

# **BOSTON CITY HALL**

## **BOSTON LANDMARKS COMMISSION**

### **STUDY REPORT**



Petition #224.07  
Boston Landmarks Commission  
Office of Historic Preservation  
City of Boston

Report on the Potential Designation of

**Boston City Hall**  
**1 City Hall Square, Boston, Massachusetts**

As a Landmark under Chapter 772 of the Acts of 1975, as amended

Approved by:



October 2, 2023

---

Rosanne Foley, Executive Director

---

Date

Approved by:



October 2, 2023

---

Bradford C. Walker, Chair

---

Date

Draft report posted on \_\_\_\_\_ October 2, 2023

Cover image: North elevation, Boston City Hall, June 16, 2023, by Laura Lacombe



# Table of Contents

<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.0 LOCATION</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1 Address	4
1.2 Assessor's Parcel Number	4
1.3 Area in which Property is Located	4
1.4 Map Showing Location	5
<b>2.0 DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1 Type and Use	6
2.2 Physical Description of the Resource	6
2.3 Contemporary Images	7
2.4 Historical Maps and Images	15
<b>3.0 SIGNIFICANCE</b>	<b>18</b>
3.1 Historic Significance	18
3.2 Architectural (or Other) Significance	20
3.3 Archaeological Sensitivity	22
3.4 Relationship to Criteria for Designation	22
<b>4.0 ECONOMIC STATUS</b>	<b>24</b>
4.1 Current Assessed Value	24
4.2 Current Ownership	24
<b>5.0 PLANNING CONTEXT</b>	<b>25</b>
5.1 Background	25
5.2 Zoning	25
5.3 Planning Issues	25
<b>6.0 ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES</b>	<b>27</b>
6.1 Alternatives available to the Boston Landmarks Commission	27
6.2 Impact of alternatives	27
<b>7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>8.0 STANDARDS AND CRITERIA, WITH LIST OF CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES</b>	<b>30</b>
8.1 Introduction	30
8.2 Levels of Review	30
8.3 Standards and Criteria	32
8.4 List of Character-defining Features	45
<b>9.0 ARCHAEOLOGY</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>10.0 SEVERABILITY</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>11.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	<b>48</b>

## INTRODUCTION

The designation of Boston City Hall was initiated in 2007 after a petition was submitted by registered voters to the Boston Landmarks Commission asking that the Commission designate the property under the provisions of Chapter 772 of the Acts of 1975, as amended. The purpose of such a designation is to recognize and protect a physical feature or improvement that in whole or part has historical, cultural, social, architectural, or aesthetic significance.

### Summary

Boston City Hall is headquarters for the municipal government of the City of Boston. The building represents the city's commitment to democratic governance and civic engagement. Completed in 1968, the Brutalist building was designed by Kallmann McKinnell and Knowles in response to an open architectural competition initiated by the Boston Redevelopment Authority in 1961. At this time, the building served as the keystone for the city's urban renewal efforts to create a "New Boston." The design was intended to foster transparency and accessibility, with the aim of bringing government closer to the people. While popular opinion does not always look favorably on the building, Boston City Hall is architecturally significant as a bold example of Brutalist architecture in a period when steel and glass structures were becoming the standard. The massive concrete building presented a significant departure from the traditional brick and brownstone materials associated with Boston's evolution, and its image has become an iconic part of the city's cultural identity. The building's impact on 20<sup>th</sup> century urban planning principles goes far beyond urban renewal. The concept of grouping civic and governmental buildings together in a pedestrian-friendly environment influenced subsequent urban design approaches in other cities. It emphasized the idea of creating integrated civic spaces that encourage public interaction. Overall, Boston City Hall holds significance as an architectural and cultural icon, a symbol of civic identity, a public space for gatherings, and a catalyst for urban planning discussions. Its presence has greatly expanded the city's architectural vocabulary and continues to influence debates on architecture, preservation, and civic engagement.

Boston City Hall has faced criticism and calls for demolition because of its architectural style and perceived functional shortcomings. The late Mayor Thomas M. Menino proposed demolishing the building and moving the city's government seat to the waterfront, stating that the building's design did not serve Boston's modern needs.<sup>1</sup> However, City Hall has a dedicated group of supporters that appreciates its historical significance and architectural merit. Many supporters called for the building's designation as a Landmark in 2007, arguing that "Boston City Hall is both a cornerstone and a fertile starting place for an evolving urban revitalization. Boston Landmark status will provide a good framework for managing change."<sup>2</sup> Though it has yet to be landmarked or listed on the National Register of Historic Places, efforts have been made to preserve and adapt City Hall for future use while addressing its functional limitations. In 2017, the Getty Foundation provided

