: So, the height hasn't changed, there's just the shift in the mass. The entry is better, although still very modest. But that's your choice. It's a very nice project. With that, it was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the proposed 3200 Washington Street Project, at the intersections of Iffley and Montebello roads, in the Egleston Square area of the Jamaica Plain neighborhood.

DM and LW were recused from the next item. David Hacin (DH) arrived. The next item was a presentation of the **AC Hotel /South End Project**. Ted Tye (TT) of National Development gave a quick introduction to the Project, noting its locus. Kent Knight (KK) of Elkus/Manfredi presented the design, noting first that the building faced onto Albany Street, then showing the circulation and the site plan. He noted trees, and the handicapped ramp up to the Whole Foods. KK: There is a continuation of the tree-lined 'street' through to Harrison. (Shows the future development of the block; notes the progress on the Ink Block.) The third [Ink Block] building is nearly done, and there will be a condo building on the corner south of the hotel. The other corner is less certain. (Notes accessible paths.) There is planting screening the parking at the back, transferring to the side. Antonio Catalan started AC Hotels in Europe.... (Shows ground floor; notes circulation along the street, the width of the sidewalk, the breakfast area, the upper floors, the glass curtainwall at the [north] end.) At the ends, the rooms shift orientation. On the facade, there is slightly tipping standing seam zinc on the south, and flat metal elsewhere. The building is faceted on both long sides. The signage faces Chinatown. We are playing with the randomness of the metal panning, in and out. The breakfast lounge has a walled garden (with the parking beyond).

Bill Rawn (WR): Is that a billboard in the foreground? TT: Yes. DH: What is the story? TT: It was under a long contract when we purchased the property. We are able to remove it when that lapses. KK then showed elevations, and some metal detail precedents. LE: Back to the site plan...(KK shows)...I'm trying to understand it as a pedestrian along Albany Street coming into the site. It seems awkward *here* (indicates with laser)...rather than interrupt the flow with traffic twice, then shift - why not align with the building? KK showed the pedestrian routes through the site. DH: What is the route to Whole Foods from SOBO? (KK indicated on the plan.) I would reconsider the route, make it more gracious. I question the stair along the edge.... TT:

Those are built. Kirk Sykes (KS) asked to see the site plan again, then the ground floor plan. He noted the uses and activation along the sidewalk. KS: What happens during off hours? How is this animated? TT: (Shows the elevation.) The street is owned by Mass DOT there; its configuration must remain. We are limited in what we can do there. To David's point, the route from South Boston is becoming more important. We deliberately did NOT want to include a restaurant. The edge is glass, but we want the (active) uses to go deeper into the site, into other venues. Exercise, etc. will be used along the corridor. Deneen Crosby (DC): The street edge is important to make the passage pleasant.

MD: What are other issues to discuss in Committee? DH: I'm impressed with the progress on the Ink Block; I'm going through the area more. You used the word 'slightly' when talking about the canting. I would urge you to be stronger; it's an important view. Sepia has a strong, iconic frame at the corner for the [Ink Block] Project. I encourage you to be bolder here. Add interest. It will also be seen from the highway. AL: This comment is really in three pieces. I echo David's comments. The Ink Block has a nice commonality, in three parts. This doesn't have to *so* blend in with the fabric of the housing that it merges in - it should feel different. There is a sea of paving, of parking. I can't help but feel that I'm stuck in a sea of asphalt. There is nothing between this and Whole Foods. Be really *intentional* in how you go through the block. WR: I agree with the comments. There is no respite. Can we see a block plan? (This is done.) The Whole Foods parking is suburban, and it is exacerbated on your site by the tandem parking. MD asked about the scale of the building: What else is limiting you? The high-rise code? TT: Not necessarily. What's more important is the size of the hotel; about 200 keys is right. A 15-story structure didn't feel right. MD: Interesting. Good to hear, but nevertheless it comes across as [overmodest]. With that, the AC Hotel Project was sent to Design Committee.

