

DRAFT MINUTES

BOSTON CIVIC DESIGN COMMISSION

The meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was held on Tuesday, September 6th, 2016, starting in the BRA Board Room, 9th Floor, Boston City Hall, and beginning at 5:19 p.m.

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

The Co-Vice-Chair, Mike Davis (MD), announced that this was the meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission that meets the first Tuesday of every month and welcomed all persons interested in attending. He added thanks to the Commissioners for the contribution of their time to the betterment of the City and its Public Realm. This hearing was duly advertised on Friday, August 19, in the BOSTON HERALD.

The first item was the approval of the August 2nd, 2016 Meeting Minutes. A motion was made, seconded, and it was duly

VOTED: To approve the August 2nd, 2016 Boston Civic Design Commission Meeting Minutes.

Votes were passed for signature. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **101-105 Washington Street Project**. David Carlson (DAC) noted that this Project, down the street from the St. Gabriel's site proposal recently introduced to the BCDC, proposed to build a new Mikvah, demolish the old Mikvah and build a new Synagogue, and finally demolish the old Synagogue and build a new residential building. This was a new Project, at 99,600 SF exactly at the BCDC threshold; though more modest, it was in the vicinity of other projects and review was recommended. It was duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed 101-105 Washington Street Project in the Allston/Brighton neighborhood.

David Manfredi (DM) was recused from the next item. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **South Station Project NPC**. DAC noted that this project, seen in 1999 and 2006, had submitted an NPC which reflected a clarification of uses in the tower (residential component added) and a modification of the structural

system with ground floor implications due to that change. Other aspects had evolved over the last ten years. The Project remained well over threshold and review would essentially be a condition of the prior approval in any case. To confirm, review was recommended. It was duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the revised schematic design of the South Station Air Rights Project NPC dated July 29, 2016.

DM returned. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Marine Wharf (RLFMP Parcel A) Project**. DAC noted that this project was in the Raymond L. Flynn Marine Park but one of two parcels near the Drydock Avenue entry that did not require industrial uses. RFPs had been issued and developers selected; both would come tonight. The Marine Wharf hotel proposed at Parcel A, at 320,000 SF, was well over the BCDC threshold and review was recommended. It was duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for Marine Wharf at 660 Summer Street, on Parcel A in the Raymond L. Flynn Marine Park, in the South Boston Waterfront District.

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **RLFMP Parcel Q1 Project**. DAC noted that this was the other of the two parcels near the Drydock Avenue entry that did not require industrial uses. The use proposed here was office; the two taken together formed a kind of gateway into the Park. The Parcel Q1 Project, at close to 300,000 SF, was well over the BCDC threshold and review was recommended. It was duly moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for Parcel Q1 in the Raymond L. Flynn Marine Park, in the South Boston Waterfront District.

MD noted that the next Proponent should focus only on changes made. The next item was a report from the Design Committee on the **321 Harrison Avenue Project**. Paul McDonough (PM) reported that the Committee generally had seen good progress on responses to the comments made. Mark Spaulding (MS) of SMMA presented the revised design, reminding first about the locus, then noting the facade treatment with pleated glass shifting to a vertical metal-panel-and-glass expression. He showed the modification to the corner space, now a bicycle repair facility that fit well with the program and was a retail-like expression and a public amenity. (Shows a detail of the plan.) MS: We augmented the retail in front of the loading area, and angled it so that folds/invites one into the entry. We've wrapped the building base materials around and in more completely. We have opened up the cafeteria to the public and opened windows for its new location along Washington. (Shows the corner of Washington and Herald, with the trellis structure idea and potential tenant deck, and the patterning study for the garage scrim.) We are planning art at the corner, and continue to work on the screening for the garage.