---

<sup>1</sup> Nik DeCosta-Klipa, "Why is Boston City Hall the way it is?" Boston.com, July 25, 2018, <https://www.boston.com/news/history/2018/07/25/boston-city-hall-brutalism/>

<sup>2</sup> Henry Moss, "Boston City Hall, Boston Landmark Petition Support," letter to Ellen Lipsey, April 20, 2007.

significant support for the development of a Conservation Management Plan for the structure.<sup>3</sup> Recognizing that City Hall is a “working building” subject to changes in use and programmatic requirements as the municipal government evolves, this plan is intended to help guide the ongoing maintenance and management of the building by identifying areas of low, medium, and high significance as well as providing recommendations for treatment based on that hierarchy. The plan responds to prior concerns of designating the building without a plan in place to update it.

This study report relies heavily on the Conservation Management Plan as that effort has identified and recommended Standards and Criteria to guide future physical changes to the property in order to protect its integrity and character.

### **Boston Landmarks Commission**

Bradford C. Walker, Chair

John Amodeo

David Berarducci

John Freeman

Susan Goganian

Jeffrey Gonyeau

Christopher Hart

Richard Henderson

Kirsten Hoffman

Thomas Hotaling

Felicia Jacques

Lindsey Mac-Jones

Justine Orlando

Anne Renehan

Lynn Smiledge

### **Staff**

Rosanne Foley, Executive Director

Dorothy Clark, Assistant Survey Director

Lorie Komlyn, Architectural Historian

Chelsea Blanchard, Architect

Joe Bagley, City Archaeologist

### **Consultant for preparation of initial report**

Laura Lacombe, Architectural Conservator, Building Conservation Associates

---

<sup>3</sup>[https://www.getty.edu/foundation/initiatives/current/keeping\\_it\\_modern/report\\_library/boston\\_city\\_hall.html?q=%7B%7D](https://www.getty.edu/foundation/initiatives/current/keeping_it_modern/report_library/boston_city_hall.html?q=%7B%7D)

The activity that is the subject of this Study Report has been financed in part with Federal funds from the National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, through the Massachusetts Historical Commission, Secretary of the Commonwealth William Francis Galvin, Chairman. However, the contents and opinions do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of the Interior, or the Massachusetts Historical Commission.

This program receives Federal financial assistance for identification and protection of historic properties. Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended, the U.S. Department of the Interior prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, disability or age in its federally assisted programs. If you believe you have been discriminated against in any program, activity, or facility as described above, or if you desire further information, please write to: Office for Equal Opportunity, National Park Service, 1849 C Street NW, Washington, DC 20240.

## **1.0 LOCATION**

### **1.1 Address**

According to the City of Boston's Assessing Department, Boston City Hall is located at 1 City Hall Square, Boston MA 02114. *[The current 2023 mailing zip code is 02201.]*

### **1.2 Assessor's Parcel Number**


The Assessor's Parcel Number is 0302615000. *[Per the petition, exterior designation is confined to this parcel]*

### **1.3 Area in which Property is Located**

Boston City Hall is located in the heart of downtown Boston, occupying the eastern third of City Hall Plaza with Congress Street providing the eastern border. The Government Center area is a bustling hub of civic activity with the John F. Kennedy Federal Building located on the northern edge of City Hall Plaza. The financial district opens to the south of City Hall and historic Faneuil Hall and Quincy Market are located on the opposite side of Congress Street. Numerous other government buildings, courthouses, and civic institutions are in the general vicinity, contributing to the area's importance and activity.

The MBTA's Government Center Station, serving the Blue and Green lines, is located just to the west of the main entrance, making it convenient for visitors and commuters to reach the area. The Haymarket and State Street stations are located within easy walking distance of the north entrance and provide additional access to the MBTA's Orange Line.

## 1.4 Map Showing Location



**Figure 1.** Map showing the boundaries of parcel #0302615000 (MassMapper).

## 2.0 DESCRIPTION

### 2.1 Type and Use

Since opening to the public in early 1969, Boston City Hall has been in continuous use as the seat of the municipal government.

Zoning District: Government Center/Markets

Zoning SubDistrict: Medium Density Area

Zoning Overlays:

- Restricted Parking District

- Urban Renewal Area Overlay District

- Coastal Flood Resilience Overlay District

### 2.2 Physical Description of the Resource

Boston City Hall is a striking example of Brutalist (also known as Heroic) architecture, located in the heart of Boston, Massachusetts. Designed by architects Gerhard Kallmann, Michael McKinnell, and Edward Knowles, the building was completed in late 1968. It is situated prominently on a plot of land shaped like a parallelogram at Government Center with the east elevation running along Congress Street.

