

MINUTES

BOSTON CIVIC DESIGN COMMISSION

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

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

Michael 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 Saturday, January 27, in the BOSTON HERALD.

The first item was the approval of the January 2nd, 2018 Meeting Minutes. A motion was made, seconded, and it was duly

VOTED: To approve the January 2nd, 2018 BCDC Meeting Minutes.

Votes were passed for signature. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Fenway Hotel Project (1241 Boylston Street)**. David Carlson (DAC) noted that the Project was proposed as an as-of-right hotel building, unusual given recent development in this area. The site was a significant corner of Ipswich and Boylston, adjacent to the BAA, with new SF proposed at ~125,000 SF. Review was recommended. It was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the BCDC review the schematic design for the Fenway Hotel Project at 1241 Boylston Street at the corner of Ipswich Street, in the West Fenway Neighborhood .

The next item was a report from Review Committee on the **135 Morrissey Boulevard Project**. DAC noted that this site was far better known as the former home of the Boston Globe, and so well-known and highly visible. The Project was proposed primarily as a rehabilitation, but the changes included site improvements and improvements to its major public facade along Morrissey. Review by the Commission was therefore warranted. The Project was also over 700,000 SF, well over the BCDC threshold. It was duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed 135 Morrissey Boulevard Project on the old Boston Globe site in the Columbia Point Master Plan Area in the Dorchester neighborhood.

The next item was a report from Review Committee on the **5 Washington Street Project**.

DAC noted that this was a very familiar Project to the Commission as it had been reviewed and approved a few years earlier. However, that Project did not proceed and, due to complications around the original development team, the new development team had formally re-submitted the Project as a new PNF. This technically requires a new action by the BCDC. The architect, landscape architect, and design itself have not substantially changed; the building is a floor lower overall in response to community concerns. Therefore, although BCDC review is required, it would not be amiss (should the Commissioners feel inclined after the presentation), to recommend an approval as well, since most of the Commission issues had been worked out for the prior approval. The Project remained over the BCDC threshold of 100,000 SF. It was moved, seconded, and

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

The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **70 Leo Birmingham Parkway Project**. Architect Gary Hendren (GH) presented the updated design. He showed the parking scheme evolution, from 2-way in off of LBPkwy, to one-way in off Centola and out on Lincoln, to one-way in off LBPkwy and out on Lincoln. GH then showed the accompanying changes in plans and ground-floor program and the second means of egress. GH: We have amenity spaces facing Leo Birmingham. There's a unit count change from 82 to 79; we step back at the rear to the neighborhood. The brick maintains a relationship to Roddy Hall. (Shows views of the building - from the SW, noting the change in the corner, now a blade at the entry - and from the NW and the Park. Shows the model, and the neighborhood elevation.)

Linda Eastley (LE): I saw it last. I appreciate the step down to the Park. We were convinced by the traffic consultant that Centola was not usable for the entry, even though that was our preference. David Hacin (DH): I appreciate the change in the circulation and entry; the modification to the facade is very good for Leo Birmingham. Deneen Crosby (DC): The circulation is much improved; I appreciate the change.

Eva Webster (EW) of the IAG: Everyone was thrilled with the glass corner, the developer was able to claim it for extra square footage. It suddenly disappeared. We thought it marked an entry into the neighborhood. For them, to have a public/social space on each floor was a very nice feature. This is nothing to write home about. Now, this is a crisis in modern architecture...it's too harsh; it won't age well. Another version had a rounded corner; we thought that was good as an echo of [530 Western]. The corner moved to the middle, the shark fin, is gimmicky. The neighborhood people are not happy with the design now. The Project is so oppressive.... MD: You should work with the BPDA staff. It's a matter of debate. We have done our work here, and you have heard the opinions [of the Commissioners]. I think I would be comfortable with a stronger corner. With that, and hearing no further public comment, it was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the proposed 70 Leo M. Birmingham Parkway Residential Project at the corner of Lincoln Road in the North Allston-Brighton neighborhood.

