

MINUTES

BOSTON CIVIC DESIGN COMMISSION

The meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was held on Tuesday, October 3rd, 2017, starting in Room #900, Boston City Hall, and beginning at 5:22 p.m.

Members in attendance were: Michael Davis (Co-Vice-Chair); Deneen Crosby, David Hacin, Andrea Leers, William Rawn, and Kirk Sykes. Absent were: Linda Eastley, David Manfredi, Paul McDonough (Co-Vice-Chair), and Daniel St. Clair. Also present was David Carlson, Executive Director of the Commission. Representatives of the BSA were present. Elizabeth Stifel, Raul Duverge, Michael Cannizzo, and Dana Whiteside 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, and gave thanks in particular to Andrea Leers (AL) for volunteering as Acting Chair last month. This hearing was duly advertised on Saturday, September 23, in the BOSTON HERALD.

The first item was the approval of the September 5th, 2017 Meeting Minutes. A motion was made, seconded, and it was duly

VOTED: To approve the September 5th, 2017 BCDC Meeting Minutes.

Votes were passed for signature. The next item was a report from the Review Committee on the **248 Dorchester Avenue Project**. David Carlson (DAC) noted that the Proposed Project, at about 87,000 SF, was slightly less than the BCDC threshold but held a prominent location in the newly planned PLAN:Dot Ave area and was close to the recently reviewed Project at 270 Dorchester Avenue. Review was recommended. It was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission review the schematic design for the proposed 248 Dorchester Avenue Project within the block bounded also by West 5th and West 6th streets and the Haul Road, in the South Boston neighborhood.

The next item was a report from Review Committee on the **112 Shawmut Avenue Project and Shawmut Avenue/Washington Street PDA**. DAC noted that this was a proposed PDA site that embraced three potential Projects, two by nonprofits, and was being promulgated by the developer of 112 Shawmut Avenue. As a proposed PDA in the Harrison Albany Plan area, and as a set of projects each over the BCDC threshold - 112 Shawmut alone was nearly 200,000 SF - review was recommended. It was moved, seconded, and

VOTED:: That the Commission review the revised schematic design for the 112 Shawmut Avenue Project and Shawmut Avenue/Washington Street PDA on the parcels bounded by Herald and Washington streets, and Shawmut Avenue, in the South End neighborhood.

The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **Back Bay South End Gateway Project**. Melissa Shrock (MS) of Boston Properties: We presented first in June of 2016, and

since then have been to at least three Committee meetings. (Shows list of items that had changed as a result of BCDC and Article 80 reviews.) We have eliminated two proposed bridges, but still have the one over Trinity Place. Rafael Pelli (RP) of Pelli Clarke Pelli presented the updated design, starting with an axonometric overview. He noted that the Proposed Project complied with the Stuart Street zoning guidelines. On the axon, he noted there were few places to put down actual structure. He then showed several views from up and down the Southwest Corridor and Dartmouth Street, then closer views, such as the corner of Stuart and Dartmouth. He discussed detailing the sidewalks and their widths, eliminating the bridges, and working on the entries at Stuart and Clarendon. He showed a view of the Clarendon edge, then a longer view from Columbus, then a view of the plaza off of Clarendon. He showed the improved connections through and into the Station. Jim Batchelor (JB) of Arrowstreet picked up on that connection, noting the wintergarden at the juncture of old and new, and retention/restoration of the main arches. The station interior had a potential bridge to join retail spaces. He noted the skylight detail which allowed the retention of natural daylight, and then showed a view from the exterior. Cody Klein (CK) from the Office of James Burnett noted the shifts in the building facades and showed views demonstrating the impact. He also compared existing conditions photos to the current proposal. He then showed a plan of the Clarendon plaza, including improvements around the headhouse on the opposite side.

David Hacin (DH) asked about variations between the perspective view and the model, of the office building. RP: There's a slight variation depending on the structure - the ramp, vs. the no-ramp scheme (the preferred alternative). Bill Rawn (WR) asked about that garage exit, which was still part of the base scheme. CK and Mike Cantalupa of Boston Properties noted they were working with the State to push for the no-ramp scheme. MD: We can make that a condition. AL: At the last several meetings your team has been very responsive, and Clarendon is much improved. MD noted that the improvements were seen and discussed in Committee. Deneen Crosby (DC): I have a concern that the Stuart Street bridge is merely postponed...? MS: The bridge is NOT a part of this Project. Hearing no public comment, it was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the proposed Back Bay/South End Gateway Project on the Hancock Garage and Back Bay Station sites in the Commercial Spine area of the Back Bay neighborhood, at the edge of the South End, with the condition that the Project return for further review and a vote if the garage exit ramp remains on Dartmouth Street.