Bill Rawn (WR): Is there any change in the garage program? MS: It's still an open garage. The screen will block the windows and car lights. Kirk Sykes (KS): Is there any physical activation along Herald? All you've done is great, but it should be four-sided, with eyes on the street. Andrea Leers (AL): Can we see Harrison? Thanks...we asked you to screen the loading yard; your changes have been great. The garage is unpleasant to walk along now, but your strategy to screen and make it more pleasant along a lot line condition is a good one. You should work on more development of that. The measures you've taken are good, and have gotten better each time. We've talked about parking in new buildings. Here, you've inherited one. MD: The deck, if it came, would address Kirk's comment. Deneen Crosby (DC): They've done all we suggested. KS: A final comment - pay attention to light levels, so that the public can be responsible for the public realm, so the sidewalks are safe. MD: So, work on that. Anything else? DM: I have a question about the intent of the glass selections. MS: There is reflective, and less so, glass - that's a detail in the pattern set up on the other portions of the facade. This is a north exposure. DM: So there are three types of glass - spandrel, clear, and reflective. AL: Or rather, is it spandrel, reflective, and tinted? MS: Yes. With no further questions, it was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the proposed 321 Harrison Avenue Project (on the old Teradyne block bounded by Washington and Herald streets, Garrison Avenue, and William E. Mullins Way) in the South End neighborhood.

The next item was a presentation of the **101-105 Washington Street Project**. Joe Hanley (JH) introduced the team and Project, noting Mr. Furman was a well-known developer. JH: The Synagogue has been long-standing, but it's in a building not designed as a synagogue. And there is a Mikvah, the Daughters of Israel. So this is a collaboration between those two entities and the developer, to make a small campus that works better for all. Eric Robinson (ER) of RODE presented the design, noting first the locus (on a site surrounded by the Fidelis Way BHA property) using a plan and aerial photograph. He showed a study of the scale of those buildings, then diagrams of special conditions, uses, and heights, then photos.

Linda Eastley (LE): We were looking at another Project nearby. So, there's not a lot of topo here? ER: No, it's fairly flat. There's a stone wall...about a 2-foot change overall. (Continues.) The Mikvah cannot close. (Shows site diagram, indicates phasing. Shows photos of existing buildings. Then a diagram of their site, and massing, then shaping that, evolving to the present site plan. Shows a circulation diagram.) KS: What are the colors shown on the site plan? ER: Those are paving patterns, and surface parking for the religious uses. DC: Did you look at shifting the Mikvah, using the small lot behind it? ER: It needs to operate in a certain way. We have moved it...when it's closer, it crowded the common space. (Shows plans, including the garage underneath the site. Shows materials thoughts for the residential, then the Mikvah and Synagogue (both a lighter stone). Shows views, from Washington and from the BHA property outward.)

LE: This is a lot of different things. How do you think the community will use or perceive the space? Jerry Furman (JF): There's been some

discussion - to get the congregants and members living nearby, and attract a younger membership. Both the congregants and the community think this is a good idea. LE: You've broken down the residential as much as possible. The woonerf, the space between, needs some work - planting, lighting - to make it more interesting. The Synagogue is axial to the street; I wonder how you're thinking it will receive that. I understand in your plan view where those community gardens are...how do you make the space feel open, welcoming, public? KS: I agree. It might only take about 5-6 trees. The residents would prefer looking at poplars. You've done a thoughtful analysis - it's really clear how it fits, in your presentation. The purple and beige paving - I'm not sure what that means, but would like to hear more. Quiet buildings, you said...is that true? JF: The Mikvah is especially quiet. They like that approach. DC: There is more that you could do to make it more a space, in the back especially. More park-like, maybe connecting to that park.

ER: Your comments have been focusing on the points we've been studying. The connectivity of the outdoor space, how it can be better utilized by all. PM: Could the garden be a part of it? JF: we're looking into that; we'd like to rebuild the whole garden. DM: It's all about the relationship between these three buildings. I understand you've moved things around quite a bit. Part of the site will feel like walking through a parking lot. I assume the 12 spaces are dedicated to the Synagogue? ER: 6 and 6. DM: It would really benefit if 6 were to move into the garage. JF: They actually each have 8. We persuaded each to move 2 spaces into the garage; the talks continue. Sometimes - possible on Washington Street? - spaces are dedicated for religious services. ER: Jeb (?) Court dead ends, it might be possible to use that. DC: The garage is under the site, so the trees are in planters? ER: Yes, or in dropped/elevated bays.