The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **Suffolk Downs Redevelopment Phase One Project**. Tom O'Brien (TOB) of HYM introduced the updated Project design. TOB: Many of you have been in the Committee meetings. We are on two tracks - one is this Phase, the other is the planning for the site. Phil Casey (PC) of CBT noted some of the issues addressed, including Belle Island Square and the buildings' relationship. He first showed an aerial view from the south, showing before & afters and noting the changes - facade development, the pedestrian experience in the passageway, the change in alignments, etc. He showed the proposed change to the Belle Isle Square concept, with the splayed corridor/plaza. He noted the commonality of the language between the two buildings, and the 'coastal mews' landscape concept. He showed a new pedestrian circulation diagram, then views of the updated building designs. PC: The Building 1 east [Belle Isle Marsh] elevation is now very straightforward, then cut at the end, echoing the west (which he shows). We have increased the scale of the corner at Belle Isle Square. PC then showed the changes in the mews space, with the improved stepping down, including views from within the space and looking down at it.

DC: And the Plaza is not part of this Phase, right? PC/TOB: Right. We will talk more about that as part of the Masterplan process. DH: I was at the last meeting - the connection through is much better. It was a very good turnaround, a good process. DC: How the open space works and comes in, pieces of the big plan, seem to be working well. LE: I appreciate what you've done to engage, and draw one into the space [i.e. the view into the innovation space]. One caution on the plaza - it should not feel too vehicular. People should know they have a place to alight. One of the first issues was how to pull daylight into the news; the pulling back was very helpful. Andrea Leers (AL): That's at the heart of what can make this work really well. It makes it clear that this is a major way in. And the space between the buildings has developed. The space next to the first office - continue to think about that. It's a loft-like building evolution. Bill Rawn (WR) asked about the changes between [January] 16th and 30th. PC showed the changes to the east and west facades, but didn't have earlier versions of the east. WR asked about the mews elevation. PC showed views and the ends and from above, pointing out the simple treatment strategies in the setbacks. WR: How long is the facade? PC: About 400'. AL: The corner came out well at Belle Isle Square.

MD: If we get lucky, we will expect this to come back with Amazon. This is a really good set of principles, now it's a loft/mill building. Max (resident of the North End): The renderings are great. The scale of the ground floor should not be so high that it's intimidating to people. Especially with the glass, and the framing of retail. Like on K Street in Washington....the framing of the bays is key. TOB: We have given a lot of thought to retail, to your point. EW: This is an example of really clean modern architecture. This one scores high. With that, and hearing no further public comment, it was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the Phase One component of the proposed Suffolk Downs PDA Masterplan and Redevelopment Project at the edge of the East Boston neighborhood and the City of Revere, with the understanding that BCDC review will continue on the Master Plan itself, and that any significant changes will return to the Commission.

The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **Old Colony Phase Three Project**. MD: We are inclined to approve this out of Committee, so please go as quickly as you can. Jay

Syzmanski (JS) of The Architectural Team presented the updated design, showing the overall Old Colony site plan and then the site plan for Phase Three, noting responses to Commission comments. JS: We have moved the management offices to Dorchester Street and have transparent lobby space at the terminus of Joseph Agri Way. Also, shifting the building here allowed saving a tree, and a passageway through the lobby to the other side...not a publicly open passage. On Building B, we have broken up the long facade with a courtyard, and changed one side to three stories to differentiate it. We have the full landscape plan if there are any questions. JS then showed a series of neighborhood elevations, and a series of view vignettes. He showed the section through the lobby aligned with Agri Way and connecting to a courtyard. Other views included one of the 3-story element, trees along Patterson Way, and several showing the relationship to earlier phases.

LE: This is a creative way to solve the issue of the view corridor coming in - breaking up the building form was a clever response. The landscape has developed...the preservation of the trees is important, and really gives a sense of presence. AL: We focused on the entry to Building A...the other issues had been resolved. WR: Is the management office in the right place? It's not all on Dorchester Street, nor is it in the center [of the overall Project]. It seems like a lost opportunity. JS: It had been located toward the school, but was moved to accent and solve other issues. We can continue to study. Hearing no public comment, it was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the BCDC recommends approval of the design of the Phase Three component of the Master Plan for the Old Colony Project (bounded by Dorchester, East 8th, and Old Harbor streets, Columbia Road, and Old Colony Avenue) in the South Boston neighborhood, with the ongoing proviso of review for all future phases.

