

## DRAFT MINUTES

### BOSTON CIVIC DESIGN COMMISSION

The meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was held on Tuesday, January 3<sup>rd</sup>, starting in Room #900, Boston City Hall, and beginning at 5:18 p.m.

Members in attendance were: Michael Davis (Co-Vice-Chair); Deneen Crosby, Linda Eastley, David Hacin, David Manfredi, Paul McDonough (Co-Vice-Chair), William Rawn, and Daniel St. Clair. Absent were Andrea Leers and Kirk Sykes. Also present was David Carlson, Executive Director of the Commission. Representatives of the BSA were present. Michael Cannizzo, Jeong-Jun Ju, Elizabeth Stifel, John Dalzell, Dana Whiteside, and Matt Martin were present for the BPDA.

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 Sunday, December 18, in the BOSTON HERALD.

The first item was the approval of the December 6<sup>th</sup>, 2016 Meeting Minutes. A motion was made, seconded, and it was duly

**VOTED: To approve the December 6<sup>th</sup>, 2016 BCDC Meeting Minutes.**

Votes were passed for signature. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **212 Stuart Street Project**. David Carlson (DAC) noted that this was a new residential Project on a Stuart Street site at the edge of Bay Village previously reviewed by the BCDC, resulting in approval of a building of about 112'. The new proposal is higher, with a new architect. The Proposal, at 146,000 SF, remained over the BCDC threshold, and review was recommended. It was duly moved, seconded, and

**VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the newly proposed and reimagined 212-222 Stuart Street Project, located at the edge of the Bay Village neighborhood.**

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **Brooke Charter High School Project**. DAC noted that this site was previously approved as part of the Olmsted Green Project last seen in 2005. DAC: The programs proposed on this site have gone; the Brooke Charter High School proposed augments the existing Brooke Charter School (K-8). The size is just below the threshold on its own, but this is a significant location and a changed component of a much larger Project, and so should be revisited by the BCDC. It was moved, seconded, and

**VOTED: That the Commission review the NPC and revised schematic design for a portion of the proposed Olmsted Green Project - for the Brooke Charter**

**High School - on the former State Hospital site in the Mattapan neighborhood.**

The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **270 Dorchester Avenue ('The Chandlery') Project**. DAC noted that the proposal, at about 119,000 SF, was over the BCDC threshold and within the recently completed PLAN: Dorchester Avenue Study Area. A vote to review was recommended. It was duly moved, seconded, and

**VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed 270 Dorchester Avenue Project in the South Boston neighborhood.**

Daniel St. Clair (DS) arrived. MD and Linda Eastley (LE) were recused from the next item. The next item was a report from Review Committee on the **Boston College Indoor Practice Facility (Field House) and associated IMPNPC**. DAC reported that this was a new facility within the IMP, and modified the housing previously included for the parcel. The Field House Project was over 100,000 SF; for this reason and because it is a part of the BC IMP, review was recommended. It was consequently moved, seconded, and

**VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for Boston College's Field House (Indoor Practice Facility) Project and the associated amendment to its Institutional Master Plan, in the Allston-Brighton neighborhood.**

MD and LE returned. The next item was a report from Review Committee on the **Jackson Square Indoor Recreation Center (Rink) NPC**. DAC recommended that the Commission view this as an update to the previously approved design, and await to take any action (no new vote, or a vote to review followed by sending to Committee or a vote to re-approve) until after their presentation tonight. It was resolved to do so.

Bill Rawn (WR) arrived. The next item was a report from the Design Committee on the **Tremont Crossing (Parcel P-3) Project**. Barry Feldman (BF) introduced his team and thanked the Commission for their input - very constructive comments. Gary Johnson (GJ) of C7A asked Michael Cannizzo (MC) if he wanted to present the BPDA background slides; MC noted that most Commissioners present had seen them. MD asked that they be available for Q&A. GJ then flipped through those slides to show the pedestrian route diagram. GJ: We will continue to work with BPDA staff on these issues, including the School Department access paths, the paths across the playing fields, etc. (Shows a view, then a plan of the garage.) We've done some work on East Drive, which is now one way in and out at that end of the garage - which helps East Drive. (Shows a view looking down same.) We have active uses at the corner of the garage, and an interactive display which will be managed by the Museum. (Shifts to a view showing activity, and more articulation of the buildings and architecture. Shows a view of Market Street.) We have worked to produce a path through the garage to connect to the school paths. We've also been working to activate Market Street with multiple retailers on the ground floor. The second floors will have destination retail; the third floors will have entertainment retail.

