

# PARCEL 7 & 9 ADVISORY COMMITTEE

*Convened by the Massachusetts Department of Transportation  
In Consultation with the Boston Redevelopment Authority*

June 1, 2012

William Tuttle, Director  
Office of Real Estate Development  
Massachusetts Department of Transportation  
State Transportation Building at Ten Park Plaza  
Boston, MA 02116

**RE:** Parcel 7 & 9 Advisory Committee Comments on the CAT Parcel 9 Development Proposals

Dear Mr. Tuttle,

Attached hereto are the consensus comments of the Parcel 7 & 9 Advisory Committee on the four proposals for the redevelopment of CAT Parcel 9 within the Market District of Boston, which were submitted pursuant to a Request for Proposals (RFP) issued by the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MADOT) based on Parcel 9 Development Guidelines that were prepared by MADOT and reviewed and approved by the Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA) and the Parcel 7 & 9 Advisory Committee.

Please note that some of the individual members of the Parcel 7 & 9 Advisory Committee are also expected to submit written comments from their respective organizations on behalf of their own constituencies. Those individual comments may reflect somewhat different emphases and priorities than those reflected in these consensus comments; but we are quite confident that those emphases and priorities will be generally compatible with what is expressed herein.

Our consensus comments have been prepared on the basis of the many months of our public Advisory Committee meetings that preceded formulation and publication of the development guidelines and RFP for Parcel 9. They were done in the context of the related RFP for a Public Market on Parcel 7 that was issued by the Massachusetts Department of Agriculture and has since resulted in the selection of the Boston Public Market Association to operate that facility. They also reflect our review and discussion of the four written Parcel 9 development proposals, the subsequent oral presentations of each of those proposals to the community, and the Q&A sessions that followed them.

As requested, our comments identify and describe what Advisory Committee members perceive to be the principal strengths and weaknesses of these proposals, without ranking them or otherwise expressing a definitive preference for one or the other; and our comments on each proposal are presented in the order of their oral presentations. It should be noted that the Advisory Committee is not privy to the financial components of developer submissions and, therefore, our comments do not directly address that critical element of these proposals. And we offer our views with the understanding that MADOT, in consultation with the BRA, will be responsible for making a final designation of the Parcel 9 developer.

*Victor Brogna: North End/Waterfront Residents Association Otto Gallotto: Haymarket Pushcart Association  
Ryan Kenny: North End Neighborhood Council Claudio Kraus: Faneuil Hall Marketplace Daniel Nuzzo: North  
End Resident Robert O'Brien: Downtown North Association Tad Stahl: Beacon Hill Civic Association  
George Thrush: Boston Society of Architects Kathryn West: Partners HealthCare*

*Parcel 7 & 9 Advisory Committee Comments on the Parcel 9 Development Proposals*

*June 1, 2012*

*Page 2 of 2*

We have, however, gone beyond the simple recounting of the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal to further note the commendable elements of some proposals that we believe could/should be integrated into whatever proposal is finally selected, to the extent possible and appropriate. We have also made a number of related suggestions for follow-up actions by MADOT, BRA and the Parcel 7 & 9 Advisory Committee itself. These include our respectful recommendation that whatever project team is finally selected for redevelopment of Parcel 9 should be requested to prepare and submit an updated and optimized proposal based on the conclusions of the ongoing proposal assessment process. That can then be fully reviewed by the community in and through the Parcel 7 & 9 Advisory Committee before it is finally submitted for BRA Article 80 review, thereby taking full advantage of the quite extensive public input and feedback that has informed this process thus far. To that end, the Parcel 7 & 9 Advisory Committee would be ready, willing and able to continue to serve as a venue for community participation through the completion of required BRA design review and permitting processes for this project, perhaps in lieu of or as part of its Impact Advisory Group.

We would conclude by acknowledging and applauding the critical and commendable roles played by both MADOT and BRA staff and consultants throughout this lengthy planning and designation process, particularly including their organization of and support for extensive community input and feedback in and through Parcel 7 & 9 Advisory Committee itself. The consistent and continuing involvement of individuals and organizations from the impacted neighborhoods, as well as of most of the prospective Parcel 9 developers, is likewise noted and commended. The result has been four serious and substantive Parcel 9 development proposals from four credible and resourceful project teams, all of whom added their own invaluable insights and perspectives. And we hope that these comments of the Parcel 7 & 9 Advisory Committee will help to inform the choice among them and to facilitate its refinement and implementation thereafter.