The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **100 Hood Park Drive Project and PDA Amendment**. Mark Rosenshein (MR) of Trademark introduced the changes and noted that this was the first of a 2-part submission with Office and the Masterplan coming back in shortly. Mark Spaulding of SMMA showed the overall plan, then a view from Hood Park Drive showing the prior and the new design. MS: We removed the screen that came down to the ground on the east. We capped the retail with the perforated metal component; the glass at the corner allows full visibility. (Shows a view from the north.) The main entry was an incision before, and is now a large frame element centered on that future intersecting street. It breaks the mass of the garage. (Shows a night view.) We have considered a lot due to the venue. The lighting could be an extension of the retail element. MR: It's now a more flexible treatment. We can continue that conversation. On the garage to the west, there are more pleats in the [fin] material. We had talked about the street as an event space; now it's more a street, but 16' [sidewalk] allows plenty of room. The canopy is now a string of posters for the venue.

DC: You could use it the same way you did when it [the street] was flush. MS: Exactly. (Shows an evening view of this area.) AL: A terrific project. The changes have clarified the corner, and the entry...all the programs. You know where to go now. LE: Today, the improvements make the building feel contextual, but still itself. The idea of projecting on the facade could be memorable. DH: The entrance feels so much more prominent. It makes a *place*, appropriate to its programming. DC: I'm interested to see how it evolves. With that, and hearing no public comment, it was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for 100 Hood Park Drive, and associated minor changes to the PDA, in the Hood Park Master Plan PDA in the Charlestown neighborhood.

The next item was a presentation of the **Fenway Hotel Project**. Harry Wheeler (HW) of Group One presented the design. HW: I'll run through the Project; we expect it to change as part of the public review process. (Notes the locus, pointing out the intersection, the neighborhood, the Fenway Victory Gardens. Shows an aerial, noting the existing gas station, its curb cuts and the curbside private alley. Shows context photos. Notes the BAA construction area, and the associated improvement to Ipswich.) HW: The Ipswich improvements will clarify pedestrian crossings. We intend to continue that curb line, with a similar bulb-out at the [Boylston] corner, and a ground-floor recess at the hotel entry.

DC: It's not aligned with your neighbors.... HW: That's the subject of conversation. But there is also a raised sidewalk on those two buildings [to the west]. WR: We'd need to see that. DH: It's the same on the other side. HW: Our response will be to adjust the building placement, and develop its architecture. We will bring that to Committee. WR: We should comment on that. HW then showed how the hotel drop-off worked: We are working out the valeted pick-up. Parking is below grade. (Shows program at the ground floor, then upper floor plans, noting the interface with the residential building next door. Shows elevations, noting the change in materiality at the inflection of Boylston. Along Ipswich, he notes the setback and the shift in elements to be more 'industrial.')

LE: What's in that [expression of shift] space? HW: Rooms. LE: Even in that grand gesture? HW: Yes. They have good terraces.... We have 'unlived' the alley elevation, so there are no direct views into the BAA's windows or its terrace. (Shows a rendered perspective, evening view.)

DH: We'll need a model. This is a good project on a pivotal site. There are two foundational issues. One is how it meets the buildings on Park Drive - right now, there's an abrupt end to a great row of residential buildings. And on the other side, align with the buildings further down the street. On the first point, the upper floors brought down suggest how you could do that. It's architecturally nice, but I need to be convinced that it fits with its sides. DC: This is a critical point in the Emerald Necklace. The City is changing bicycle lanes in the area; you need to find out what the City plans here. One of your views should be from the Victory Gardens. AL: Your model should give a feel for the area. There's a lot new, but a lot will stay. More existing photos will help. I share the wish for resolution. I get the change of materials at the [infection] corner, but am not as sure about the change of materials there on Ipswich. And why is the building shorter on Boylston? HW: It's the result of zoning. We are building to the max. MD: Maybe you should think about how it relates to the historic context, and turns the corner onto Park Drive...the massing options could inflect to favor Park Drive. LE: The site is interesting here, with the road's inflection. How do you negotiate this? It's a complex problem. Show us your thinking, variations. On the courtyard of the building next to you - I like the relationship. The model will help us understand that, with the car lifts there.