(Shows a new view of the bridge/walkway structures, noting their articulation; shows a view across Market from one walkway toward the others. Shows a view looking down Market, with a new garage Portal treatment; notes the alignment at the rear.)

Deneen Crosby (DC): Does the retail continue around the corner onto East Drive? GJ: Yes.  
LE: Go back to the garage/East Drive plan - are these all at the same grade? GJ: Yes. We're working on allowing the sidewalk to remain level throughout, and minimizing treatments such as bollards. LE: The Project has come a long way. The portal ending the Market Street view is good...we all have high hopes about Market. You would be treating East Drive differently there, but that's a detail that can be worked out. The retail going around the corner is a real addition.  
David Hacin (DH): The future of the neighborhoods has been enhanced; the project has only gotten better. First the architecture, and now the paths through, the connections. It was very helpful to get Michael's BPDA overview. David Manfredi (DM): I agree. This presentation very much addresses the issues in a responsive way. The exterior lighting along Market, East Drive, and Whittier - continue to work on that; it seems weak now. GJ: We are working on that.  
DM: The catenary lights made me think of it; they seem high. GJ: That's an important detail.  
DC: I agree, a lot has been done. MD: There have been some concerns expressed; this is a new typology for Boston. But I think it'll work. With that, and hearing no public comments, it was moved, seconded, and

**VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the Tremont Crossing Project (and proposed PDA), on Parcel P-3 at the intersection of Whittier and Tremont streets, in the Roxbury neighborhood.**

The next item was a report from the Design Committee on the **Stavis Seafoods (Boston Cargo Port NPC) Project**. MD suggested that they focus on the issues discussed in Design Committee - this should not be heavy lifting. Brian Fairbanks of WSP/Parsons Brinckerhoff noted the site location, the parcel configuration, and site/area photos, and introduced Amir Degany (AD). AD presented the changes, showing now simple, clear distinctions between the office and the warehouse/cold storage elements. These were similar for the south elevation. AD: WE have kept it simple; the windows are red, or dark. WE worked on the graphics for Stavis, with a graphic on the corner and waves above the canopy (shows variations). On the south, we show the MMT area plan as a sign.

LE: I like the playfulness of the logos. We were talking about that, and whether you could extend that to the roof. AD: There is rooftop equipment.... Jonathan Rothstein of Millennium: We got the preliminary graphics from Stavis. We have engaged an engineer to figure out the MEP treatment. LE: For me, the most successful elements are the large, bold ones - the corner, i.e., and not something small. DM: I completely agree. The little pieces dilute the effect of the corner. WR: Can we ask that the designers work with BPDA staff to retain the boldness of the graphic treatment? DAC: Yes. AD: Were there any comments on the southern graphic? MD: That [detail] is up to the BPDA staff; it's beyond our purview. Stay bold. With that, and not hearing any public comment, it was moved, seconded, and

**VOTED: That the BCDC recommends approval of the revised Project and schematic design for the Stavris Seafoods Development (old Boston Cargo Terminal Project) on Massport Marine Terminal Parcel #5 in the RLFMP in the South Boston Seaport District.**

The next item was a presentation of the **212-222 Stuart Street Project**. After a coordinated team effort setting up the presentation, Eric Howeler (EH) of Howeler and Yoon introduced himself and presented the design. EH: Boston is made up of neighborhoods; this is a parcel within the Bay Village neighborhood, but it also participates in the high spine. Bay Village is one of the most intimate and beautiful neighborhoods of the City (shows photos of ornaments, detail, buildings). There is a dichotomy between the two sides; the building is straddling that edge. We have a small open space, to acknowledge the network of small parks in the area, with brick, and stone, and even honey locusts (shows diagram of the site). We are working with Sasaki on the concept of the park, trying to make the space an extension of Church Street, and maybe carrying it through the intersection. We are mapping it as a place where people walk, and adding trees to the street behind. (Shows shadow studies.) There is not much incremental shadow from that cast by the prior approval, and none in Bay Village. We looked at visual impacts and viewsheds.