Sincerely

*The Members of the Parcel 7 & 9 Advisory Committee*

cc: Secretary Richard Davey and John Romano and Roy Avellaneda of MADOT  
Governor Deval Patrick, Senator Anthony Petruccelli and Representative Aaron Michlewitz  
Director Peter Meade, Kairos Shen and Lauren Shurtleff of the BRA  
Mayor Thomas Menino and City Councilor Salvatore LaMattina  
Commissioner Scott Soares and Mark Lillienthal of the Massachusetts Department of Agriculture  
Donald Wiest, Yanni Tspis and Mimi Hall of the Boston Public Market Association  
The Four Parcel 9 RFP Respondents  
Other Interested Parties

**PARCEL 7 & 9 ADVISORY COMMITTEE COMMENTS  
ON THE FOUR PARCEL 9 DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**THE BOSTON MUSEUM PROPOSAL**

**PERCEIVED PROJECT STRENGTHS:**

**The Boston Museum Concept:** The desire for a Boston Museum basically as described in this submission has long been well established. From its origins with the Bostonian Society several years ago, this concept has since been refined into a clear vision for the kind of civic, cultural and historical institution that should be an important element of Boston. Support for such a facility has been evident in previous public processes that have resulted in serious consideration for its development on CAT Parcel 18 and its actual designation for development on CAT Parcel 12 -- a designation that remains in place.

**The Boston Museum Governance Structure:** The Board of Directors and National Advisory Committee organized more than ten years ago to implement the Boston Museum concept are unquestionably informed, respected, resourceful and experienced groups that well represent a broad range of the financial, academic, business and cultural sectors of the Boston community. And they are they are more than capably supported by a President and CEO who has had a distinguished and accomplished career in both the public and the private sectors.

**PERCEIVED PROJECT WEAKNESSES:**

**Funding Uncertainty:** The lack of reliable current funding commitments for this project is fundamentally problematic, especially since the other three civic/cultural uses proposed for the CAT right-of-way have not been able to secure sufficient funding, with or without a development designation. Notwithstanding their well known and highly regarded Board of Directors and Advisory Committee, the Boston Museum project has yet to secure a level of contributions for either Parcel 12 or Parcel 9 – or even conditional pledges based on a Parcel 9 development designation – that would provide reliable public confidence of eventual full funding success. There is no default position outlined in this proposal, either for the Boston Museum or for Parcel 9, in the event of another funding failure, which could well put us in another two or three years essentially back where we started.

**The Appropriateness of Parcel 9:** This proposal makes a more persuasive case for the Boston Museum itself than it does for Parcel 9 as the best or only site for the Boston Museum. And in our view, it has failed to meet the burden of proof that the residential and/or commercial redevelopment of Parcel 9, as reflected in the Boston 2000 Plan and as since reinforced by the Boston 2000 Working Group, should now be converted to a civic/cultural use. The issue is not just whether Parcel 9 would be good for the Boston Museum, but whether the Boston Museum would be better for Parcel 9 and the Market District as a whole than one or more of the other submissions. The Parcel 7 & 9 Advisory Committee is not convinced that it would be.

**The Availability of Other Greenway Sites:** None of the six CAT parcels reserved for civic or cultural purposes has yet to be developed; and these include the three non-ramp parcels initially reserved for development by the Massachusetts Horticultural Society (MHS), which

had its development designation from the outset. One or more of those MHS parcels are still available for development; and they are located in an emerging civic/cultural district on and around Fort Point Channel that already includes the Institute of Contemporary Art and the Children's and Computer Museums. Those parcels and that district may well need the Boston Museum more than does Parcel 9 and the Market District.

**Architecture and Design:** While the height and massing of the current Boston Museum proposal is a great improvement over their previous Parcel 9 proposal, the architecture and design now proposed combines a very contextual approach to the Blackstone Street side of the building with a much more contemporary design on the Greenway side of the building. This admixture of disparate architectural styles is somewhat disconcerting; and the dramatic quality of its fully glazed and brightly lighted Greenway façade draws attention to itself in a manner that violates both the letter and the spirit the Parcel 9 guidelines. Viewed from the North End and the Kennedy Greenway, it also presents a foreground that is visually out of synch with the more important architectural character of the historic Blackstone Block in the background.