AL: We've talked about the spaces. The buildings - have a lot of moving parts. All the marbles have rolled to one side. The two small buildings don't fit together as they might, as two pavilions in a park. The residential building is more complicated than the buildings around it. I would simplify, and I think that if the two smaller were more together, shifted, reportioned so they seem like one, surrounded by as much 'garden' as possible. Big building, little building. In between, as much non-car space as possible. MD: Obviously you don't want to make this look like all one project. There's a real sense of confidence in the Synagogue. (You can't see the Mikvah.) Bring some of that into the residential building. Not all the same, but a dialogue. KS: You might want the back to be a rotary, or cul-de-sac - not a bunch of 3-point turns. Allan MacIntosh in the audience spoke, simply supporting the developer. With that, the 101-105 Washington Street Project was sent to Design Committee.

The next item was a presentation of the **South Station Air Rights Project NPC**. David Perry (DP) of Hines Interests introduced the design team from Pelli Clarke Pelli: Fred Clarke (FC), Ed Young (EY), and Graham Banks. DP: This [tower] has been approved before, previously as all office. The change in use has affected the tower, and that has impacted the structure. And Atlantic Avenue, which now requires two lobbies. FC: We have been working on this since 1998...the change in use has been a breakthrough. When this was started, we were at the edge of the Central Business District. Now, we're more in the middle, as a kind of hinge point. So, residential is appropriate. This is a perfect moment, a perfect place for that [fusion].

The initial setting of the tower on the axis of South Station maximized the visible sky, and that set the structure, and all else. With the residential, the change allowed us to really emphasize the vertical with a carved massing. EY: It's really one continuous move, a strong form, so it can hold its own with the other towers. FC: The building must be seen and experienced in the round. This has allowed us to re-think it. The inner layer becomes the emphasis on the south side, too.

FC: The massing of the two further buildings has not been strongly studied. EY: With the residential program, there's a lot of pressure to provide green space as an attractive area to arrive in or go through. FC: Atlantic Avenue, with its lobbies, is still intact as a concept, and limited by the track behind it. The main change is a 'sky street' above a clarified Atlantic Avenue. It connects all three phases. EY: The office elevators open at the rear. LE asked about the width of the connection. EY noted that it's actually 10 feet wider than before. MD: There had been circulation up, but that's cleaned up from the concourse. What about the bus station? FC: We're above all that. This still allows the buildout of the bus station expansion. (Shows the old office lobby along Atlantic, then the new view, and a section.) Spaces like these [shallow] office trays - loft-like, or maker space - make sense now. (Notes the layers of program. Shows an early sketch of the Atlantic Avenue facade, now fully populated.) EY: the addition of these floor structures allows a cantilevered canopy. A discussion ensued regarding the section and programming. FC noted that the skylobby and sky street are common in Shanghai and elsewhere. AL: So, the sky street is double height? FC: Yes. And there is a restaurant proposed for that top area. KS: Tokyo Station works. You should look at the ones that work, and those that don't. FC: Previously, the upper levels were doomed. But this new circumstance, where people come in from all levels, helps to populate the area. Office, residential - all stop at or pass through this space. We are working with OJB now. (Shows a plan, then a view, of the rooftop gardens.) The elevation is just about level with the eagle atop South Station. The office has a terrace on this level, too. DC asked about the vantage point for the view. FC noted the massing, and solar orientation: Light will get in, but Phase 2 is not very designed yet. AL: Is it residential? FC: Yes, or a hotel combination.

FC then noted the change in the structure. FC: With an office building, it could be steel. With residential, we had to change it - we could not allow the building to move beyond the limits for a residential structure. (Shows the old design; shows a diagram of the structure.) EY augments: The parabolic shape is best. (Shows an earlier engineering diagram, shows their earlier arches.) We felt we needed to use the parabola as an architectural solution. (Shows parabolic arch sketches, with pendentives.) We have a lot of work to do to study this further, with lighting, etc.

KS: You don't have the arches set in the context of the historic headhouse, or show how the two rooms co-exist. WR: The more we can understand the ground floor condition, the better. The rooftop, is really just private spaces. Except for the restaurant. FC: That's a public floor. WR: Sunlight on the garden.... LE: I'm intrigued by the pedestrian experience. We're looking at a very large plaza, in the context of two rooms - old, and new. The arches create visual noise, block a lot of views. I would like to clarify that opacity. The passage between the buildings - I want to make sure it's announced better. It's an important slot. How do you get people from the street to a noisy

plaza? The residential tower access seems corridor-like. Understanding that, would be helpful. MD: The change in program is a real plus. The tower is quite strong. The mix of uses on Atlantic are good. The complexity - is making people aware there's an upper public realm. KS: The Atlantic Avenue hotel experience...what's nice about the Mandarin (for example) is that activity is everywhere. There's a rhythm of lighting and activity. Walk us through that. Right now, there's a lot of equipment. DC: I'd like more of a distant view. I appreciate the idea of more sky toward Dewey Square.

