

2-4 BROOKLINE PLACE DAT MEETING SUMMARY

October 9, 2014 -- 7:30 p.m.

DAT Members Present: Chair Linda Hamlin, Mark Zarrillo, Edith Brickman, Steve Lacker, Arlene Mattison, and Antonia Bellalta

Staff Present: Polly Selkoe

Members of the Public: Phil Kenney and Steve Holt (Brook House), Tim Vitolo and Craig Bolon

Development Team: George Cole (Stantec), Architects Sam Norod and Tim Talun (Elkus Manfredi), Landscape Architect, Mikyoung Kim

Mark Zarrillo opened the meeting. He made a motion to accept the **minutes of the September 15th** DAT meeting. Linda Hamlin seconded. The minutes were **approved unanimously**.

Architect Tim Talun reviewed the scenarios shown at the last meeting. The goal tonight is to get input related to the design and materials of the buildings and the open space. He then showed a power point presentation showing pedestrian circulation, bicycle circulation and parking, and vehicular drop-off locations. [See hand-out dated 10/9/2014.] Then a massing model was shown and two of the refined scenarios were placed in the model.

There was discussion about the pros and cons of the open space and buildings in options 1 & 2.

The DAT was then asked to express their reactions to the two scenarios.

Mark Zarrillo liked scheme 1 with some tweaks to the walkways. Also like to see “green” when entering space from T.

Linda Hamlin liked form of buildings in scheme 1, although not supportive of pavilion attached to garage as designed.

Steve Lacker likes the design of the north side of 2 Brookline Place in scheme 2, because it doesn't feel added on. Also likes open space of scheme 2 - green on left and plaza on the right. The garage needs a bolder touch i.e. more texture.

Edith Brickman raised the issue of which scheme worked the best.

Steve Holt (Brook House) responded that people tend to walk the fastest, straightest way which would be scheme 2.

Mark Zarrillo suggested a fountain.

George Cole said it could be designed to allow children to play in it.

Arlene Mattison – wonders whether green space should be adjacent to parking garage (scheme 2).

Mark Zarrillo – scheme 1 is more of an urban plaza.

Linda Hamlin – how does the retail space relate to the plaza?

Steve Lacker – scheme 2 is ready for more detail.

Mikyoung Kim – scheme 1 could be simplified to provide a larger plaza. She also noted that any fountain should look good in all seasons, and it could be a shallow element. She is also very conscious of the percentage of hardscape and green space required. Landscape plans of the various schemes are not interchangeable; they are uniquely tied to the building forms and building adjacencies.

Architect Sam Norod – scheme 1 gives more opportunity for outdoor restaurant space especially on the south side. He also noted that Scheme 1 allows for more sun and less shadow on the path between the buildings. They are looking at the possibility of a continuous stair on west side of the garage that could house bike parking or storage below, as well as serve as a sculptural element facing the public park.

Antonia Bellalta preferred Scheme 2, the more direct route through the site and did not like the curved paths at Route 9 as the connection with the Brook House is not as nice. She also commented that the tree canopy in Scheme 2 could spill into the terrace area instead of having to use umbrellas. She requested that some of the positive elements of Scheme 2 be incorporated into Scheme 1.

Mikyoung Kim said she understood the comments about both schemes and would take them into consideration while developing Scheme 1 further.

Linda Hamlin recommended another look at scheme 1 at south side of building to see how a restaurant could use it. She also suggested that the pavilion be better integrated into the garage to provide more green space.

Arlene Mattison suggested that in Scheme 1 the path to the T needs to be better delineated and that restaurants should face the greenway.

There was consensus by the DAT (5-1) that Scheme 1 should be further developed.

The next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, Oct. 22nd at 7:30 pm in Rm. 103.

The meeting was adjourned.