WR: There's a lot to like on many levels. This is an opportunity. You do a lot of hotels; the scheme seems efficient. You're going to the IAG tomorrow with ideas - we should be a part of that [back and forth]. I particularly agree that Park Drive connection is important. How much

of an alignment is there, and where it becomes of Boylston Street. Can we have a conversation *now*? HW talked about the program adjustments which would allow setbacks at grade...and possibly shifting the hotel functions to the corner by the residential because it's quieter, with another notch at the restaurant. WR: Please show *that* to the IAG, then. LE: If you're shifting the massing back, then there's a chance for a small garden area in the transition zone, ending the residential row. HW: There are ramps and other things in front of the residential buildings. DH: Was there a historic continuation to that row? That could give clues to another solution. AL: It might be odd to have a piece of the building proud...it might be a chance to wrap around a piece of the restaurant, and carry that activity.

MD: This establishes a new edge for Boylston. Look at the other buildings down the street. HW: We've measured all those buildings and their setbacks. We can bring that information. WR: What you traced about your program change plan is good - feel free to represent that in your meetings. AL: Although we're discussing alignment, we're looking for a non-imitative relationship.

MD invited public comment. Max: If you have a respite area for the lobby with setbacks, then maybe that should be on Park Drive. Marie Cunha of the IAG: Your overarching concern has been an issue with the community. We are looking forward to a resolution on either side. There's a concern with re-doing the massing - the parcel across the street is DCR parkland. So the bulk of the hotel rooms should be on Ipswich, in the back. The adjacency of restaurant uses next to the residential - wasn't desired, was pushed away from there. With that, and hearing no further public comment, the Fenway Hotel Project was sent to Design Committee.

The next item was a presentation of the **135 Morrissey Boulevard Project**. Og Hunnewell (OH) of Nordblom: We are now the owners of the Globe site. We've actually been working on it for a long time with our architects and the neighborhood. Our plan is to reinvent this industrial property, to bring back 2,000 jobs. Tamara Roy (TR) of Stantec and John Copley (JC) of Copley Wolff Design Group then co-presented the design. TR: (Shows an old photo) There's a lot of history here. The locus (shows aerial) includes the highway, Savin Hill, the T, and the sites between this and the T. JC: This is next to Patten's Cove, a DCR Urban Wild. The neighborhood is [mostly] cut off by the highway; the property ends in asphalt and a fence. TR: (Shows enhancements planned for the existing parking lot) We will create an entry by the old pressroom at the back, and connect through the building. We will also allow for a future connection from the T, per the Columbia Point Plan. JC: There is currently a plan on Morrissey for a bike path; we are creating a connection through the site for a connection to the neighborhood. We're improving the edge at Patten's Cove. And we're pushing the parking lot back from the line of adjacent properties.

TR: SOM's 1950s inspiration for the building was the work of the Bauhaus and Gropius. We're inspired by that, but also ideas about PV arrays and urban farming. (Shows the proposed facade changes.) We're creating an atrium 54' high and wide, and 200' long. JC: We'll try to bring that limestone entry frame to create an echoing space on the ground, allowing for the suggestion of a multi-use path on Morrissey. TR then showed a photo of the existing condition, then a view of the proposed interior. TR: The atrium space allows the choice of stairs or escalators. The spaces are all high-ceilinged, so many *different* types of offices can fit. Mezzanines, etc. are possible. (Shows a clerestory cut allowing windows into the atrium.) And a roof deck with bar outside of that. We're opening up the overall facade, channeling Bauhaus glass. LE asked

about the painted brick area to the right of the entry. TR: Our 'graffiti art' area is a way of breaking up the brick - "bringing it up," while also respecting the architecture. DC asked about the floor line. TR: We are pitching up the sidewalk to minimize the steps at the entry. (Shows a view of the SE corner, noting 'The Beat' graphic and banners suggesting tenant companies. Shows view of the rear entry with added windows. Describes compositional ideas for the facades. JC notes the continuation of the atrium space, the hops towers, the extension of the multi-use path.)