This is a location in an area with other tall buildings - a syncopation of rhythm along the Stuart Street corridor, up and down. This is lower than the Revere Hotel; the lower piece in the rear is aligned with The Arlington. We have studied the use of materials, and the history of tall buildings in the area, for ideas on how to treat the facade. The paradigm is how to modulate the height, how to fit into the neighborhood. This is right inbetween the scales. We went through an exhaustive study process, making dozens of models - layered, stratified, modulated. WE are creating a texture appropriate to the neighborhood. The idea is stacking up 'pieces' of the neighborhood, of 2, 3, 4, and 5 stories. On the wall, there are two coarse blocks sliding past each other. There is shear, but also continuity between the layers. The two sides are opposite, with the largest tier at the top facing Stuart, and the smallest at the top facing Shawmut. (Shows a view from Stuart - close, then further away. Shows elevations - first alone, then with background context. Shows the plans that face each street.) Along the alleyway, we are creating a safe place. The fluting on the panels is based on neighborhood details...we have studies showing how it catches the sun. We looked at wood, stone, and finally precast. Or Indiana limestone. It's an inverse of the Boston bay window, creating space rather than protruding into it. Looking up at the facade, it has fluting, like curtains.

DM: The alley - does that exist today? EH: Yes. The idea is to light it, make it safe. There's no parking on the site; the Project is 130 units. DS: The material is stone? EH: At the base, then it transitions to precast above. DC: The materials of the paving...if you have brick on both sides, will the idea still work (pavers on the ground plane as a connector)? EH: It could. DS: You have a setback for parking, and trees, on the south. EH: Yes, in the public realm. There are existing large curb cuts. MD: So that will be beyond your property line? EH: Yes. Peter Spellios (PS) of Transom Real Estate: This compares to the work done on Beverly Street with Lovejoy Wharf, with the pavers in the public street and the dam beyond. DM: Do you have

floor plans? EH: Not here (but describes the basic floor layout).

WR: This is a wonderful explanation; we shouldn't fiddle with it too much. Two questions: one is the detail of the loading dock, and the other is the treatment along Shawmut, the wall-ness of that. EH: It's a tricky thing, since the south will be used occasionally by residents. WR: Do you want to show a rhythm? EH: We've done a lot of study, we can show you. On the loading, we are trading curb cuts, and leaving just enough to fully receive a truck. DS: I'm convinced fully on all the material you've presented. Could you make the alley a little wider? EH: It may be wider than I've said, we can look at that. DM: I agree, and if you could pull the wall, it would be less of a projection into the [Stuart] sidewalk from the Revere. DS: What happens if the improvements you show can't be done? PS: We did a lot of that at Lovejoy. We understand that dealing with entities can be - creative. Paul McDonough (PM): Where do you stand in the neighborhood process? PS: We have an IAG meeting in two weeks, a public meeting after. WR: The central idea is the shear between the two streets. I hope you don't get pushed into softening that; keep the bold move. The east/west streets are like the spoke of a wheel...by and large, you can't see the [Revere] hotel from the streets. (EH showed the south elevation as a view, but did not have neighborhood perspectives of it.)

A woman self-identifying as the chairwoman of parks and public spaces for Bay Village spoke: The parks are subject to a lot of zoning. And some of the Midtown Cultural District purposely protects them. This is a beautiful building, but it doesn't invite you in, and it doesn't do anything for the Village. This puts Statler Park in in shade, and blocks the sky for those people whose windows look north. The houses along Shawmut - that retail area could open up more. The [rooftop] space could be open. People from Statler could go there. From the neighborhood, this is overwhelming; there's not enough contextualization. Bernice Jacob, a resident of 45 Church Street (at Church and Winchester) spoke: Six of the seven units in our building face north. We will lose all our blue sky as a result of the height. This was characterized as 'not a lot taller.' But that earlier project was 120', this is 199'. That's a 65% difference. In addition to the Columbia Pictures building (45 Church), others on Winchester will also lose their sky. On Piedmont, and Shawmut, others will lose their sky. I haven't heard anyone note that this is a historic district...this is significantly higher than anything created since 1983, and those are meant to [cast some longer].... Bob: I want to make it clear that no one here speaks for the BVNA. Not everyone is opposed. This is a beautiful building; it will improve the view. Monty: I have a concern about how it comes down on Shawmut [where he lives]. I'd like something that *adds* to the street. Barb Glover of Melrose Street: I echo the comments about blocking of the views and sky. East/west streets means every street has windows that face north. Light pollution - you talked about lighting the building. And the reflection from the glass during the day might be good - but the night may not be. Steve Rosen: Look at the LEDs of the garage at night. I know there's precedent, and economics, but there's not that much this high. If the garage were sold, how would *that* change?