DM and LW returned. KS left. MD noted a time glitch on the agenda. The next item was a presentation of the **Congress Square Project**. Amy Kortes (AK) of Arrowstreet gave a brief introduction then presented the design, first noting the locus (the 'Fidelity Block') and then showing a diagram of the block. AK: These are good old building bones. 40 Water Street had a prior addition on its low part. The name of the Project, Congress Square, is the name of Quaker Lane on an old City Atlas map. (Shows, using detailed massing axonometric diagrams, the different components of the Project.) We balance the judicious use of existing buildings and selected additions - all dwarfed by the surrounding buildings. But there are glimpses and slivers through...(Shows a precedent.) The Laneway is a notion of reactivating old lanes and areas, as in Europe, with active uses. (Shows before and after views of Quaker Lane re-imagined.) We are proposing a kind of internal street...connecting through...and dealing with floor levels. WR: Can you walk through without going through security? AK: Yes. WR: And that's the intent of the developer? Peter Spellios (PS) of Related Beal: Yes.

AK noted the changes: We are tabling the entry curb cuts into the site, using all pedestrian-friendly paving. (Shows how the service works.) We use different zones for loading/service at different hours. We are changing Water Street, creating small bump-outs at the corners [for corner retail entries] and a drop-off in the center. The entry will be made

accessible. Daniel St. Clair (DS) asked about details, and what was in the basement. AK: Retail (shows section). There is no parking. The streetscape will be a series of smaller interventions. There are some changes - to an *existing* bridge [re-cladding], and other elements like canopies, which invite you in. (Shows views from further out, into the site.) We want to emphasize entry. (Shows the corner treatment of 40 Water, with copper insets and enlarged windows.) The additions...at 54 Devonshire, the buildings aren't matching exactly; they are an assembly. (Notes massing strategy, the reveal/setback to set off the adjacent building.) There is a second-level datum, but glass at the base. On 15-19 Congress, we use stacked, 'floating' floor plates - the shifting creates patios. One unit to each floor. This doesn't take away from the existing architecture. On 40 Water, our addition is more subtle, because it's viewed from further away. We have deliberately shifted it back away from the corner, and shifted it in, so that it becomes a jewel-like box on top.

AL: Can you tell me what's different about the fire escapes? Are they just painted? AK: Fidelity restored [and repainted] them recently. LE: Lighting will make such a difference. Your before-and-after suggests that; it's all brighter. So think about that. And use the canopies and other features. DC: The fire escapes are great. I walk through there a lot; the space is smaller than suggested. Lighting is important. With the connections to the Old State House and more, I'm excited about the use of the alleyway. WR: So much about this is exciting - the mix of uses. We walk through there all the time...and that's the problem. [Congress] is a very narrow sidewalk, with cars rushing past. What more, on a Project like this, can you do for Congress Street? Can the sidewalk come deeper into the building? Water and Devonshire are okay, but Congress is a scary edge. A brief discussion ensued on this topic.

DH: This is an exciting project. Anything you can do within the building to address Bill's point would be good. I like the diagram of the rotated hotel addition...I feel it's been toned down a bit...I like the peeling away. The stacked floors at 15 Congress are very appealing. The only thing that concerns me is the bland glass box on top of 40 Water. At night it's fine, but in the light of day, less so. I'd like to understand the views. The model would be useful...something more interesting [would be better]. MD: I think the addition will be very visible from Post Office Square. AL: I appreciate your knitting together the buildings, which now don't come together. You walk past. A question - at the prow building [40 Water], three stories are more problematic. They would be less so in mid-block, or that part - it will always be difficult to make it work. AK: We will come back with more views. Paul McDonough (PM): It will be visible from Faneuil Hall. AL: You have a lot of good thinking. I would think about how that [addition] would work, is detailed, sets back more. DM: I think Andrea's right that it's hard. The strategy on the others works. It feels like you're pushing up against the inside of the parapet, and extending the geometry - so consider the geometry. Signage [on the project] will be very important. Some pieces you show make me nervous - you have to be careful. With that, the Congress Square Project was sent to Design Committee.