AL: And the tank? TR: It's a public art opportunity. We did have it as signage, but now it's like the other public art. AL: This is a great project. It's a smart reinterpretation of the building. I like the new face, and what you've done to the brick; it's still a building of pieces, and that's good. The atrium going all the way through...I have a question about the path from the neighborhood to the entry...? JC: There's a large desire line to the supermarket - they walk there. (Notes existing pathways.) To other questions, DCR does NOT want to improve Patten's Cove; they want to keep it wild. LE: The purpose and architecture of the existing building is all about being cloistered, except for that one area. You're turning that on its head - it's now very transparent, animated, active. DC: The sites between the Globe and the supermarket...think of yourself as setting an example. MD: On a sustainability note, you know you're subject to flooding [along Morrissey], but this can also be a place of refuge, with power, supplies, etc.

A motion was made to approve the project. MD opened to public comment. EW: It's a little like New Balance, but what you've done is so much better. What is the parking on top of? TR: It's existing parking, on top of [what is now] a warehouse space. Hearing no further public comment, the motion to approve was seconded, and it was

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the proposed 135 Morrissey Boulevard Project on the old Boston Globe site in the Columbia Point Master Plan Area in the Dorchester neighborhood.

The next item was a presentation of the revised **5 Washington Street Project**. TR: It's déjà vu all over again. There's a new development team. Because of that, the process has begun all over again. The new design is one story shorter, a 16,000-SF reduction, and 30 less units. Parking is about the same. (Shows the old and new models.) The old design was a 6-story structure with a clear U-shape, and a 1-story piece at the corner. The new design, which responds to your and community comments, is 5 stories, and has a 4-story segment relating to the Baldwin School across Washington, with brick at the base. (Shows a site locus, photos of site and context, precedent building photos.) The ground floor plan is very similar. There's a pharmacy now at the Corey corner, then the lobby, and a community retail space at the other corner. Bicycle storage opens up onto the pocket park. The park itself is the same strategy. (Shows upper floor plans.) We're working on richer details on the building, in the brickwork. Like basketweave brick patterns at the windows. We have simplified the base. The other, darker material shown is fiber cement. LE: So the changes are the brick, and the retail at the corner. DH: The reduction in scale is sympathetic to the neighborhood. You've refined your design in an amended language.

EW: I was on the original IAG, and am again. What happens when buildings are shown to you, is you don't see all around it. I wanted to maintain the consistency of the setbacks along Corey

Road. It's a neighborhood street, then it opens up to a garage opening. But that's not the most important thing. This gives the park to Brookline, and the building is pushed toward Brighton. It wouldn't hurt the *pro forma* to push [the center] back (creating an 'H' form). It would be further from Corey Road. It would be better for the quality of life, and pedestrians on Corey. Other than that, The Kent (?) in New York City, in the middle of the precedent photos - maybe it would be good to have windows more classical in detail. TR: We know Eva's points; we've tried to respond. The Corey Road sidewalk is now 2'8" wider, almost 11' wide. We did have an 'H' plan, but it creates too many elbows, and loss of efficiency. So when we lost a floor, we had to recoup the efficiency. MD: There is still some of that form. TR: Yes. We just couldn't make it deeper. EW: To the detriment of the neighborhood. TR: We can shift the building a foot or two more...we're working on the garage more. DH: Does the brick treatment go into the garage? Thinking of that, and using lighting, etc., the garage can be addressed in an elegant way. AL: More street level views will help you refine the design. (To Eva) I think that it is *not* as threatening as you feel from that side. DH: Per the earlier conversation, as you come down Corey, this projects forward. When you come down, you should *see* something. Windows, a detail, something more graceful at that corner. With that, and hearing no further public comment, it was moved, seconded, and

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

The next item was an update (per the DPIR submission) on the **115 Winthrop Square Project**. DAC and MD reminded the Commissioners that NO VOTE was expected or necessary; this was a design update only, and the Project remained in Committee. It was felt best to show the revised design to as many Commissioners as possible, using a monthly meeting.

