

**Coppens Square
Committee/Design Meeting #2
Date: January 30, 2017**

Attending: Ed Cook, Chairperson, President of Friends of Coppens Square (EC) (FOCS)
Clara Batchelor, CBA Landscape Architects LLC
Megan Tomkins, CBA Landscape Architects LLC
Chantal Harris, The Browne Fund, COB
Rob Rottenbucher – Chief Engineer, (RR) COB
Christina Lantzi – Urban Cultural Institute
Friends of Coppens Square Committee – see sign in sheet
Community members – see sign in sheet

1. The meeting started off with Ed Cook introducing the project, the meeting agenda and recognizing the civic, cultural, and governmental organizations and individuals which have been involved thus far. EC outlined the history of the Friends of Coppens Square group and its mission. He updated the audience on the group's recent 501c3 status. He outlined the goals for this meeting, which were to determine whether there is a consensus type for the main feature in Coppens Square, as in whether it will be a fountain or sculpture, and whether it will have a traditional or contemporary style. He noted how community members could continue to be involved in the FOCS group. The meeting agenda also listed the upcoming FOCS meeting dates. They are as follows:

2/2 MEETING – FOCS Design Committee
2/28 MEETING – FOCS & CBA – CBA Presentation
3/2 MEETING – FOCS & CBA – CBA Final Presentation

2. CBA presented their power point which briefly covered the existing conditions of the site, and the possibility of existing utility service to the site (still unverified). CBA then discussed options for the main feature to be incorporated into the park, mainly, should it be a fountain or sculpture, and should it be in a traditional style or contemporary. CBA then showed several example slides of each type. CBA talked about their investigations into replacement ornamental cast iron fountains through Robinson Ironworks, including rough costs for an exact replacement (creating new castings) or an approximate version (using existing castings.) CBA then opened the floor for community members to ask question or make statements or suggestions.

The below items were discussed:

- Question: Where is the original fountain? Has anyone investigated? (EC responded with notes from 1951 Boston Arts Council meeting that it was in poor shape at that time.)

- Question: Can a new fountain run without being connected to the City water system, can it recirculate? (CBA – fountain needs to be connected to city water to replace water that evaporates out, but is intended to recirculate.)
- Question: Are people using the park? (Another attendee noted that older people use the sitting area in good weather.)
- Statement: Park could be more inviting with water and added greenery. This user appreciated the existing fir tree but thinks the existing basin is too large and that the water service needs to be fixed.
- Suggestion: Lighting could be added to the feature.
- Statement: Have we thought about restoring the Olmsted Brothers firm plan. This attendee wants a traditional fountain. (CBA stated that the original plan did not include direct pedestrian access to the fountain and the planting, if recreated, may appear dated.) He noted that people will appreciate a traditional fountain as they drive by the park.
- Statement: The head of the Dorchester Historical Society introduced himself and expressed a preference for a traditional fountain.
- Question: Can lights be added to the fountain basin? Could water jets “dance”?
- Statement: One of the FOCS members explained the reason this fountain was dedicated to Mayor Lyman is that Mayor Lyman brought water service to Boston. The dedication event, which was quite grand, was also discussed.
- Statement: A traditional fountain would suit the surrounding traditional architecture.
- Can the existing surround/basin be reused (CBA noted that the granite may be reused, but the concrete basin would need to be replaced for safety and efficiency.)
- If the preference is for a fountain, would basin and plumbing be an added cost? (CBA – yes, cost TBD.)
- Question: Can the cost of a fountain and sculpture be compared? (CBA – no exact costs exist for either, but sculpture, or a custom contemporary fountain, would need to be designed by an artist. That process would begin be the FOCS identifying an artist and then working with the artist toward their goal. Cost for a sculpture could be higher and time line of design could be longer because of this increase in process.)
- Question: Can a traditional fountain have ground jets?
- Question: Can there be a fruit orchard in the park?
- Statement: A sculpture would a huge increase in discussion and work for the FOCS and community.
- Question: What happens to the existing fountain if it replaced? (It will be surrendered to the City of Boston).
- Statement: RR stated that generally City of Boston parks with fountains have friends/community groups that fund the fountains operation (same for parks with extensive plantings.)
- Suggestion: Virtual fountain (hologram)?

4. After the questions and suggestion period, the meeting attendees were invited to express their first and second preference for feature types by placing colored coded (pink-first, green-second) stickers to posters showing feature type options. The count was as follows:

- a. Traditional Fountain: 22 pink, 11 green
- b. Contemporary Fountain: 2 pink, 9 green
- c. Traditional Sculpture: 0 pink, 3 green
- d. Contemporary Sculpture: 1 pink, 1 green

End of notes.

Notes prepared by Megan Tomkins & Clara Batchelor