The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **North Point Parcels G&H Project**. Mark Johnson of DivCo West thanked the Commission for their time and input on the project. Alex Krieger (AK) of NBBJ: The concerns were mostly about how the building (H) lands, and what is seen. We improved the landscape on all 3 sides; we strengthened the idea of a 'prow,' and the Gilmore Bridge interface. (Shows the sidewalk change as it approaches the building, then around the corner at the Murphy Stairs. Shows a diagram, then a view, describing how to get down; then a view of the Zakim from the space below. Shows a section, upper and lower floor views, and then the curtainwall system. AK: We are using exaggerated metal panels. We prefer the simple scheme, but are also still considering variations of the added element. Chris Matthews (CM) of Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates showed an articulated site plan. CM: We are doubling the width of the Stairs, and strengthening our strategy for buffering from the railyards. We have worked to define the space at the bottom (shows) to address the

Commission's concerns. At the Bridge, we have left an extra 10' at the edge of the building to allow space, and added climbing vines to augment the edges. (Shows a series of detail sections, more views, distanced views.)

Robert Brown (RB) of Perkins+Will re-explained the massing diagram for Building G, then showed the landscape plans. He showed changes to the upper massing, noting the use of precast panels, and showing precedents and details. He used a perspective to explain how the facade details worked to articulate the shifts in the facade plane. He showed longer views from the highway. RB: It's much changed from a month ago; we added more details and shifted more. CM: I'll focus on the landscape *here*. The food truck plaza is smaller, so it's less defined by hardscape. On the other side, there's open space, an exercise area, bicycles. The conifer trees to the side, on the edge are part of the same strategy used for the buffer. (Shows street level views, then a series of sections, examples of materials, furniture, plantings.) There is a single landscape between both buildings, part of a system for the master plan.

DC asked about the jersey barriers on the Bridge. AK: They are continuous at the roadway. The outer barrier is a rail, which shifts at our property. DC: I would advocate for their removal - and for those which will front the building planned across the street (bridge), to make it more like a street. CM: We can ask [the State]. AK: That other building is 40-50' away from the bridge. DC: I understand the difficulty working with MassDOT. DH: I still have a concern about color. Each building is fine, but together they are a *lot* of silver/gray, monochromatic. I urge you to consider introducing color to differentiate the two - work with staff. RB: I totally agree. We are differentiating with vertical vs. horizontal detailing, and materials.... Kirk Sykes (KS): We talked in Committee about this being seen from the highway, a 60mph impression. Walking on the Bridge, it's a different story. There should be something as daring as the EF crack. AK noted the difference between precast and shiny metal: That point is probably more true on the Cambridge side. DH: The Seaport District has brought this to our attention. AL: The landscape has improved. I appreciate your work, and the shaping. Where the buildings come together, make the G entry as lively as the H entry. With that, and hearing no public comment, it was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic designs for the proposed North Point Project Parcels G and H adjacent to the Gilmore Bridge on the Cambridge/Charlestown line.

The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **BU Medical Center IMP amendment and Goldman School of Dental Medicine Project**. Chris Purdy of SmithGroupJJR: We will focus on two items. One is the receiving area, the other is the Porch. You'll see evolution on the other points, too. Darin Daguanno (DD) then reprised what was discussed in Committee, including where people come from. He showed the site plan, and described details of the changes in the receiving area. DD: The loading is directly off of Albany, but it's smaller, and we have eliminated the compactor. It's more consistent with the massing of the building, and has a vegetated wall component. (Notes building materiality and color tones.) We studied going gray, then went back to terra cotta...the glazing will be distinctive. (Shows a revised view along Albany, then the corner, then East Newton.) We talked about holding the urban edge. We now have an 'outside lounge,' with a seatwall as part of the planter. The granite is a warmer color. We looked at turning the corner with glass, but

we're on the property line, which restricts the use of glass. But we can do that on the recessed area at the base, and windows are allowed above. The idea of masonry here is referenced by warm terra cotta.