The next item was a presentation of the **Clippership Wharf Project NPC**. Nick Iselin (NI) of Lend Lease introduced his team, including Michael Liu (ML), Andrea Stebbins, and Mike Doherty of TAT, and Robb Adams (RA) of The Halvorson Company. NI: The Project has been

around for a while. It last came here about 10 years ago, with over 400 units; it was too large, and had too much (underground) parking. NI noted the locus and other nearby projects. NI: Hodge Boiler Works was transacted and should move. (Shows site aerial of existing conditions.) The City intends to activate ferry shuttles. Carlton Wharf (indicates) was sold to Maverick Gardens, and half of our affordable housing units are there. It was 400 condominiums before, but now it's a condo and rental mix, with a possible conversion to all condo. We have reorganized the notion of views, in part around the phasing. (Shows views along Marginal toward Bunker Hill, then views out toward the Harbor and the skyline.) The parking is almost all the way out of the ground (shows plan, noting entries, noting FPA spaces). The Chapter 91 license has been applied for. (Notes their strategies for site planning.) We have 'landing pads' - we are building for 100 years out, not 50. The FPA spaces are at the perimeter, on Harborwalk. You rise up *here* (shows a point on the ground floor plan). NI noted the relationship to the Portside Project across Lewis Street. NI: There is a more traditional shoreline there. Above that, it's more open - we are working with Charles River Boating, making it a living shoreline. So the experience will change dramatically during the course of the day. We have eco-planting, a tidal marsh with fluctuations. Harborwalk there is more a boardwalk. Then we go back to traditional above. (Describes the courtyard above the garage, and the MBTA headhouse.) We embrace the idea of commuting via bicycle; there is daily bike storage, and cafes. We are reinforcing transportation nodes, using the FPAs as keys. NI then began walking the Commissioners around the site, using a series of vignettes. AL and DH noted there was a 3-D confusion with all the grade changes. DH: You *really* need a model. LW: Can the road (to the north) be aligned with Clippership Lane? NI: If we do that, it creates more leftover [orphaned] space. DH: You could shift the U-shaped building down. NI: We are limited by the T infrastructure there.... A dog park is the No. 1 desire from the community. (Goes through a few plans briefly.)

ML: The site is large enough for several buildings. The residential rental units are in the U-shape; the condos are outboard. The U-shaped building behind is part of the Boston Housing Authority buildings, more the vocabulary of courtyard buildings; we are taking that quality. The three condo buildings shape a U, too, but there it's more about the water. (Some discussion ensued.) AL and WR asked for sections, which were shown. LE: The sections should include the Heritage [BHA building].... LW: ...And go all the way to the water. DH: You may want to think about the detailed parts.... (Some back and forth ensues, again because the contour/section moves are difficult to grasp.) WR: The unexplained issue about grade - is blocking the view of the water from the street. The presentation shortly resumed; ML showed views from the water, looking out toward the water/skyline, a birds'-eye view, a sideways view.

LW: The buildings are all the same height? What are the materials? ML: Yes. We are using Petrarch panels. LW: In the view looking in, what is the red building doing? I think it should connect. LE: From the water view, the tidal action gives the edge energy. From the building beyond, its courtyard is flat, larger; there is less happening; it's not connected. Think about the alignment of the last building. Another series of discussions ensued. MD: The sequence of views is compartmentalized. DH: The concern is that the view - is a wall. The decision not to align the street. The limitation of the view from the [back] courtyard. I understand the strategy of the garage and the elevation, but the buildings appear too big, too flat, and are all the same

height. Maybe one building is steel and goes higher. ML: We could add to the building footprint - say, on Building #3. AL: The concern is that walking from the sides - and ground level views looking in, etc. - how integrated this is into the larger City blocks. MD: This has all the ingredients - a better mix, less cars, a better water relationship. But this needs to be right, to be a benchmark.

RA presented the landscape / site design. He quickly moved through precedents and examples such as Channel Center Park. RA: The notion of a living shoreline is key. We may not rebuild [some of] the existing sea walls. A lot of the topography reveals itself. We are working (shows views, sketches) with Charles River Boating... RA noted the Brooklyn Bridge park. RA: We will reclaim a **lot** of old granite and use it on site. (Shows steps down, then a comparison.) We are bringing low tide to the uplands, with an intertidal marsh in between. (Shows views out, noting an amphitheater space, with a proposed community program.) The slope might seem like a lot, but Portside has a 6-foot grade change that you don't notice, and we think this will be more subtle than it appears.

DS: Is the Project phased? NI: Buildings 1, 2, and 3 will be in the first phase. We will do piles for all the buildings in the first phase. If we are successful, we will likely roll right into the next phase. DM: I agree [with Mike] - the water's edge is the best part of this. But I don't feel like I'm invited.... There is a disconnect to the streets which makes you feel unwelcome, like arriving at a resort. I understand the problems, but it has to be more connected. If it's not horizontal, how do I see it? I feel it's separated. DC: Marginal Street is as important as Harborwalk. So, that connection is key. WR: Model that - show the topo, and adjacent sites. Show Marginal with photos, etc. AL: Ground level views. DH: The facades look sheer, and long. I want to understand them more - the ins and outs, the color changes. With that, the Clippership Wharf Project NPC was sent to Design Committee.