MD: We will send to Committee. I'm very encouraged by the architecture - we encourage forward-looking architecture all the time. I'm supportive. The alley should be more generous. Work on Shawmut, and provide views. With that, the 212-222 Stuart Street Project was sent to Design Committee.

DM left. The next item was a presentation of the **Brooke Charter High School**. Jonathan Garland (JG) of Arrowstreet presented the design: The High School is proposed adjacent to an existing K-8 school, done by Arrowstreet 8 years ago. (Shows locus. Shows aerial, points out the school, Lena Park, a new housing development. Zooming in, notes the MBTA bus adjacency. Shows images of the existing school - a rehab, with a new addition.) We are trying to think of this as a campus. We're across from the maintenance yard of Franklin Park. Our outdoor courts are facing East Main Street, away from the American Legion Highway (ALH) traffic. We're providing a buffer along that edge. (Notes routes that students would take walking across ALH; notes the 33' grade change along the site.) The existing school bus route goes around to Austin Street; the high school would only add 3 buses. We think that can be managed without any disruption. There's a perimeter fence; we're thinking of trying to limit it to the edges of the building. We're trying to encourage people NOT to drop students off on ALH. (Shows the general massing and organization, noting the Auditorium and Gym volumes.)

LE: Are the 8<sup>th</sup> graders moving into the new building? JG: Yes. The idea is to create an 8<sup>th</sup> Grade Academy. So the schools will be K-7 and 8-12. DS: Do the schools work together? JG: No...(describes the relationship). DS: The question of how much pedestrian traffic there is, is what we're getting at. JG: It's not intended that pedestrian flow across Austin be a part of the program. (Continues presentation, showing plans and describing the program further. Shows a program diagram, wherein the boxes of program help to articulate the grade change.) The gym cafeteria, and auditorium are all at different floor elevations. Brick and standing seam metal reinforce the historic datum, especially along ALH, and then there's more metal along East Main to the south. We're in the Design Development stage, working out what works (shows design references).

DH: This is a nice design, a nice parti. I want to understand the building all around; maybe do a model. I'm convinced from the ALH side, but want to be convinced all the way 'round. You should have more of an assertive statement of entry - a little more clarity. DC: I think the entry comment is good. I like the cafeteria glass; it shows it's not a back side. Maybe do more with the landscaping, a fence, to show this as the front more. LE: Is the entry on the left? JG: Yes. LE: I would like to see that in elevation. And a special moment when the volumes intersect. On Austin Street, the bus drop-off gives another opportunity for a special moment there, too. Doing something with Austin - the paving and landscape, a tie-in with your vegetable garden - could be fantastic. It's hard to understand how the spaces all come together on the south - how they're handled, the grading, etc. DS: This is not really an urban location, but having the parking lot paving at the corner, you're missing an opportunity to hold the corner. JG: We have talked about that, the idea of a gateway. Signage, but also a potential second phase. Parking, a rare commodity, is a sensitive topic. We have tried to add some green space, a buffer. MD: We have to zoom in on that part. We'd prefer not to have the parking at the corner, but for your program, you have to treat it sensitively. And the spaces are part of a series. DH: That comment is a good one. Pay the same attention you did to the form and aesthetic of the building to the aesthetic of the parking area. LE: There's quite a bit of parking for the elementary school. Is that available? Larry Spang: That's shared with the community center at Lena Park, and is maxed out. JG: There's the potential of the connection of spaces and paths; we can work on

that. PM asked about exterior recreation activities. Bob Baldwin (BB): We'd like that, but we don't have the space. WR: I agree with many of the comments. I'm interested in your description of a brick and metal building; I'd like to understand that more. It's a really nice Project.

Peggy Riesenbergh: Since you are envisioning the auditorium and gym as available to the public, where would the public enter? And why would those spaces be so far apart, for security at night? JG: We'd have a secure entry to the gym, so you wouldn't have to go through the whole school. And similarly for the auditorium. BB: There's no actual requirement for security at those events. Alison Pultinas: I have been following the BCS planning. There's the issue of traffic calming along ALH, thus the name change proposal. Think about how the students walk to the entry. I don't like the idea of parking in front; that's not good urban design. Peggy: Is this 8<sup>th</sup> Grade Academy accepting students from other schools with classes of 60? BB: Yes, from three (times 60, is 180). With that, the Brooke Charter High School was sent to Design Committee.