AL: The reshaped tower is so much nicer. Even that thin layer on Atlantic - is a real difference. Two areas are undeveloped. The sense of the residential lobby wants more than two doors. It's not gracious. EY: The brokers advised discretion. AL: It's way too much. How you get there is [awkward]. The other area has to do with the creation of the arched space, its figural quality. Right now, it's super neutral. In the triangular space between, maybe there's something more neutral...like the earlier steel box. But I wonder about the figural adjacency. FC: Our intention *was* to be figural; the original station is figural. AL: And pretty grand. MD: I come in and out of that every day...it could use some work. DM: Work on the relationship between old and new. Build a larger model. Help us figure it out. AL: The headhouse and this. A question arose from the audience about considering the truss. FC: There's not enough mass. The conventional truss is not enough. With that, the South Station Air Rights NPC was sent to Design Committee.

PM left. The next item was a presentation in sequence of both the **Marine Wharf (RLFMP Parcel A) Project** and the **RLFMP Parcel Q1 Project**. The idea of sequential presentations and combined commentary was presented to the teams and accepted. Eamon O'Marah (EOM) of Harbinger introduced Marine Wharf and his team, noting that the EDIC issued an RFP about two years ago for these two commercial parcels. EOM: Harbinger was designated for Parcel A, Skanska for Parcel Q1. A hotel use was always planned here. This is a dual hotel, all Hilton: Hampton Inn, and Homewood Suites. Select Service, and Extended Stay. There are restrictions on the site; Chapter 91 impacts it. Robert Brown (RB) of Perkins + Will introduced the design, first noting existing conditions, then the locus, area plan, and site plan. Christian Lemon (CL) of Lemon / Brooke talked more about the site, noting connections across Drydock Avenue to Q1, and to the adjacent park. CL: We are enhancing the edge. There's a central court drop-off, with an idea of a large propeller as an object in the center of that turnaround.

RB talked about the ground floor program, noting entries and retail. RB: This is not just retail around the edges. The reception is up on the third floor (also points out BOH, loading, second floor parking). On the third floor and up, the hotel use is color coded on the plans. Terraces set the south wing back, and there's an upper 'Great Room' and terrace. There are suites at the top on the east side. This is a muscular, industrial area. (Shows a section indicating constraints. Shows the evolution of the massing and height, notes the 50% open space requirement, shows the evolution of the diagram into forms - a series of volumes, and stepping down.) DC: What are the views from

Summer, when you pass by? RB noted a view in response, and also Q1 and the [USDOD] property adjacent. DM asked about the parking screen. RB: The idea is to bring up an expression of the retail. KS: You've heard us on parking. This idea is interesting.... WR: This is hard to imagine as a retail neighborhood. EOM: There is an amazing amount of foot traffic. Jamestown is also creating retail opportunities, and there's what you see at Liberty Wharf. We see this potential, and the Cruiseport is next door. There's a lot of interest in the retail.

Mark McGowan (MM) of Skanska introduced their Project and team. MM: We have the opportunity to trade off the success and interest energies in the Industrial Park. The idea is to be of *this* area. John Sullivan (JS) of Spagnolo Gisness Associates presented the design, first showing a context map. JS: There's a lot of creative energy in the area - the Innovation & Design Building, the Innovation District. This serves, with Parcel A, as a gateway into the Park. (Shows a series of precedent photos.) These show the inspiration which has guided our studies, defining an architecture of *this* district. (Shows an aerial of the site, then a site plan, noting the rail line.) WR: Is the rail dormant? JS: We have to maintain it. (Shows a context aerial with Q1 inserted. Shows photos of the existing site context, including 12 Channel Street. Shows a program diagram - office, parking, retail. Shows a site plan, noting the relationship to the open space area. Begins to show a SketchUp model.) The building is an interpretation of industrial architecture. There's retail at the base, then a special scrim for the parking, using a material that speaks to shipbuilding and warmth. Above, there are simple, repetitive industrial facades, expressed in a contemporary way. The accent panels are corrugated metal, or panels with a Cor-Ten finish. There's an activated roofscape at the top, with a wood shade. (Shows a more rendered view from Drydock Ave.) Vertical notches indicate entries. (Notes similar elements on the elevations, one by one.) MD: Please don't repeat information.... JS then showed a facade detail, the ground floor plan, upper typical floors, and a section. Then a closer view of the space on the south, and a view across the open space plaza. JS: The landscape plan - you asked how this worked with other spaces. Chris is our landscape architect too. The idea here is to channel the history of the rail line, with planters on rollers. A sheltering notion. And retail as a part of that vocabulary. (Notes the space at the expanded sidewalk, shows landscape material precedents. Cor-Ten, wood, sliding benches, pop-up retail.)