**The Community Market:** The affordable ethnic community markets planned in this proposal on some or all of the days on which the HPA vendors are not operating would seem to directly compete for the target markets that HPA itself serves. It is also not clear that the availability of interior space on Parcel 9 for HPA vendors on the days that they do operate is appropriate or advisable for what has historically and successfully operated as an outdoor marketplace.

**Transportation Logistics:** The planned use of the Surface Artery adjacent to Parcel 9 for school/tour bus drop-off/pick-up of students and other museum visitors perpetuates -- and arguably exacerbates -- an already undesirable existing situation that would greatly diminish and possibly overwhelm the pedestrian and aesthetic experience in this crucial area. Given the size of these vehicles, this would complicate and compromise the visual and functional links between Parcel 9 and the Greenway, which are important goals of the guidelines.

## **THE BLACKSTONE MARKET PROPOSAL**

### **PERCEIVED PROJECT STRENGTHS:**

**Team Composition:** The Blackstone Market project team includes the longtime owner of the several of the Blackstone Street properties across the street from Parcel 9 and a Boston real estate developer with extensive local experience, including Liberty Wharf in the Seaport District and the Bulfinch Hotel on Merrimac Street. They are joined by two respected Boston architects and planners, one of whom designed the nearby visitors center on the Kennedy Greenway and the other the nearby Bostonian Hotel – the latter with a longstanding working relationship with the Haymarket Pushcart Association. This team, therefore, would be in an unusually strong position to address and realize the potential of Parcel 9 in the larger context of the Market District, critical elements of which are already under their control.

**Project Architecture:** The project architecture for the Blackstone Market proposal is clearly one of its strengths. The Parcel 9 building design is creative, contextual and unassuming; its forms are simple and well proportioned; and its proposed use of Boston brick and clear glass is consonant with the surrounding structures.

Moreover, the compact floor plan of the residential element affords the market hall element a distinct and dominant role in the overall composition; and the colonnade of the base structure provides for a human-scaled pedestrian environment. It also creates a more intimate façade on Blackstone Street and a dignified aspect for the Greenway, as well as a strong connection between these two perimeters. The overall height and massing of the project enhances view corridors from the Kennedy Greenway and the North End, which was an important basis for community support of any building height in excess of the 55' allowed as of zoning right -- although such view corridors are to some extent compromised in the minds of some by a proposed rooftop greenhouse, about which there is less general enthusiasm.

**Height and Massing:** The smaller number of residential units proposed in this submission allows for some of the design refinements favorably noted above, including the concentration of the housing element at the North Street end of the property and somewhat set-back from Blackstone Street itself. Since this tends to minimize the physical interface between these residences and the HPA pushcart operations on Blackstone Street, these characteristics of the Blackstone Market proposal have been very favorably reviewed by HPA in particular. It was also noted that, if additional housing units were desired, the commendable design of the project would not be compromised by the addition of one or two stories to its residential structure.

#### **PERCEIVED PROJECT WEAKNESSES:**

**The Failure to Address the Blackstone Street Properties:** Given the composition of the its project team and the explicit description of the major contributing elements of the Market District in the Parcel 9 guidelines -- i.e., *the Haymarket Pushcart operation, the Public Market on Parcel 7's ground floor; the food-related retail planned for the first floor of Parcel 9; and the retailers on the first floor of the Blackstone Block to the south and west of Parcel 9* -- it was both surprising and disappointing that the Blackstone Market proposal did not more fully address the development potential of the other Blackstone Street properties under its control. Due to this unexpected omission, also unaddressed were the likely beneficial implications of the ownership of both sides of Blackstone Street for the design and use of the street itself, including but not limited to its consequences for HPA operations.