The next item was a presentation of **270 Dorchester Avenue ('The Chandlery')**. Anthony Pisani (AP) introduced the Project and team, including counsel Marc LaCasse and owner Mark Edwards. AP: We have 150 units, of which 70 are affordable. (Shows locus, then an aerial with the existing buildings; notes the C.G.Edwards Chandlery, the intersection of Dorchester Ave and B Street, the Haul Road, nearby housing, the MBTA repair yards, the vanished bridge location, the Broadway T stop. Shows site photos. Notes the 30' drop-off at the Haul Road. Shows a site plan.) Dorchester Avenue is a pedestrian corridor, but there is a lot of commercial in the area. C.G. Edwards and the gym on the site will likely remain in South Boston. (Notes the residential program and breakdown, shows a typical floor plan.) On the lower level, we have a commercial space and a garage. We will house 35 cars for a rental agency, 120 in total, using an automated system for the lower level. The Project is 8 stories, 90' high, has a 10' setback along Dorchester. Blair Hines is the landscape architect. (Shows the site plan, with trees. Notes the narrowing of Dorchester Ave at the bridge.) The narrow roadway needs to be addressed by the City and State. In front of 270, we have an 18' sidewalk. We see the plaza as an active area, allowing [public] seating. (Shows upper level activated [green] terraces. Shows long views, then closer elevations. Shows perspective views.) The corner has a gateway expression. On B street, the building is a series of punched openings. (Notes the zoning massing across Dorchester Ave.)

DS: You need a massing model, so we can see the massing of the other buildings around this. MD: We're going to send you to Design Committee...more comments? LE: When you build the model, a sense of the topography would be great. Dot Ave, B Street, how that's used. The other piece, is the entry and landscape treatment...how you are announcing the entries. DC: I'd be interested to know what part of the Plan: Dot Avenue applies here. How does this comply... And more on the terrace, how that works. The relationship of the retail spaces to the sidewalk. And, the corner is an important place. DH: I echo the comments on the model; we generally ask for that. I see the merit of a smaller brick volume. I wonder if the white part needs to come out, or if the brick can engage more. Your elevational techniques - why are they different?

Windows are stacked on one side, and more dynamic on the other. With that, the 270 Dorchester Avenue Project was sent to Design Committee.

MD and LE were recused from the next item. The next item was a presentation of the **Boston College Indoor Practice Facility Project and IMP Amendment**. Philip Laird (PL) of ARC presented the design. He noted the locus on the IMP that BC is working from, noting that the Project was an amendment, and noting the new site configuration. He introduced Glen Valentine and Stephen Stimson, the landscape architect, who noted the circulation paths from the campus. PL showed photos of the site and nearby roadways, noting the guardhouse at the driveway. PL: This will be a practice facility for football; BC is the only college in the ACC without an IPF or one (Miami) under construction. It's basically a large footprint to allow the field, a 20-foot runoff on each side, and support spaces. The building is designed to span the aqueduct below the surface (notes the attached weight room). We will build a tank with 2.8 million gallons of run-off water capacity capable of taking all the water from a 25-year storm. (Shows an aerial view.) We have an arched roof, with a barrel vault in standing seam metal; the brick is the same as that used at Alumni Stadium. It's 70' high, 48' to the eaves, with a weight room entry lobby on the right. The doors and windows are sized to handle MWRA vehicles. Toward the east, these doors also do that, and open to allow out 100 people at a time. (Shows the elevation facing east.) On the south, Beacon Street is 14' above Shea Field. So the perceived height is less. There is mechanical and support space between this and the parking garage. (Shows a view from the northeast.) We need support for the weight room; otherwise, this would be all glass. (Shows a view from the southeast across the field.) We'll install new field lights, with a better cut-off. (Shows a view down Beacon, then a section, then plans.) On the north, our landscaping will provide a 'flexible lawn' for events. On the south side (shows contours adjacent to Beacon), we are replacing pine trees with red oaks, matching the other trees along Beacon in this area. The IMP amendment also reconfigures the housing previously proposed; the parking has been moved elsewhere. We have 5- to 6-story buildings grouped around courtyards. (Shows a ghosted axonometric, a section, and the model.)