Joe Larkin (JL) of Millennium Partners introduced the revised design. JL: What you saw before was the competition presentation. The shadow laws were modified, and the height modified to conform to FAA requirements. The office also became a significant change, and we have advanced the Great Hall. Blake Middleton (BM) of Handel Associates: You have the materials. I'll talk about the changes, the architectural inspiration, our thinking on Winthrop Square, and the Great Hall. (Shows an exploded axonometric program diagram.) This is a classical mixed-use building, with residential on top, office, the Great Hall with food and beverage to support it, and lobbies with *porte cocheres* below grade. (Shows an elevation with heights, then a massing with all height datums, then a section explaining the program, including mechanicals, then a pedestrian connections diagram.) This is an unusual mid-block infill building with an unusual site plan, which creates some interesting conditions. (Shows how peds move through the site. Notes the parking/*porte cochere* level plan. Notes loading docks on the south, and notes sidewalk dimensions.) We have expanded some sidewalks to accommodate pedestrian flows. The below grade valet parking program serves the residential and offices uses from both sides. (BM then showed a larger ground floor plan, noting the lobbies, and noting the 6' grade change from Devonshire down to Federal.) A mezzanine level about 16' high wraps around the Great Hall. There's a residential amenity floor on level 2, with pods and landing platforms around the Great Hall. Above that is the office amenities floor, also with pods framing the Hall. Office floors are above that, and residential floors above *that*. On the north, we have a 18-26' setback from 101 Federal. We are 25' from 100 Summer to the south. And 36' from 133 Federal. Compared to the [mostly demolished] parking garage, we are pulling back from that line.

(Shows a massing diagram.) This design is a merging of two building components, laced together. (Shows a Federal Street axo massing diagram, with height going up to their center. Shows a streetwall diagram for Devonshire.) We are defining Winthrop Square in a new and stronger fashion.

Shauna Gillies-Smith (SGS) of Ground: I want to step back before discussing the Square. We're already at a crossroads; the Great Hall makes a much more porous connection. And Winthrop Square is considered as a destination complementary to, but distinct from, the Great Hall. (Shows photos of the existing Square.) There is the question of the existing trees...is keeping them really the best *long-term* strategy? Their soil mass is much higher than the plaza. There are a series of open spaces in the area; Winthrop Square can be another distinct one in Boston. We explored the notion of extending the space across - table-topping, a shared street. (Shows examples of such spaces.) LE: What is the extent of your table-topping? SGS pointed that out on the plan [limited to pedestrian connections across]. She also showed shadow studies. SGS: Winthrop Square is *already* in shade most of the time. The landscape concept is a watering hole in a square, with ripples around that. Connecting through, and expanding the east Devonshire sidewalk for trees used as wind mitigation. (Explains the likely grading, with a broad tabling connecting the Square to the Great Hall. Otis is less sure, due to the bus traffic there.)

BM: The motifs of the building design are deco, drawing inspiration from nearby buildings - pleating, a vertical expression. There is a robust presence of a metallic enclosure, with crystalline glass inbetween. This leads to the facade treatment diagram progression: a dense wall, then frame, sheared apart, and perforated. Those openings are punched, for depth. (Shows a series of elevation massings with material details.) We are as close as possible to PassivHaus standards. On the east, there is the expression of a different tower, with more vertically punched modules. (Shows a series of elevations.) At the top, we have a simplification/accentuation of the top of the tower, creating a presence. Lower, there is a strong metallic character, using a rich, coppery, phase-changing paint. We are working on program development and infrastructure in the Great Hall. (Shows a view looking to Federal.) The building is in concrete, although the columns may be steel. The columns in the Great Hall are 65' apart. (Shows a view of the entry from Winthrop Square.) We are trying to draw a line from the strong entablature there. (Shows a night view from Federal.) There is strong communication of activity. (Shows sections.) The Great Hall is a synthesis between large Hall precedents, and small spaces within those. We are looking to have a robust programming, adapting to a series of venues. (Shows variants using an oblique cutaway view. Shows sketch studies from different viewpoints, then a birds-eye.)