**The Blackstone Street Commitments:** The nature and scope of proposed Blackstone Street improvements and the extent of developer funding commitments are addressed equivocally in the Blackstone Market proposal. Their written proposal indicates that proposed improvements **may potentially include** several that are listed; and it then suggests that the developer **will contribute financially** to the costs of such improvements, without specifying any amount that has actually been budgeted or otherwise committed for this purpose. That begs the question of whether the economics of the redevelopment of Parcel 9 alone is sufficient to provide the funding necessary for required Blackstone Street improvements, since this proposal provides many fewer housing units than the other residential development proposal and it also includes a not-for-profit rooftop use that is likely to require funding that could compete with Blackstone Street for resources.

**The Blackstone Market Itself:** It is not entirely clear from the written proposal or the oral presentation what kind of market is actually being proposed for the first floor of Parcel 9.

There are three options outlined – two variations on a farmers market and a specialty retail food store – that do not appear to compete with the HPA operations. But the first two do appear to compete directly with the Public Market planned for Parcel 7; and the third might well compete with the new supermarket planned for the nearby Bulfinch Triangle. As required by the Parcel 9 guidelines, any new retail activities proposed for Parcel 9 should not compete with either HPA or the Public Market, but rather should complement both; and it is not clear in our view that such in the case in this proposal as now presented.

***The Proposed New Restaurants:*** Based on the recent and continuing success of Liberty Wharf, the three second-floor restaurants and associated decks outlined in this proposal would likely be successful from a commercial perspective; but there is a real question as to whether they would be as successful from a community perspective – and even whether Liberty Wharf should be the restaurant model for Parcel 9, albeit on a much smaller scale. What is clearly not desired is an extension into the Market District of the primarily tourist-oriented restaurants and retail spaces that are already well represented in Faneuil Hall Marketplace.

Concern about the undue encroachment of tourist-oriented attractions into the Market District was noted in the Market District Feasibility Study prepared by the Project for Public Spaces; and we certainly share that concern. The Market District already has long and well-established economic, cultural and historic ties to the North End; and that community provides a far better model for Market District restaurant and retail facilities than does either Faneuil Hall Marketplace or Liberty Wharf.

***The Rooftop Farm:*** This is an interesting idea for a rather widely visible rooftop space; but it does not seem to be fully thought-out or well developed. References to potential collaborators are not supported by reports or results of any related discussions; and no budgets or sources of funding are described. There is also no fallback position defined in the event that this concept does not prove to be viable or advisable now or in the future.

## ***THE HAYMARKET SQUARE HOTEL PROPOSAL***

### ***PERCEIVED PROJECT STRENGTHS:***

***The Inherently Public Quality of a Hotel Use:*** One of the most appealing aspects of the Haymarket Hotel proposal is the inherently public nature of a hotel use. The prospect of an active, attractive, and visible lobby and winter garden, for example, and the availability of additional community meeting and function spaces, makes this use especially interesting.

***Compatibility with HPA Activities:*** Given the longstanding and generally – albeit not universally – successful record of co-existence between the adjacent Millennium Bostonian Hotel and the Haymarket pushcart vendors, there is reason to believe that a hotel use on Parcel 9 could work well with HPA operations, if it is managed with that goal as a priority.

***The Proposed Configuration of the Haymarket Pushcarts:*** As described in their oral presentation at least, the Haymarket Hotel proposal lays out the option of a 3-lane pushcart configuration that is quite similar to what is now in existence on Blackstone and North Streets, thereby limiting pushcart dislocation while accommodating the need for emergency vehicle access. This approach is facilitated in this case by cantilevering the building on its Blackstone

Street façade in order to provide both space and shelter for some HPA vendors. This proposal also explicitly supports the extension of the Haymarket pushcarts through the crucial Hanover Street intersection and onto the Parcel 7 plaza, which provides more room to accommodate pushcart growth and/or any necessary dislocation as well as strengthening critical links between Parcel 7 & 9. In all of these respects, this proposal is responsive to requests and requirements of HPA that are supported by the Advisory Committee as well.

**Successful Cross-Parcel Connections:** Among the significant advantages of a visible and hotel public lobby space is the clear and convenient, safe and secure mid-block pedestrian connection that it provides through the building. This would be a public passageway that is always available and likely to be well utilized throughout the day and night; and in that regard, it is not only consistent with Parcel 9 guidelines but in many respects superior to what is shown in other proposals.