Kallmann McKinnell and Knowles created a tripartite vertical arrangement for the building, a traditional architectural organization, but expressed here in a modern interpretation that resembles an inverted pyramid. From the exterior, the forms, organization, and material selection help identify the general functions that take place in the building. The brick mound rising from City Hall Plaza contains public services; the middle zone uses monumental columns and ceremonial spaces identified by large, projecting, cast-in-place hoods to symbolize the heads of government; the crown composed of repeating windows and precast, projecting fins (simplified paired brackets) extending from the sixth through ninth floors provide a vertical rhythm that represents the bureaucratic levels. The north end of the east elevation along Congress Street features a brick-clad terraced element that both emphasizes the elevating of the building from the ground level and secures the transactional functions behind a solid mass that is lit from skylights above the terraces.

There are three public entrances to the building. The west entrance rises from City Hall Plaza by way of a brick ramp (originally a set of brick steps, but changed for improved accessibility in 2021-2022) for entry at the third floor. The north entrance leads from the plaza directly into a covered area that extends into the building, leading the public directly into the transaction level. The east entrance at Congress Street is deeply recessed and almost hidden from view, serving primarily as an entrance for City Hall staff. This area also accommodates private elevator access to the mayor's office.

A central courtyard was originally designed as a way to allow a public pass-through of the building, intended as a public space that encouraged visual access to the interior shapes of the building while remaining on the exterior. The courtyard is accessed by a series of brick lined ramps from the west elevation. In the courtyard, a central, pyramidal skylight and a series of rectangular skylights were intended to pass light into the transaction level below. Prior to the courtyard closing because of security concerns, the public could continue down a stairway to Congress Street. Public access

through the courtyard remains closed due to security concerns. The red brick texture throughout the building achieves a mottled texture through the use of sand-struck and water-struck brick varieties chosen from many New England brick sources.

With the proximity of surrounding taller buildings, visual access to the roof of City Hall presents a fifth façade. The roofline is characterized by a series of mechanical vents, equipment, and light shafts that are integrated into the building's design. Interior balconies overlooking the courtyard project from the seventh, eighth, and ninth floors.

The main lobby (included in the petition) on the third floor provides a seamless transition from the brick plaza into the building's modern concrete interior, with the continuous brick floor representing public accessibility into the building. A monumental brick stairway rises from the entrance, dominating the space. Cast-in-place concrete columns segment the two stories of continuous glass windows and doors around the lobby perimeter. A solid concrete mezzanine sits above these columns, bordering the perimeter of the brick staircase at the fifth-floor level. The entire area is bathed in light from the glass walls above the entrances, the concrete light shafts, and the coffered ceiling perforated with light fixtures.

Overall, Boston City Hall's elevations embody the Brutalist architectural style, showcasing a bold and robust aesthetic with a focus on exposed concrete as the primary material. The geometric shapes, alternating openings, and use of contrasting elements contribute to the building's distinctive character and make it an iconic landmark in the city, throughout the United States, and internationally.

### 2.3 Contemporary Images



**Figure 2.** West elevation (2023)



**Figure 3.** North elevation, June 2023. Photo credit: Building Conservation Associates.



**Figure 4.** East elevation, June 2023. Photo credit: Building Conservation Associates.



**Figure 5.** South elevation, June 2023. Photo credit: Building Conservation Associates.




**Figure 6.** Brick terracing at the northeast corner of the building. (2023)



**Figure 7.** View from northwest, June 2023. Photo credit: Building Conservation Associates.



**Figure 8.** Contextual view of southwest corner with Faneuil Hall in the background at right. (2023)



**Figure 9.** View under eaves at southeast corner, June 2023. Photo credit: Building Conservation Associates.



**Figure 10.** Crown detail (northwest corner) showing alternating windows and fins at upper (administrative departments) levels. (2023)



**Figure 11.** Cast-in-place concrete hoods for City Council offices (left) and City Council Chamber (right). (2023)



**Figure 12.** Cantilevered hoods and balconies in the central courtyard. (2018)



**Figure 13.** Pyramidal skylight in the central courtyard. (2018)




**Figure 14.** Main lobby, looking northeast. (2023)




**Figure 15.** Main lobby looking southwest. (2023)

## 2.4 Historical Maps and Images



**Figure 16.** Dock Square in 1938, later the location of Boston's New City Hall. Note Faneuil Hall and Congress Street to the east. Location of New City Hall outlined in blue.