DM was recused for the next item. The next item was a presentation of the **Fan Pier Parcel D Project**. Richard Martini (RM) of The Fallon Company noted that this was the 7th parcel out of 9 total to be reviewed by the BCDC. RM: April 2016 is the projected finish date for Parcel C. Note the buildings on the model...there is a 170' height limit here, and 270,000 SF. There is an increase in cultural space on the site to over 20,000 SF, making a total of 111,000 SF. (Notes he does not have the correct model insert.) AL asked about the buildings on the model - which have been reviewed. DAC pointed out the ones yet to come: Parcel E, and Parcel H. John Martin (JM) of Elkus/Manfredi presented the design. He noted the site plan and locus, and showed the parking ramp location (in other buildings). JM: The garage is a continuous boat section. (Shows the site, the perimeter roads, the drop-off, the lobby, the second floor program, the upper floors of condominiums.) 160' x 180' is not ideal [for residential], but we are creating an 'L,' and open space, to maximize the views. This provides residential frontage to the Fan Pier 'community' - we want to relate to Parcel C, but be different (shows a view image). Christian Galileo (CG) of Elkus/Manfredi then quickly showed a section and perspective views. He noted the angled shapes, corresponding to unit layouts. CG: It's a pixilated approach. We are thinking of using a natural stone, limestone. On the other side, there is a roof terrace above the podium. (Shows the detail of the wall.) There is movement in the facade; the balconies have some privacy - you're not seeing into your neighbor's unit. At the end, we are extending

the skin of the penthouse down to create variety. JM: There is no 'ask' tonight; this complies with both Chapter 91 and the PDA. One thing that's important is the two-story expression at the base.

LE: Is there common space? RM: That's lower. The third floor terrace is not accessible; it has units, with a simple green roof beyond. LE: That's probably better.... DH asked about the proposed building on Parcel E. RM: That was an L-shape; we have realigned it to create a space fronting the Harbor (instead of the SE corner). AL: As a continuation of the necklace - this blocks the views of the blockbusters behind it - the lower height is effective. WR asked about the datum (along Fan Pier Boulevard). RM: That was a two-story datum. It hasn't quite worked. We went to a one-story on Parcel C, to give it more a human scale, and were considering the same on D, and part of the program (on the second floor) relates to the residential. So it's not yet decided. WR: You have lost something if the two-story datum doesn't continue. RM: We will keep that in mind. DH: The building could erode, could open up more, at the base. Above, the end could be more like a prow, even as much as it is already shaped. AL: Sculpted...it could even overhang, as something on a base.

A discussion regarding the sculpted quality ensued. Commissioners generally liked the approach, especially the balcony at the corner. DH: It's great to see a different height. Do anything you can do to sculpt it more, shape it - the base and the tower. AL: I guess we've seen the park. With that, the Fan Pier Parcel D Project was sent to Design Committee.

DM remained recused for the next item. The next item was a presentation of the **375-399 Chestnut Hill Avenue Project NPC**. TT again: This is like a day/night double header. We couldn't help ourselves - we thought there were some things that could be made better. Our goal was to change as little as possible, but improve the Project. We think it will encourage more investment in the area. The program is basically the same - same units, hotel rooms, commitments, and an active ground floor. What's changed? The first thing was the throat of the garage - and the circulation was awkward. The mix of uses intermingling was not financially. The amount of stories is the same...but there are now two distinct buildings. The SF is less, and there is less traffic [due to senior housing/independent living].