AL: The receiving area work is a good step forward in how it meets the street. DH: This has evolved nicely. As you work with the BPDA, I hope for warmth on the terra cotta, since the neighborhood is brick. Your last rendering is more appealing than the white one shown before. KS: On the Porch, focus on lighting. This is an important corner, and passive surveillance is important in this area. CP: That has been part of our thinking and design. KS: That can help with the scale and comfort of the Porch. With that, and hearing no public comment, it was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the BU Goldman School of Dental Medicine Project and its associated Amendment to the Boston University Medical Campus Institutional Master Plan, in the South End neighborhood.

The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **87-93 West Broadway Project**. Doug Stefanov (architect) thanked the Commission for its input. Doug: We will focus on changes. Monique Hall (MH, of the BSC Group) has worked on the streetscape contribution (shows a slide showing the evolution of the West Broadway sidewalk thinking). The big change today is in the materials. We previously changed from Nichiha to brick. Because this is designed as a panelized building, we have changed to terra cotta (shows some samples in the red range, shows pictures of a nearby project clad in the same material). We have removed the corner canopy. The entry is still marked with a marquee, but it's shortened, and you can look up as you enter. The east corner matches the edge of the police station next door. (Shows views up and down West Broadway, A Street, Silver Street, across properties. Shows a set of plans, then the roof plan, noting no new changes there. Shows a night view.)

DC: I'm curious about the setback of the building. Doug showed the plan. MH: The sidewalk width is 10' clear, with 4' for the furniture zone. DH: We did talk a lot about this in Committee. The terra cotta is welcome. I understand how the community feels about brick, but this is a happy change. KS asked about breaking down the scale of the garage element. Doug: We can add faux windows.... MD: Is it south-facing? Doug: Yes. MD: Then you could do a green wall. KS: You have integrated window systems, so it's not an issue as it was with the Urbanica project on Mass Ave. Doug: Yes. WR: I appreciate the change to terra cotta. And it's more than usually seen on these projects. With that, and hearing no public comment, it was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the schematic design for the proposed 87-93 West Broadway Project in the South Boston neighborhood.

The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **Landmark Center Redevelopment Project NPC (North Office Building)**. Abe Menzin (AM) of Samuels Associates introduced the team, including John Martin (JM) of Elkus/Manfredi and Keith LeBlanc (landscape architect). JM: I want to thank you for your critique; it made the building much better. (Shows

a list of issues discussed, including the context relationship and the interconnection with the cinema. Notes the site plan, and shows a prior view.) We have separated the interlock of the cinema. We have narrowed the building facade 7'8" (shows before and after views). We broke the column grid at the base. (Shows a close-up of the corner, noting the interaction with the retail space. Shows the shift in the cinema box design, with language related to the new building which then begins to shift in the front.)

DH: What is the red box? JM: That's the office building entry. It's in the corner, so we brought it forward to emphasize it. WR asked JM to toggle back to the plan. WR: It's hardly noticeable on the plan. What would happen if you didn't have that [carbuncle]? JM: What would happen is that you wouldn't see the office entry until you're on it. We wanted also to separate it from the retail expression. (Shows the north side.) We have added articulation to the north, but here the balconies are recessed. KS: The proportions of the building are much better. Deconstructing the box is a good move. In general, it works better. DH: Separating from the cinema is very good. On the red box, I wonder if it has to be red, or just a bridge between the two. It could be glassier, with a piece of public art. JM: It could be red metal, or red granite, or even a different color. DH: A piece of art that marks the entry is something to consider. AL: Now that the theater is less volumetric, the big red box is more an element. So you can work on that. With that, and hearing no public comment, it was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the Commission recommends approval of the significantly modified schematic design for the Landmark Center Redevelopment Project NPC (North Office Tower) in the Fenway neighborhood.