**Source:** Atlas of the City of Boston: Boston Proper and Back Bay. (G. W. Bromley & Co., 1938, via Atlascope.org)



**Figure 17.** Boston City Hall under construction; looking southeast from JFK Building. (1966)

**Source:** Boston Redevelopment Authority photographs, Collection #4010.001, City of Boston Archives, Boston



**Figure 18.** Boston City Hall under construction; looking southeast from JFK Building. (1968)

**Source:** Historic New England, Kallmann, McKinnell Archives



**Figure 19.** Historical image of central courtyard showing skylight structure at left.

**Source:** Historic American Building Survey (HABS) Collection, Library of Congress, Bill Libovich, 1981, HABS MASS, 13-BOST, 71--8

## 3.0 SIGNIFICANCE

### 3.1 Historic Significance

The site on which Boston City Hall is located has a substantial history that predates the construction of the building. Before the arrival of European settlers, the land was inhabited by Indigenous peoples, specifically the Massachusett tribe, who called the area Shawmut. Boston was first settled by Europeans when a Puritan group from England led by John Winthrop arrived in 1630. Through the next 300 years, Boston grew and evolved, serving as the center of the rebellion against England in the late 18th century and subsequently flourishing as a hub of commerce and culture in the 19th century. The mid-19th century saw the rise of abolitionist movements and the fight against slavery, with Boston becoming a center of anti-slavery activism. By the late 19th century, the city faced social and economic challenges. The Great Fire of 1872 devastated a significant portion of downtown Boston, which spurred a wave of rebuilding and urban development. While the early 20th century brought further transformations to Boston, such as the construction of the first subway system in the country, the mid-20th century brought urban renewal projects, including the razing of neighborhoods to make way for developments such as Government Center and the construction of Boston City Hall.

In Boston, the concept of urban renewal began in the 1950s, after the city began to lose middle-class families to the suburbs where they were promised better schools, less crime, and lower taxes. As families moved to the suburbs, the city's population decreased from approximately 800,000 to 700,000 from 1950 to 1960. Companies were also moving out of Boston to the suburbs, and Boston's jobs declined from 562,000 in 1947 to 537,000 in 1963. Boston's retail sales fell 5% in the 1950s as well. The city was forced to raise taxes because of this decline in revenue, creating a negative cycle that caused more residents to leave Boston and further impacted the city's economy. To add to Boston's challenges, the reputation for graft and corruption by the local political presence was affecting the city's ability to secure funding for renewal projects.<sup>4</sup>

Mayor John B. Hynes was elected in 1949 under the promise of a new, restructured Boston free from corruption. He improved the city government's relationships with the business community, and began a series of urban renewal projects meant to improve the city's housing stock and "begin anew" – the New York Streets Initiative in the South End, the creation of the Central Artery, and the West End development plan. Hynes formed the Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA) in 1957 to oversee all the city's renewal projects, though the poor outcome from the West End project nearly caused the BRA to be terminated.<sup>5</sup>

John F. Collins succeeded Hynes as Mayor of Boston in 1959, and continued the urban renewal goals set by his predecessor. In 1960, he hired planner Edward J. Logue as development administrator of the Boston Redevelopment Authority, and Logue and Collins worked together to rebuild Boston. They immediately set out to tackle the city's most ambitious urban renewal project: Government

---

<sup>4</sup> Brian Sirman, "Concrete Changes: Architecture, Politics and the Design of Boston City Hall," Amherst: Bright Leaf, 2018, 8-9.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid, 16-23.

Center.<sup>6</sup> Their goals were to “remove a decadent and blighted area in the heart of the City and convert it to a major center of governmental and private activity,” and to simultaneously revitalize and create jobs in the downtown area.<sup>7</sup>

Prior to the construction of Boston City Hall, the surrounding neighborhood was known as Dock Square, and later renamed to Scollay Square, after the real estate developer who purchased a prominent building in the square in 1795. Up until the 1950s, Scollay Square was a commercial center and a junction point for multiple trolley lines. However, the Square had become a central location for many of the city’s less desirable businesses, like burlesque houses and tattoo parlors, thus directing early urban renewal efforts to that area.<sup>8</sup> The efforts of the Boston Redevelopment Authority in the 1960s transformed Scollay Square into Government Center, a medium-density center of civic activity that employed 25,000 white-collar workers, with New City Hall at its center.

The groundwork for the Government Center project had been laid by Hynes in 1957, when he called for a feasibility study for replacing Scollay Square with new federal, state, and private office buildings. The 1958 blueprint proposal by planning consultants Adams, Howard, and Greeley was met with wide approval and the hope that the project would curb disparagement of the BRA and increase property values in the West End. Although some Bostonians protested the razing of Scollay Square, many were in support of it – one developer recalled, “Much of it seems nostalgic and colorful to people looking back at it, but in actuality it was horrendous. It was a terrible eyesore that needed to be changed.”<sup>9</sup> Today, the demolition of Scollay Square is viewed with regret-- the loss of 1,500 structures was a terrible blow to the historic fabric of Boston’s downtown and would permanently alter the daily human experience of the neighborhood.<sup>10</sup>