JM showed the footprint change. LE: Is the corner still a restaurant? JM: Yes, but it's still there now in an reentrant corner. (Shows a section comparison.) The key is separation...the story is how it fronts the spaces with which it interacts. There are four, including the courtyard. Cassidy Park: it forms an edge to the playground and park. The Street: is emphasized as an important frontage. The courtyard space: is open to the public, and the garage entry has been moved to the side. The rear piazza: is an urban room, and a turnaround - but more a landscaped open space. The turnaround also serves as a drop-off for the hotel. The independent living entry also has a drop-off. The garage is shared, including retail customers. The independent living program has a lobby which also has a secondary opening to the park. (Shows view from the park.) The building needs to be strong against the park. The copse of trees will be enhanced; the building anchors the park. On Chestnut Hill Avenue, we have restored the Circle

Cinema sign on the top, and aligned it now to front the circle [of Cleveland Circle]. On the reentrant corner, we think it important that the use there have an outdoor space which addresses the Circle. So we have pulled the building back, and that gives us more corner units. The front facades are treated differently; there is more detail there. At the top, the windows are bays, at the outer edge they are co-planar with the windows below. The brick in front is different than the brick going back, and the brick on the hotel. On the inside, the balconies are incised. All units have a balcony; it serrates the edge against the sky. The dining room does come out to the courtyard. (Shows views, illustrations of the described pieces, the rear elevation, the rear piazza.)

MD: What are the widths [in the courtyard]? JM: About 90', tapering to 40' between the buildings at the end. LE asked about the garage entry in the courtyard view. JM explained, also noting the garage limits, and the fact that real planting is possible in the courtyard (indicates locus). He returned to a view of the green-framed piazza turnaround. JM: This used to be the rear, and now it's a facade in its own right. Against the tracks, the facade is very simple, per that [Brookline] neighborhood's request. At the hotel front, the windows are larger and fill the frame; along the tracks, they are more punched. DS: Is the hotel flagged yet? TT: It's likely the Hilton family, limited service. JM showed the plans and elevations, indicating the retail. He showed the reentrant corner restaurant seating, with a path along the building edge. (More plans and elevations.) JM: The north elevation is a path...it's more public up to the lobby, and then more associated with the independent living program common areas. The lower balconies are incised; the upper balconies pop out, and are more random. (Shows the floor plan and layout.) DH: This is the only place this occurs. TT: We did it deliberately to create interest. JM showed a series of plans (including a public space/path diagram), section details, and views.

WR: In your takeover - was this Project approved? TT: Yes, but no PDA. We are filing that simultaneously with the NPC. WR: The reason I ask...the simplification, interior, etc. feel really good. One thing [the Park facade] bothers me.... If that's what the neighborhood wants, then fine. Otherwise, you need a little more shadow, articulation. On the north, you have a responsibility toward the park. [The facade] feels long and planar, very flat. Is this deliberate? A straight line, versus a curve.... JM: It's not a series of townhouses; we wanted this to be a strong wall. There are subtle things - the windows at the top are proud. It is purposely repetitive. DH: I'd like to piggyback on that comment. This is a good project, evolved in good ways. The park facade...it's one building, with a different articulation on Chestnut Hill Avenue, on the park, in the courtyard. If that interior courtyard faced the park, it would be so much stronger. I feel like the randomized balconies are not necessary. I would be willing to trade the review.... MD: The internal treatment convinces; the outside is relentless. AL: For me, the massing and program all work well. About the cladding - this is one of the buildings with brick, and then an upper material used as though it goes away. That never works for me. But then you have three different bricks, and different material. It doesn't work. It's too chopped up, too top-heavy. I encourage you to take a step back, and look for other ways to scale the building that make this one place. The awkward strategy doesn't do what you intended, which seems to be a reduction in perception. It can be more open on Chestnut Hill Avenue, but not hugely. This is a good opportunity to be more refined. There are all oddities viewed at the end....

Eva Webster: I want to echo - the random balconies don't reflect the character of balconies. They're a little goofy; I would prefer them as inside. I hear your comment about top heavy, but if it's sloping away, like a mansard, that would be good. It looks like a later addition; if done right, it works. It would make the building less overbearing. No one thinks it needs to project a strong wall over the park. I have a problem with the gray line extending; it's not like the neighborhood; we are not Fan Pier, etc. The prior design had a series of bays with shadow lines, etc. But a lot is really good, and improved.

DS: I view the comments [as suggesting] that it should hold the edge of the park - I agree, with the top broken up - but a simple, consistent backdrop. With that, the 375-399 Chestnut Hill Avenue Project NPC was sent to Design Committee.

There being no further items for discussion, a motion was made to adjourn, and the meeting was duly adjourned at 9:06 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was scheduled for May 5, 2015. The recording of the April 7, 2015 Boston Civic Design Commission meeting was digitized and is available at the Boston Redevelopment Authority.