The next item was a report from Design Committee on the **Rio Grande Dudley Square Project.**

David Lee (DL) of Stull & Lee presented the design update, starting with photos of the site. DL: There's no accessibility at the front, so, because of the historic facade, we want to accommodate that on the side. DL noted the Project's program, and used photos to explain what was intended with the buildings and spaces created. He noted the urban design strategy, and went through the massing scenarios studied, remarking that there were cost issues with height and reduced footprints. DL: We came to a compromise, and tried to get more verticality in the design. (Shows tower upper floor plan diagrams, noting the possibility of a 2-floor variation each way. Shows an elevation, before and after changes. Shows a view looking between the buildings. Shows a view of the entry elevation on Marvin Street.) We have verticality defined on Martin Street, and the residential entry is clear. Our intent is to pedestrianize Marvin Street (shows a site plan) by tabling it, at least on one side - it will read more as a shared street. DL then showed their shadow analysis ('not on historic properties'), and an aerial view of the tower in context.

KS: We looked at this quite a lot in Design Committee...ways of making it porous, and more related to Dudley Square. Have you reworked the ground plane? DL: Yes, quite a lot. (Shows the plan.) We carved away the bank building to create an atrium space. The program is still the same. DH: I'm seeing this for the first time since your initial presentation. It seems clearer; the ground plane is clearer. But take note of the landscape of towers in this area. We should be mindful of that, with Northeastern, Tremont Crossing, and this used as precedents. There isn't a plan for where they should be. But that's not a question for this site, which we understand to be marking Dudley Square. AL: We might have to think about the towers, and agree that this location is apropos. I note the use of colors, Caribbean colors. It's good to keep

that going. I appreciate what you've done to compose the tower, give it proportion. Work on making the Square successful. Go ahead and develop your plan. KS: Northeastern's International Village, and the Mass Art Tree House - you're headed in that direction. We looked at the massing and variations, and encouraged more variation on the back. DL went back to views that showed the effects of the massing. He showed the outcome of the 'Slim L' discussion. DL: I welcome the opportunity to be more playful with color. And in the interior space, too. We are looking for opportunities; this is not just another tower. AL: The vertical bands of color are a good start. DH: The proportions are much improved. Kevin Benjamin of Stull & Lee noted the color relationship seen in a twilight view. DC asked about MHC and the historic buildings. DL: We are asking for modifications to the rear, not the primary, facades. MD: You've done a great job responding. With that, and hearing no public comment, it was moved, seconded, and

VOTED: That the BCDC recommends approval of the schematic design for the Rio Grande Dudley Square Project at 2343-5 Washington Street, on the corner of Marvin Street and Shawmut Avenue, in the Roxbury neighborhood.

The next item was a presentation of the **248 Dorchester Avenue Project**. Jason Cincotta (JC): Our first Boston project was 22-26 West Broadway. Here, we had a permitted residential project, but wanted to wait for the outcome of the planning study. Now, we propose a 87,000 SF hotel, design-forward, across from the Cabot Yards. So we have the responsibility of designing something to attract interest in a mid-block location. Michael LeBlanc (MLB) of Utile: We were ready to proceed with the prior project, before deciding to wait. (Notes the mid-block site on an aerial photo. Shows the locus on the Broadway-Andrew Square arc.) We are mindful of our neighbors.... The BRA Board approved the PLAN: Dot Ave study, but there are a lot of interesting things. There is a large bus maintenance facility across the street. In this area, there is also a hospitality desert. (Shows a transit diagram, remarks about the Pappas hotel change.) DH: I want to know how that has changed. DAC: We saw that, then reviewed the adjacent 14-20 West Broadway condos. Both sites now have the same owner. But the hotel will still be the William James design, as executed by RODE. And still a hotel, not significantly changed.

MLB: We want this to become a destination here. We have an elegant facade, meant to recall the beauty of mid-century modern (Bellusci, Stahl) buildings. (Shows a frontal view image. Shows axonometric views, then the panelized metal facade system precedent/intent.) There's a lantern-like feature on top of the building. Understanding the resiliency issues, we've raised the sidewalk a few inches (shows a sidewalk section and a street view). There are active program uses at the base, with an open lobby, and an inflected entry. (Shows lobby precedents. Shows the site plan, with valeted parking and loading in the rear.) The parking is substantially at grade, above the Haul Road and in back of the neighboring properties. (Shows a side yard section, illustrating the treatment in aback of their condo abutters. Shows a green wall precedent for this location. Shows a typical floor layout and hotel room, then precedents for the room and rooftop lounges.) The roof plan has two pools now. (Shows a terrace/lounge view, notes lighting of the element, the intended indoor/outdoor condition. Notes the views of downtown.)