The Master Plan for Government Center was conceived by I. M. Pei in 1961. Crooked streets and haphazard lot sizes were to be erased and corrected, in order to improve traffic movement and to create parcels of land suitable for modern business development.<sup>11</sup> The plan centered on Boston City Hall as the keystone structure, specifying its location, overall dimensions, and the vast open space of the plaza setting around it. Pei specified a low height for the building so it would not overwhelm Faneuil Hall, and positioned it at the southern boundary of the plaza in an attempt to stimulate development in that area.<sup>12</sup> In 1962, demolition of Scollay Square began, sparing only the Sears Crescent Building after public outcry convinced officials to improve the structure and make it an integral part of the Government Center design.<sup>13</sup> Throughout the next decade, Government Center began to take shape with the completion of noteworthy buildings such as The John F. Kennedy Federal Building (Walter Gropius), Government Services Center (Paul Rudolph), and One Center Plaza (Welton Becket & Associates).

---

<sup>6</sup> Brian Sirman, “Concrete Changes: Architecture, Politics and the Design of Boston City Hall,” Amherst: Bright Leaf, 2018, 23-28.

<sup>7</sup> Edward J. Logue, “Seven Years of Progress: A Final Report,” Boston: Boston Redevelopment Authority, 1967, 11. <https://archive.org/details/seven-years-of-progress>

<sup>8</sup> Thomas H. O’Connor, “Building a New Boston,” Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1993, 15.

<sup>9</sup> Thomas H. O’Connor, Building a New Boston, Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1993, 141.

<sup>10</sup> Henry Moss, “Boston City Hall, Boston Landmark Petition Support,” letter to Ellen Lipsey, April 20, 2007, Boston Landmarks Commission archives.

<sup>11</sup> Government Center Commission, A Competition to Select an Architect for the New City Hall in the Government Center of the City of Boston, 1961, 8.

<sup>12</sup> Brian Sirman, “Concrete Changes: Architecture, Politics and the Design of Boston City Hall,” 2018, 32-33.

<sup>13</sup> Thomas H. O’Connor, “Building a New Boston,” Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1993, 199-201.

The design of New City Hall was decided upon in 1961 by means of a national design competition under parameters set by I. M. Pei-- the first competition to focus on a city hall since San Francisco City Hall in 1912.<sup>14</sup> The winning design by Kallmann McKinnell and Knowles was a bold and daring scheme that fulfilled many of the hopes that Collins, Hynes, and Logue had originally laid out for the project.<sup>15</sup> The completed building played a major role in reinvigorating the city. It is considered the earliest example of architectural prominence associated with Boston's modernist movement, a notable distinction in a city known as "the cradle of modern architecture in America."<sup>16</sup>

City Hall has served as a major symbol of the City of Boston, the urban renewal initiatives of the time period, and the national Brutalist movement. It has been featured in movies, television shows, and photographs, showcasing its architectural distinctiveness. Overall, Boston City Hall holds local, regional, national, and international significance as an architectural and cultural icon, a symbol of civic identity, a public space for gatherings, and a catalyst for urban planning discussions. Its presence has shaped the city's skyline and continues to influence debates on architectural aesthetics, preservation, urban planning, and civic engagement. The building's international significance as a work of concrete modernism is paralleled by its cultural and economic legacies— as "a miracle in Boston" in the words of competition juror Harold Hodgkinson, that initiated "the rebirth of confidence in this city."<sup>17</sup>

The Government Center complex, and Boston City Hall in particular, helped catalyze growth in Boston's downtown, leading to a more mixed-use, multimodal, and vibrant commercial center with a focus on preservation. Today, high-traffic streets have been reworked to accommodate pedestrian activity, encouraging the development of new residential spaces nearby.<sup>18</sup> On a national level, Boston City Hall's design and its surrounding Government Center development had a profound impact on urban planning principles. The concept of grouping civic and governmental buildings together in a pedestrian-friendly environment influenced subsequent urban design approaches in other cities. It emphasized the idea of creating integrated civic spaces that encourage public interaction. Its creative approaches to urban planning helped not only to revitalize a dying city, but an entire generation of planning principles nationwide.

### **3.2 Architectural (or Other) Significance**

Boston City Hall represents a pivotal moment in architectural history for the City. It is considered one of the most prominent examples of Brutalist architecture in the United States. The building's unconventional aesthetic challenged the prevailing architectural norms of the time, emphasizing the use of materials like raw concrete rather than natural stone for the monumental symbolism of this public building.

---

<sup>14</sup> Brian Sirman, "Concrete Changes: Architecture, Politics and the Design of Boston City Hall," 2018, 52.