DH: What strikes me is the bulk of the design now. What was the SF before? How much did the building come down? How much was the SF per floor...? JL: It was 760' high, now down to 690'. It was 1.1 million SF, now about 1.5 million. DH: If you were to maintain the height, then you're making up 120,000 SF, roughly 6 floors. So now, it's 1.5 million SF. This is *foundational*. You've added 400,000 SF. This is unprecedented in the City, to have towers of this height *so close* to other towers. What precedent does this set? What is an acceptable relationship? It feels to me like this is coming at the expense of the neighbors. It's sheer bulk - basically, you've extruded the entire site to the FAA limit.

AL: For me, the presentation was hard to get around, because I wasn't remembering what was shown before. In Committee, show us what it was before, and what it is now. I was *very*

enthusiastic before, not so much now. I want to understand why. It's bulky now. Winthrop Square is a success, Federal not so much. Your vertical systems were unified before, not so much now. The Great Hall - the urban reading of it is utterly different. My feelings are similar to the earlier point by David. I was quite enthusiastic earlier.... LE: The danger in showing us something we like, is that we remember it. What struck me, is how clear the Great Hall was in the diagram before. The opening now is very minor. It feels too normal. Shauna's diagram leads through the space. That needs as bold an expression as the Square. The space needs to be *open*, so that it can remain a beautiful passageway. WR: 1.1 million originally, and 1.5 now? Nearly 1.6. So it's nearly half again as big. MD: Recently, we've taken things in Design Committee one issue at a time. I want to understand how we got from *there* a year ago, to *here*. DH: This is a City-owned parcel. The impacts will be felt around the City - which was a wonderful aspect of the project. This is 500,000 SF more. I want to understand [the added positive] impacts around the City. MD: Public benefits balance the building; we need to understand that [those]. WR asked about the mass. BM noted the difference using the model. DH: That's another part. It was a slimmer building, arising out of the base. The T at the back is now the full height. AL: If you look at the elevations, the change in size has resulted in a real change in impacts on the City, and on the proportion. WR: The T section going all the way up - it's not your problem, but please clarify it as part of the list.

BM: One of the concerns expressed earlier was the scale of the opening in Winthrop Square...I recall that as an observation. DC: I remember that the earlier relationship of the Great Hall to the exterior was stronger. The programming now is all in the interior. SGS: That was a response to comments that the Square should be complementary but distinct. DH: It's an elegant design, charming, related to the older buildings. A question - does the Square belong to the building (a forecourt)? Or is it related to the 19th-century aspect of the City? Seeing those trees come down will be hard. It has a 19th-century aspect now that's hard to let go of. AL: On the Square, it belongs to the City, not to this building only. I appreciate your seeing it that way. I like the water element; it helps make a space like this intimate. WR: I found it interesting that the Square was mostly shadowed...and now is totally. How do you deal with that as a challenge? Does the water help, or not? DC: I am happy that you are *not* letting the higher trees dictate the space, as a landscape architect. LE: The water element will work for a discrete set of months. But the space has to work both ways. MD: The bulk, mass, architecture, Great Hall.... Public comment?

Max: I want to echo the sentiments about Winthrop Square. With skyscrapers, the top is considered, and the base forgotten...think more about that 19th-century datum. Kathy MacNeil of Millennium: What do you think of the trees? Max: I love trees, but it's an interesting discussion. Dan Down of the Rockpoint Group: We share a lot of the concerns expressed. We own 2 million SF within a few blocks...we are very *pro* that development. We were supportive of the original; we think we can be helpful as a neighbor, with our garage directly adjacent. That could create a larger Great Hall. The earlier plan - we understand it's an infill parcel - allowed more light and air in more ways. DAC noted that he would transmit the abutters' comments - and the Winthrop team's response comments - via email to the Commissioners tomorrow. Bill from 133 Federal: I echo Dan's comments. We support the project, but the biggest change is the higher T massing. Emily Woodward of 10 High Street asked for more information on solar glare. (JL offered to provide that.)

There were no further comments. No action was required; the 115 Winthrop Square 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 9:16 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was scheduled for March 6th, 2018. The recording of the February 6th, 2018 Boston Civic Design Commission meeting was digitized and is available at the Boston Planning and Development Agency.