AL: What about the event space, wrapped in its golden screen? MLB: It will be used for weddings, parties, events, community meetings...right now, the neighborhood lacks venues, and this will be a great addition in that sense. DH: This is a really great project, and potentially a

good catalyst. I like the idea of a unified facade system that makes sense of the site. When I think of the public realm - the streetscape, and lantern itself - on the lantern, I really love the idea of it. What bothers me is the *extrudedness*. It could be more pure, figural. The views are beautiful. The model is a little clunky. I like the volume of it, but as a part of the urban landscape of the City, it should be understood on a sculptural level. DC: Bring the Dot Ave PLAN, to understand the context. The sea level rise...if this is elevated, it will go down on the sides - I want to understand how that impacts the sides. MLB: It's just a little on one side, but up to 20" on the Doughboy site. DC: Spreading that out, what does it mean to Dot Ave? And the party wall created - what does it look like in the interim? We may look at it for a while. MLB: That's a great question. We are exploring ideas, such as an Artists for Humanities mural.

DH: There are a lot of precedents from that [mid-century] era of sculpted tops. AL: I echo David. This is a very beautiful facade strategy. Elegant, detailed, and not a simple strategy. Don't dumb that down - don't lose it. The lantern, achieving it as the kind of figure you propose, will require a lot of careful detailing to make it read as one thing. Tell me more about the space aside it. The screen - is it one or two layers? It feels like a notation.... On the sidewalk, it's better to just leave it, rather than go up and down. What if the building goes up...look at that. MLB: There's a question of continuity...we have 128' of bike lane along here. MD: Discuss details in subcommittee. KS: Maybe that can evolve; we dealt with this at Crosstown. On staying faithful to the design - we had one in Dudley that got watered down. This warrants this treatment; it's a billboard in its own right. I look forward to it. With that, and hearing no public comment, the 248 Dorchester Avenue Project was sent to Design Committee.

The next item was a presentation of the **112 Shawmut Project / Shawmut-Washington Block PDA**. Dante Angelucci (DA), president of The Davis Companies (TDC), introduced the project while equipment was being set up. DA: We have worked with the CCBA (Consolidated Chinese Benevolent Association) and BCEC (Boston Chinese Evangelical Church) for two years to assemble the PDA. Steve Chin (SC) introduced himself: I'm the senior pastor of the BCEC, which was founded 50+ years ago with just 18 members. Now we are the largest such church in New England. We have worship services in three locations - one in Newton, two in Chinatown. We purchased the nursing home on this site in 2014, and have looked at adding worship space with sanctuaries on the lower floors. And residential units above, which will help fund our Project. We can consolidate all our programs into a single building, which will allow us to provide better services to our community. Paul Chen (PC), president of the CCBA: We were organized as a charity in 1923. Our mission: to maintain community harmony, promote Chinese culture...and provide affordable housing. Our Board consists of 46 people, representing 35 organizations. We did several housing projects, then purchased Tai Tung village. In 1986, we thought of housing at the C-Mart. We run an after-school program and promote Chinese cultural activities. Our building has NPS designation; we are on the National Register. WE are excited to be part of the team developing the site. We propose 206 units, with a commercial ground floor - we hope C-Mart will come back. There will be a minimum of 40% affordable housing on the site. We are looking for approval of height and massing only at this point. DA: We purchased our site at 112 two years ago; there are two tenants left (introduces Michael Liu [ML] of TAT).

ML introduced his TAT colleague Jason. ML: There are three parcels constituting the PDA. We are showing height and massing only for two, and full architecture for 112 Shawmut.

(Shows an aerial noting the locus, then an outlined bird's-eye view to show the extent of the combined 82,000 Sf site.) For 112 Shawmut, we propose 143 units, 124 parking spaces, and 1,000 SF of retail. (Notes the program for the CCBA and BCEC sites similarly.) All buildings are at the maximum allowed height of 150', with some stepping. (Uses a site plan to discuss the logistics of the site.) It's a bit of a jigsaw puzzle; we are providing pedestrian 'crossways.' There are two residential entries off of Washington for the CCBA project, allowing for a large retail space and service to the south. Access to the BCEC site is provided. Massing was developed among all three Proponents. The massing variations respond to 321 Harrison/1000 Washington, and then to the church condo addition at 148 Shawmut. (Points out the garage and service entries for 112 Shawmut, notes a second garage entry on Herald.) It's important to retain the historic 112 Shawmut Avenue building, with the new construction more contemporary in style. (Shows the four elevations.) We are using terra cotta, curtainwall, and metal panel. (Shows three pedestrian views...one from the bridge over the Turnpike on Shawmut, first with just the existing, then the 112 Project, then with all three volumes. Shows views from Marginal Road, then Paul Place in Oak Square - again with existing conditions, the 112 Interim, and full buildout. Another sequence from Washington. An evening view.) We are trying to create a distinctive profile within our constraints.