<sup>15</sup> Utile Design, Building Conservation Associates, and OverUnder, "Boston City Hall Conservation Management Plan," prepared for Mayor Martin J. Walsh. Getty Foundation, January 2021, 23.

<sup>16</sup> Ada Louise Huxtable, "An Architectural Shot Heard Round the World," *New York Times*, September 28, 1980.

<sup>17</sup> Harold D. Hodgkinson, "Miracle in Boston," *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*: 81.

<sup>18</sup> Utile Design, Building Conservation Associates, and OverUnder, "Boston City Hall Conservation Management Plan," prepared for Mayor Martin J. Walsh. Getty Foundation, January 2021, 32.

The surrounding Government Center and City Hall Plaza were conceived of by I. M. Pei as part of the larger urban renewal efforts of the Boston Redevelopment Authority. City Hall was to act as the centerpiece for the large open plaza in the center of the development, symbolizing the building's role in reinvigorating the city politically, economically, and architecturally. A nationwide, two-round design competition was announced in 1961, using Pei's spatial parameters as a guide, and was judged by a jury of architects and business leaders of Boston. The design submitted by Kallmann McKinnell and Knowles was unanimously voted as the winning entry, and was built exactly as designed, even though the City of Boston was not obligated to do so.<sup>19</sup>

The design and construction of Boston City Hall were led by architects Gerhard Kallmann and Michael McKinnell. The building was their first joint commission and remains the most important work of architecture in the lifelong partnership between Kallmann and McKinnell.<sup>20</sup> Gerhard Kallmann, the senior and most well-known architect on the team, was born in Germany in 1915 and had spent the early part of his career writing exhaustive manifestos on the "new brutalist" and "compositional rigorist" philosophies of architecture. These two approaches would provide the major framework for the design of Boston City Hall.<sup>21</sup> Kallmann met the younger architects McKinnell and Knowles while the three were teaching at Columbia University.<sup>22</sup> The success of their partnership at Boston City Hall would encourage Kallmann and McKinnell to establish a Boston office together after winning the competition, later designing the Five Cent Savings Bank in Boston, another noteworthy Brutalist structure, and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in Cambridge.

Construction on Boston's New City Hall began in 1963 and was completed in November 1968 under the collaborative efforts of Kallmann McKinnell and Knowles, local architectural firm Campbell and Aldrich, and structural engineering firm LeMessurier Associates, Inc.<sup>23</sup> using innovative construction methods. The resulting brick and concrete structure was a monumental achievement of both design and workmanship, leading one architect to marvel, "the ingenious double floor system of precast concrete girders and criss-cross ceiling beams took time to perfect. Those carefully formed and painstakingly poured massive concrete columns didn't just happen."<sup>24</sup> City Hall effectively joined historic "red brick Boston" with the modern world, demonstrating that Boston could "look boldly ahead as well as comfortably back."<sup>25</sup> The red brick of the plaza flowed seamlessly into the building and up the sides of the brick bases, symbolizing the flow of old into new. The permeability of the building, with three entrances converging in the central lobby and allowing pedestrians to pass through on their way from Beacon Hill to Dock Square, symbolized the accessibility of the City's government. And with the projecting volumes, large-scale concrete hoods, and precast fins creating a vocabulary of government hierarchy on the building's façade, City Hall fits into the tradition of grand civic architecture without being traditional itself.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> "The Way We Were: Boston in the 1960s," *Architecture Boston Roundtable*, 8:3 May/June 2005, 21.

<sup>20</sup> Utile Design, Building Conservation Associates, and OverUnder, "Boston City Hall Conservation Management Plan," prepared for Mayor Martin J. Walsh. Getty Foundation, January 2021, 23.

<sup>21</sup> Mildred Schmertz, "The New Boston City Hall," *Architectural Record*, February 1969.

<sup>22</sup> Paul Heyer, *Architects on Architecture: New Directions in America*, Walker & Co, 1978, 256-263.

<sup>23</sup> Brian Sirman, "Concrete Changes: Architecture, Politics and the Design of Boston City Hall," 2018, 91.

<sup>24</sup> Joseph Eldridge, "City Hall -- At Midpoint It Begins to Show Its Style," *Boston Globe*, February 20, 1966.

<sup>25</sup> "The City Hall Look," *Boston Herald*, May 5, 1962.

<sup>26</sup> Jeff Stein, "Inside Story: What's it like to work at City Hall?," *Architecture Boston*, 8:3 May/June 2005, 48.