**Security and Oversight Benefits:** The round-the-clock security benefits of a hotel facility that is staffed and operational on a 24/7/365 basis are worthy of positive note. These benefits apply both within the facility – e.g., with respect to the hotel monitoring of the planned restaurant and function spaces – and on and around the adjacent streets and sidewalks, where the continual presence of staff and guests would be expected to have a positive surveillance effect on the district throughout the day and night.

#### **PERCEIVED PROJECT WEAKNESSES:**

**Project Architecture:** While it is understood that the conceptual architectural plans reflected in this and other proposals are but starting points for an extensive BRA Article 80 review and refinement process, the design and architecture in this proposal is a far less desirable starting point than it is in some others. Particularly problematic are the proposed exterior terra cotta fins, which appear inappropriate for this district and obscure and overwhelm other underlying building features from most viewing angles.

**A Narrow Market District Focus:** Beyond HPA operations, there is little systematic focus on other elements of the Market District and whether and how the proposed hotel would support the district as a whole. Notably absent is any substantive reference to Parcel 7, excepting its plaza; and there is little discussion in the written proposal regarding whether or how the retail functions planned for the first floor of Parcel 9, which are not well described or defined, would complement or compete with those planned for the Public Market on Parcel 7 in particular.

**Transportation Logistics:** The downside of a hotel use is its ongoing transportation demands: guest drop-off/pick-up at check-in/check-out times and during their stay, related luggage handling requirements, and taxi and limousine services for hotel guests and event and restaurant patrons. All of these functions have to be accommodated on the Surface Artery side of the building; and based on experience elsewhere in the area, their adverse impact could arguably be exacerbated by hotel doormen whose income depends in part on this traffic. Such a situation on Parcel 9 could have a deleterious effect on the safety and attractiveness of the pedestrian experience in this vicinity as well on the visibility and use of the links between Parcel 9 and the Greenway parks across the street – a problematic situation previously noted with regard to the Boston Museum as well.

**Long Term Ownership/Management Issues:** In their oral presentation, project proponents suggested that they might well sell this property in the foreseeable future once it is developed. That is a concern, particularly to HPA but to others as well, since a change of hotel ownership and/or management could well change their priority on and attention to needed communication, coordination and compatibility with HPA operations and with the goals of the Market District as a whole. This could be an issue with any of the four proposals; but since it was raised in this case, it is noted here.

**Differences Between the Written Proposal and the Oral Presentation:** Quite unlike the three others, the difference in the case of the Haymarket Hotel proposal between their written submission and their oral presentation was both striking and substantive. The HPA vendor plan illustrated in the oral presentations, for example, is much more expansive and responsive than in the written proposal; and the strong emphasis in their oral presentation on project links to communities beyond the North End was notably absent from their written submission.

## **THE MARKET SQUARE PROPOSAL**

### **PERCEIVED PROJECT STRENGTHS:**

**A Comprehensive Community Focus:** A singular strength of the Market Square proposal is the comprehensive community perspective and interactive strategy that it provides as the premise for its approach. This was the only written proposal to mention a community other than the North End; and this broader community focus is highlighted by its attention to the design and function of the crucial Hanover Street intersection – Market Square itself -- which serves as a new nexus for all of these surrounding districts.

**A More Comprehensive Market District Focus:** Likewise, the Market Square proposal most systematically addresses the interaction and interdependence among all of the various elements of the Market District. This proposal is also alone in addressing the relevance of the uses on the upper floors of Parcel 7, including its on-site parking, to the success of the Market District as a whole. While such proposals go beyond the requirements of the Parcel 9 RFP, they do not necessarily go beyond the purview and priorities of the Parcel 7 & 9 Advisory Committee, which has emphasized the relevance and importance of those linkages from the outset.

**Blackstone Street Commitments & Funding:** This is the only submission that made an explicit financial commitment to fully fund the cost of their enumerated improvements to Blackstone Street. It specifically provides a \$2.1M capital budget for this purpose; and it further identifies the public source of an additional \$1.5M that would enhance that basic commitment. These matters are treated more equivocally and less specifically in other proposals.