John Copley (JC) of the Copley Wolff Design Group showed the area connections, how they link to the site, and how they set up similar passageways. JC: We want to create, to celebrate pedestrian ways, while also including a service and pedestrian court. We are creating things which glow at night - AND day. Lighting elements and paving celebrating 'the Neck.' DH: What are the sidewalk dimensions on Shawmut, Herald, and Washington? JC: 10' on Shawmut, up to 40' across Washington, then 20'. On Herald, it's more like 8'.

WR: Could you have gone up, say, 3 more stories? DA: With our program, we could have, but speaking to the BPDA, we were advised not to do so. Brian Fallon (BF) of TDC: When we went in, it was strongly suggested that we comply with the precedents - the height, 20% open space, affordable housing on site. DH: 112 Shawmut is a nice building, but not a great one. Why keep it? BF: If you know the building, we felt it had character. And the South End Landmark District.... AL: The coming together of three sites is potentially a win-win. This amount of density desperately needs a courtyard of scale. To make this a place you want to be.... The first concern is the massing of the entire block. That suggests shifting the mass, or adjusting the heights. Right now, it won't be nice for anybody. 345 Harrison really works because of that courtyard space, and the through-block connection. 112 Shawmut is a warehouse building; there are two ways to go at it. One is to leave it as it is. Inserting a new building in it leaves little of the original. I would love to see more presence of the worship community, with activities on the street, not buried inside. An opportunity to showcase. I walk through here all the time. Step back, and take a look at the massings.

DC: I agree. Work on the spaces. There's great view of the Hancock...but the spaces that lead in go nowhere; the block seems impenetrable. KS asked about the process. DAC: It's the same as with other projects we've seen - 345 Harrison, 321 Harrison, 370 Harrison, 80 East Berkeley. But this is uniquely different - it has three sites/owners, and all the others have had just one. The PDA will include all three but initially define just 112.

DH: I agree with Andrea; this is a great collaboration of three entities. I'm very familiar with the site. Consider - if Michael's building comes to the ground, maybe that will give the site some breathing room. The spaces...compare this to 345 Harrison, with steps to allow the

sunlight into the public space. It's very difficult to imagine being in *this* space. A lot of work is needed on the massing. We want this to succeed for all parties. MD: The Seaport Square L block...we spent a lot of time looking at that, suggesting more buildings. Here, maybe it's the opposite. What if there were two building masses, instead of three - if the buildings touched? The historic building is a kind of Gordian Knot. AL: There might also be something we could look at: incremental changes in height to make it work together. The goal is to allow three entities to make a block in the City. DH: At the Troy, the height allowed them to create spaces that have allowed them to create program. Height might allow that here.

ML asked MD about the party wall idea. MD: I'm not sure what's possible, but maybe that would work. DH: Having the right to do things, and doing them, are two different things. WR asked about the parking. DA described it, noting the various entries and loading access points for all three buildings. DH: [The Herald Street access] is tough. I don't have to tell you that Herald is tough at peak hours. DA: There is actually a traffic reduction from the existing curb cut use, and the 112 Shawmut project is the only one utilizing that side. (Some discussion ensued on this and related points.) AL: That goes to the nature of that [interior] space, with two levels of parking there. That needs to be resolved. With that, and hearing no public comment, the 112 Shawmut Project / Shawmut-Washington Block PDA was sent to Design Committee.

There being no further items for formal discussion, a motion was made to adjourn, and the meeting was duly adjourned at 8:52 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Boston Civic Design Commission was scheduled for November 7th, 2017. The recording of the October 3rd, 2017 Boston Civic Design Commission meeting was digitized and is available at the Boston Redevelopment Authority.