Kallmann's exploration of design philosophy led the team to develop an innovative design melding the compositional rigorist and Brutalist philosophies. The architects considered the building "a celebration of government; but in a newly symbolic way that derives its strength from function, program and structural logic."<sup>27</sup> Brutalism lent the building its bold forms and textures, while the compositional rigorist approach informed the spatial organization of the building, breaking the boundaries of the classical confines of space. City Hall holds power in its unapologetic ignorance of traditional beauty, asserting that its success lies in topology rather than its aesthetics. Through this philosophical approach, it has been widely published and heavily praised, lauded as "[maybe] the most significant Boston building of the mid-20th century,"<sup>28</sup> and counted "among the finest public buildings in the world."<sup>29</sup> In the words of MIT professor of architecture, Albert Bush-Brown, "No bows to the Georgian. No weak-kneed copying of the State Housedom. Or the Faneuil Hall roof. Nothing but a whole-hearted affirmation of a new time, new social needs, and the new technology and new aesthetics to declare faith in the civic instrument of government."<sup>30</sup>

### **3.3 Archaeological Sensitivity**

Downtown Boston is archaeologically sensitive for ancient Native American and historical archaeological sites. There are possibilities for the survival of ancient Native and historical archaeological sites in the rare areas where development has not destroyed them. As the ancient and historical core of Shawmut, now Boston, any surviving archaeological deposits are likely significant. Any historical sites that survive may document 17th-19th century history related to Boston's colonial, Revolutionary, early Republic history especially yard spaces where features including cisterns and privies may remain intact and significant archaeological deposits. These sites represent the histories of home-life, artisans, industries, enslaved people, immigrants, and Native peoples spanning multiple centuries. Downtown's shoreline may contain early submerged ancient Native archaeological sites, shipwrecks, piers, and other marine deposits that may be historically significant. There have been no archaeological surveys within the City Hall Parcel to determine the extent of preservation within the parcel. It is likely that much has been disturbed or destroyed by development of the building, but it is possible that historically significant components of the former Dock Square, earlier occupations, and even Native sites that may survive around and under City Hall. Surviving abandoned subway tunnels in the parcel abutting to the south as well as other nearby MBTA tunnels may indicate the presence of preserved historic subway infrastructure within the footprint of the City Hall parcel that may be historically significant.

### **3.4 Relationship to Criteria for Designation**

Boston City Hall meets the following criteria for designation as a Boston Landmark as established in Section 4 of Chapter 772 of the Acts of 1975, as amended:

---

<sup>27</sup> Mildred Schmertz, "The New Boston City Hall," *Architectural Record*, February 1969.

<sup>28</sup> Boston Society of Architects, *Architecture Boston*, 1976, 11-16.

<sup>29</sup> Boston Landmarks Commission Survey Form, Boston City Hall, 1980.

<sup>30</sup> Thomas H. O'Connor, "Building a New Boston," Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1993, 186.

A. Inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places as provided in the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966.

Boston City Hall is not currently on the National Register of Historic Places, but is considered eligible for listing under Criteria A and C at the local, state and national levels. The building retains integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association.

B. Structures, sites, objects, man-made or natural, at which events occurred that have made an outstanding contribution to, and are identified prominently with, or which best represent some important aspect of the cultural, political, economic, military, or social history of the city, the commonwealth, the New England region or the nation.

Boston City Hall plays an integral role in Boston's history due to its central role in Boston's urban renewal movement and the subsequent economic revitalization that it brought to the City, and due to its recognizable design and distinction as a civic symbol of the City of Boston. On a national scale, its association with the Government Center project made it impactful to urban planning approaches across the country by encouraging the integration of civic spaces that encouraged public interaction with their government.

C. Structures, sites, objects, man-made or natural, associated significantly with the lives of outstanding historical personages.

Boston City Hall was erected largely through the efforts of Mayor John F. Collins and his partnership with Edward J. Logue, development administrator of the Boston Redevelopment Authority. Their vision for a better Boston, economically successful and free from corruption, directly led to the implementation of the Government Center project.

D. Structures, sites, objects, man-made or natural, representative of elements of architectural or landscape design or craftsmanship which embody distinctive characteristics of a type inherently valuable for study of a period, style or method of construction or development, or a notable work of an architect, landscape architect, designer, or builder whose work influenced the development of the city, the commonwealth, the New England region, or the nation.

Boston City Hall is often cited as playing a central role in the nation's Brutalist architectural movement, and is notable for its innovative design and masterful craftsmanship using cast-in-place and precast concrete. It is the first work of the acclaimed architectural partnership Kallmann McKinnell and Knowles (later Kallmann McKinnell & Wood).

## **4.0 ECONOMIC STATUS**

### **4.1 Current Assessed Value**

According to the City of Boston's Assessor's records, the property at 1 City Hall Square, Boston (parcel #0302615000) where City Hall is located has a total assessed value of \$183,217,500.00, with the land valued at \$56,946,200.00 and the building valued at \$126,271,300.00 for fiscal year 2023.