**Proposed Retail & Restaurant Uses:** The first floor retail concept presented in the Market Square proposal is a casual and diversified food marketplace with an emphasis on Italian imported and artisan food products, some of which can be sampled on-site. It is intended to be adapted to the retail scale and ambience of the adjacent North End neighborhood, from which existing merchants are among those to be recruited as tenants. Such a local community orientation is commendable; and it is essential that it be maintained to avoid the possibility of the Market District becoming a primarily tourist-oriented extension of Faneuil Hall Marketplace.



Equally importantly, this type of retail complements -- and does not compete with -- the food merchandising operations already established by the Haymarket pushcarts and now planned for the Parcel 7 Public Market, which will focus on Massachusetts farmers and food producers. In that critical regard, this retail strategy can be favorably compared to the other proposals in which Parcel 9 food retailing would likely compete with one or the other of these other Market District operations.

**Proposed Residential Restrictions:** The Market Square proposal commits to various explicit residential restrictions that should assure the compatibility of proposed rental housing with HPA operations. As suggested by HPA itself, these include deed restrictions that preclude future condominium conversion, as well as marketing, leasing, management and tenancy policies that would preempt resident complaints about HPA operations.

#### **PERCEIVED PROJECT WEAKNESSES:**

**Building Massing:** The larger number of housing units proposed in the Market Square submission results in a project design and massing that brings residential uses farther down Blackstone Street than in the Blackstone Market proposal, in which the much smaller housing component is in a more distinct structural element located closer to North Street. Although residential uses are not objectionable to HPA, and while additional housing would also relieve housing pressures in the adjacent North End neighborhood, there is serious HPA concern that the housing density and massing proposed in this case would result in residential uses that so fully parallel HPA operations as to be predictably more problematic.

**Project Architecture:** This building massing is reflected in an architectural design that is also perceived as less attractive than that of the other residential proposal, understanding that all proposals are in a schematic stage of design that will surely be further refined and revised through the BRA Article 80 process. It is noted, however, that the Market Square project architect is also involved in the design of the Public Market on Parcel 7, in the planning of the adjacent Government Center Garage site and is the architect of a major hotel and residential project in the nearby Bulfinch Triangle, which suggests the possibility of some beneficial design synergies in this larger Parcel 9 context.

**Financial Viability:** A significant question about the Market Square proposal is the relative inexperience of the project proponent as an independent development entity. Upton + Partners was only established in 2009; and while its principals and the other members of their project team have records of demonstrated accomplishment on major projects throughout Boston and beyond, this entity has yet to complete a major project on its own account.

#### **SOME CONCLUDING REQUESTS & RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is clear that all of the Parcel 9 proposals as submitted and presented have their strengths and weaknesses; and it is also clear that in some cases the strengths of one proposal can remedy the weakness of some others. In the opinion of the Parcel 7 & 9 Advisory Committee, and obviously to the extent possible and appropriate, an effort should be made to formulate and implement an optimal proposal that takes full advantage of all elements of the public process that has thus far informed this effort, including the ongoing evaluation of the relative strengths and weaknesses of these four proposals.

To that end, we would hereby respectfully recommend and request that whichever project team is finally selected for Parcel 9 development designation should be required to submit an updated proposal, which can then be fully and finally reviewed by the community in and through the Parcel 7 & 9 Advisory Committee before it is subject to BRA Article 80 review; and the members of the Advisory Committee would be ready, willing and able to serve as a community participation venue through the completion of that process, perhaps in lieu of or as part of an Impact Advisory Group for this project. At this stage in the process, based on a review of the relative strengths and weakness of these four proposals and other relevant considerations, the following are among the elements that could/should be included in any finally designated proposal:

- ❖ ***Explicit Attention to the Relationship of Parcel 9 Development to HPA Operations and the Public Market within the Overall Market District:*** Any Parcel 9 development proposal needs to fully address its relationship to all of major contributing elements of the Market District as defined in the Parcel 9 guidelines. This includes a specific financial commitment to Blackstone Street improvements and an explicit discussion of the nature and scope of the complementary relationship of proposed Parcel 9 retail plans to both HPA operations and the Parcel 7 Public Market. The latter should hopefully include the readiness, willingness and ability of the designated Parcel 9 developer to proactively support the success of the Public Market with its planning, management and marketing resources, as required and requested.
- ❖ ***Other Blackstone Street Properties:*** If the Blackstone Market project team is designated, they should be required to describe the scope and schedule of their current redevelopment plans for the other Blackstone Street properties under their control. Of particular relevance is how such redevelopment plans would affect the design and use of Blackstone Street and the nature, scope and schedule of the proposed street improvements for HPA operations or otherwise. If the Blackstone Market project team is not selected, they should be requested and strongly encouraged to provide such information as might be relevant to the planning and implementation of the Blackstone Street improvement plans of whatever other project team is designated as Parcel 9 developer.
- ❖ ***Haymarket Pushcart Configuration:*** The various Haymarket pushcart configurations shown in these four proposals suggest that current arrangements on Blackstone Street can be maintained to a large extent while still providing acceptable levels of emergency vehicle access. While this approach will surely require further refinement in consultation with BFD and BPD among others, the best elements of the logistical and building design alternatives now on the table should all be considered. It is our assumption and recommendation that whatever pushcart configuration works best from an HPA perspective could/should be adapted to whichever Parcel 9 proposal is finally selected.
- ❖ ***Utilization of the Parcel 7 Plaza Area:*** In consultation with the Boston Public Market Association and the Parcel 7 & 9 Advisory Committee, MADOT and/or the BRA should promptly determine and describe the scope and schedule of HPA use of the Parcel 7 plaza on the Greenway side of the building. It is the strong recommendation of the Parcel 7 & 9 Advisory Committee that this space should be made available for HPA pushcart use on the Friday and Saturday hours of their operation.

- ❖ **A Description of Other Parcel 7 Building Uses:** Likewise MADOT should fully and finally determine and describe the nature, scope and schedule of the uses planned for elements of Parcel 7 beyond the Public Market on its ground floor, so that they can be reflected in and accommodated by the final Parcel 9 development proposal. This outcome should include occupancy plans for the upper floors of Parcel 7 as well as attention to the policies and procedures that will govern utilization of the on-site Parcel 7 parking – both of which should be formulated with specific reference to how they will support the plans and priorities of the Market District as a whole.
  
- ❖ **Residential Covenants:** Any residential development proposal should include covenants and make other provisions of the type requested by HPA to assure long-term compatibility with HPA operations. As previously indicated, these would include deed restrictions that preclude future condominium conversion, as well as marketing, leasing, management and tenancy policies that would preempt resident complaints about HPA operations.
  
- ❖ **A Market District Governance/Oversight Structure:** More systematic and explicit attention should be paid to a continuing governance and oversight mechanism for the Market District as a whole. Such a structure will assure and facilitate communication and coordination among the various components of the district and provide effective district management and marketing resources as it continues to evolve over time. In the context of some cautionary lessons from the origins and evolution of Faneuil Hall Marketplace, an important purpose of such a governance structure should also be to assure that the original vision and purpose of the Market District, as defined in the Project for Public Spaces report and otherwise, are reliably maintained and appropriately refined over time. Beyond the major components of the Market District itself, such a governance and oversight structure should also represent surrounding neighborhoods and districts as well as other regional and professional interests – not unlike the diverse composition of the Parcel 7 & 9 Advisory Committee itself.
  
- ❖ **Market District Branding:** Attention should also be paid to the elements of a distinctive and coherent public identity for the Market District – e.g., signage, planting, paving, and lighting. This could/should be done initially through the BRA Article 80 design review process, in consultation with all elements of the Market District and adjacent communities; and it could/would eventually become the responsibility of the collaborative Market District governance structure outlined above. Prompt attention to these issues and opportunities would further enhance an optimized and updated Parcel 9 development proposal as well as plans for Parcel 7 occupancy, including but not limited to the planned Public Market.
  
- ❖ **Revitalized Roadway Identity:** The term *Surface Artery* is a widely used but unduly functional designation that is no longer worthy of this area. As noted in various Parcel 9 proposals, the formal name of this increasingly central and important roadway is the *John F. Fitzgerald Surface Artery*; and John F. Fitzgerald has a natural and historical connection to the Rose Kennedy Greenway, to the North End and to Boston. As a suitably symbolic outcome of the Parcel 7 & 9 Advisory Committee process, it would be fitting and timely to revitalize the identity of this visible perimeter of the Market District, perhaps as *John F. Fitzgerald Boulevard*, or the *Honey Fitz Parkway*, or some appropriate variation thereof.