DH: I really think that this is a *very* uninspiring building next to the residential street. I'm just so surprised that Boston College is not willing to invest more in such a prominent location. There are so many examples of roof structures for uses like this. Even the EDIC building we just saw...this is not much more elevated. DS: It sits way too close to the road; I go by here all the time. It's right on the street, and it feels like an emergency shed. DH: And from an institution that takes great pride in its buildings. Surprising. DS: Even if it's good architecture, it's too close to the road. PL: There were no significant comments from the neighborhood, and it will be screened by the future housing. DH: Couldn't the roof be expressed by a different form? WR: I tend to agree. DC: The landscaping and the siting of the building...a major campus path now comes down, and ends in a 6-foot path [between the buildings]. I would move the building out more, make the path more generous. PL: If we moved the building out, we would preclude the exterior football field. With that, and hearing no public comment, the Boston College Field House was sent to Design Committee.

MD and LE returned. The next item was a presentation of the **Jackson Square Recreation**



**Center/Rink Project NPC.** MD reminded the Commissioners that they would decide what action to take based on the update presentation. Emily Loomis (EL) of Urban Edge introduced herself, and noted that the Project previously approved was an ice rink which converted to a turf facility in the summer. A second story now includes a year-round turf field and classrooms. The rink is below, and now has a longer duration (~10 months). The facility serves youths and families. (Shows the overall Jackson Square plan.) In Jackson Square, the uses are primarily residential with some first floor retail. The Recreation Center extends the rejuvenation and revitalization of Jackson Square to serve area families. A study we did in 2015 showed the need for more program; we have a *lot* of support.

Joel Bargmann (JB) of Bargmann Hendries Archetype: Five years later, the agreement to retain the brick wall of the Webb building has lapsed, so we were able to open it up (we still have some brick). (Notes the site plan.) We were able to negotiate about 20' more of property from the DPW salt shed, which allowed more program flexibility. (Shows plan, notes entries on Columbus Ave and from the rear lot. Points out the bathrooms and support spaces that are fronting the salt shed.) The opportunities given us by the State and City allow us to go higher. (Shows an internal view looking over the rink, then a plan of the upper floor, then an internal view of the turf facility. Shows an axonometric demonstrating the relationship to 225 Centre Street, and sections in both directions.) The top of the building is a polycarbonate box - a lightweight, light-filled material. (Shows the elevation.) The [remaining] brick denotes this being part of Jackson Commons, but also emphasizes the entry. (Notes the materials, and shows day and night views from Columbus.) The entry is bigger, more inviting. (Shows a corner view.) You would think this was the entry, but the entry needs to be down the street, and also accessible from the rear. We are activating the sidewalk edge with visibility.

DC: Is there ice at the sidewalk level? JB: Yes. There's seating above, and locker rooms. The season is only limited because you have to turn the ice off for two months, or permafrost will be generated. DH: This is so much better than the prior version. It's more urban. The only dilemma is the corner reading as an entry...I imagine that if the darker material turned the corner, it would de-emphasize that reading. Otherwise, I support this. DS: I had the same thought. Maybe the canopy could change. DH: The slits, if on the curve, make it even more dramatic. LE: I like the project too. It was very hard to announce the entry before. Now, you have the flexibility. And seating. This is much more simple and straightforward, with polycarbonate at the top...with the rounded corner at the base, I find myself wishing that the poly could turn the corner. JB: We did look at that; it competed too much. DH: It's worth studying, bringing that around. LE: And the canopy. MD: The canopy is a public benefit; it acts as a shelter. WR asked how the entries worked with the grade. JB pointed out the entry program and challenges: It's not the best solution, but the constraints are hard. The parents would be here (indicates). WR: I like what you did 7 years ago. For me, it's not so different. One worry is the horizontal windows - it feels like it could be the edge of a retail building. I worry that that part is not lyrical enough. Is there maybe something more that you could do...maybe bringing the wall around would help. JB: The intent was to separate.

The question of whether to send to Committee was raised. After a brief discussion, it was instead decided to re-approve, which meant that a vote to re-open review was first necessary. Two votes were subsequently moved, seconded and affirmed:

**VOTED:** That the Commission review the most recent Notice of Project Change for the Jackson Square Indoor Recreation Center Project in the First Phase area of the Jackson Square Project (the specific Project is in the Roxbury neighborhood).

And:

**VOTED:** That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the most recent Notice of Project Change for the Jackson Square Indoor Recreation Center Project in the First Phase area of the Jackson Square Project (the specific Project is in the Roxbury neighborhood).

There being no further items for discussion, a motion was made to adjourn, and the meeting was duly adjourned at 8:49 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was scheduled for February 7, 2017. The recording of the January 3, 2017 Boston Civic Design Commission meeting was digitized and is available at the Boston Redevelopment Authority.