AL: Are both buildings the same height? JS: About. AL: One thing I noticed, is that the plaza is very much in the shadow of the hotel. It's important that the two come together; that could be good. But I wonder if the plaza is in the right place. If the space were across from the hotel garden.... MD: Who owns the guard shack in the median? JS: EDIC. DC asked where the entry to the Park was. This was indicated. MD asked about the green zone shown on the site area map: I'm not sure this is a gateway. KS: I disagree. These could work together...I don't know. They could....be reacting to the water. A city face, vs. the water. Marine Wharf is further along...this is a tough challenge. WR: We are faced with an important issue here. One project with one level, the other has three [of parking]. The deeper thing is not the projects, it's what the BCDC does. I can't imagine a city in which the second, third, fourth floors are garages. The retail is all good, but the problem lies just above. KS: You're trying to articulate the issue for the Proponents. It's this, or subterranean. On the facades, it's how we frame the issue. What we really want. Supporting the concern about the issue. We expect that the types of treatments - are really amazing

architecture. WR: If you think there can be elephant screens. We still don't have uses there. Are we willing to have such a city, devoid of that life? There's a lot of careful work done... DAC: We were going to start guidelines, after our conversation on Washington Village. MM: We don't want to build parking. It could be maker space, moving forward. DM: This is more than a trend. Mark makes a good point...parking has to be convertible. Bill makes a good point - parking can't reach the edge of a building. Like on Robert's design, where the parking doesn't reach the edge, is held back. This puts us in a hard place to look at these buildings, especially on Q1. KS: There are places where it can be, can't be, can be partially activated. In Manhattan, there is NO parking. EOM: The City doesn't want us to build parking. We only have 75 spaces. We wouldn't want a [below-grade] bathtub. It would be too big.

DM: Track 61 has a volumetric setback. Did you consider (like the MIT Cognitive Sciences Building) a track running *through*? JS: We did consider that, along Drydock, but it didn't allow the parking to work. DM: Rotate the building 90 degrees, so it goes through. AL: Looking at these together, both are prow-shaped sites. The hotel has taken more advantage. If you did that, entering the district between prow shapes, the entries talking to each other. Now, they're not quite relating. Think about the gateway - it would give you tremendous power. Both are very good buildings. I'm not worried about that, but how they work together. Coordinate. Who comes there? EOM: The BCEC is excited about the 411 rooms. And it's retail, but penetrable. John Matteson added that the IDB building is like the Pru placed on its side. DM: A lot of people are now walking from South Boston, a new phenomenon. EOM: The foot traffic in the area is growing. *We are* beginning to work together - we have the same landscape architect.

MD: The corner [at the intersection] is very tight. If the massing could shift, it would free up the corner. AL: Coming down the sidewalk, I'm not seeing the important entry. I'm seeing parking, loading. I'm not sure you're taking advantage of that. EOM: We have to allow trucks through. And we can't enter off of Summer (for vehicles). The retail entries [some] are off of Summer. KS: Help us understand. How many days of the year, etc. The EOM team explained further the retail/ entry location concept. AL: The slipped bar expression doesn't say, "Come around the side." There are a lot of signals; it's confusing. When you put it together with the building across the street, you're not taking advantage.

Hearing no public comment, it was then voted to send both Projects (Parcels A and Q1) to Design Committee, preferably to appear together.

There being no further items for discussion, a motion was made to adjourn, and the meeting was duly adjourned at 8:50 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was scheduled for October 4, 2016. The recording of the September 6, 2016 Boston Civic Design Commission meeting was digitized and is available at the Boston Redevelopment Authority.