### **4.2 Current Ownership**

According to the City of Boston's Assessor's records, Boston City Hall is owned by the City of Boston, with a mailing address at 1 City Hall Square, Boston, MA 02114. (Current 2023 zip code is 02201.)

## 5.0 PLANNING CONTEXT

### 5.1 Background

Boston City Hall was built to serve as a municipal building in 1967, designed as the centerpiece of the Government Center urban renewal project initiated in the 1960s. This project created a medium-density area of civic activity employing 25,000 white-collar workers, replacing a historic commercial center of the city that had become downtrodden in the 1950s.<sup>31</sup> Boston City Hall remains Boston's civic center to this day, and is occupied by the Mayor, City Council, the city's administrative and planning departments, and other everyday public-facing functions of the city's government.

### 5.2 Zoning

Parcel number #0302615000 is located in the Government Center/Markets zoning district, a City Hall Medium Density Area subdistrict, and the following overlay districts: Restricted Parking District; Urban Renewal Area Overlay District; and Coastal Flood Resilience Overlay District.

### 5.3 Planning Issues

On April 10, 2007 a petition to Landmark Boston City Hall at 1 City Hall Square was submitted by registered Boston voters. At a public hearing on April 24, 2007 the Boston Landmarks Commission voted to accept Boston City Hall for further study.

Boston City Hall is a building that embodies the essence of urban planning both in its history, present, and future. Originally conceived as the keystone building within the new urban plan for Government Center, the building design itself was designed as a submission to an architectural competition hosted by the Boston Redevelopment Authority, (since renamed as the Boston Planning and Design Authority.) Drawing both admiration and criticism over the course of its history, there have been many proposed planning initiatives to demolish, improve, renovate, and preserve City Hall. It is a building that sparks passionate opinions amongst Boston's residents, city hall workers, and politicians alike.. The petition to landmark City Hall marks a point in Boston's history where the building has garnered value and appreciation as a potential landmark and residents have called for its lasting preservation.

#### **City Hall Changes and Planning Initiatives:**

The building has been changed and updated many times over the past 55 years. The interiors have been adapted to meet the changing needs of city departments. Fortunately, due to the monumental

---

<sup>31</sup> Lizbeth Cohen, "Building Government Center: The Boston Redevelopment Authority, 1960-67," In Heroic: Concrete Architecture and the New Boston, ed. Pasnik, Kubo and Grimley, New York: Monacelli Press, 2015, 49.

nature of the masonry and concrete exterior and interior architecture, there have not been any substantial changes that have degraded the overall design.

City Hall was designed as an intensely public building - a civic node where citizens could pass through its central courtyard, as they climbed from Dock Square and Faneuil Hall to GovernmentCenter and the State House. Pedestrian pass through was closed to the public after security measures were implemented due to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. These security measures also changed other aspects of the building's entrances and the surrounding public plaza.

In 2014, the administration initiated a master plan study called "Rethink Boston." The study examined long-overdue programmatic and operational needs at City Hall and identified ways to improve constituent services. The administration undertook several pilot projects to address the most urgent and public-facing needs identified, such as the lighting of the exterior of City Hall; a series of interior and exterior way-finding improvements; the installation of a handicap lift in the lobby to allow access to the mezzanine event space; renovations to the City Council Chamber; and significant improvements to the public-facing main entrance lobby.

The Rethink Boston study also called for the need of a comprehensive Conservation Management Plan (CMP), to serve as a long-term resource and working document for the City's Property Management Department and the Public Facilities Department. In 2017, the City of Boston applied and City Hall was chosen as a grant recipient for the "Keeping it Modern" Grant by the Getty Foundation. Boston City Hall was chosen as one of 12 grant recipients worldwide, receiving funding to create a Conservation Management Plan (CMP) for City Hall in order to guide future work. The city hired architects, historians, conservators, and technical specialists to collaborate and write the City Hall CMP, which was published in January 2021. Together with the creation of this Boston Landmarks Commission Study Report, there is now a roadmap with clear strategies for caring for the building but also undertaking future changes to this iconic building.

Several recent projects on City Hall Plaza, including the installation of a children's playground, installing more plaza seating & public art spaces, and the planting of trees & greenscapes have improved accessibility and use of public space. There have also been non-permanent changes to the plaza, such as the installation of a seasonal beer garden at the south side of the plaza.

## **6.0 ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES**

### **6.1 Alternatives available to the Boston Landmarks Commission**

#### **A. Designation**

The Commission retains the option of designating Boston City Hall as a Landmark. Designation shall correspond to Assessor's parcel #0302615000 and shall address the following exterior and interior elements hereinafter referred to as the "Specified Features":

- The exterior envelope of the building.
- Certain landscape elements including: The brick paving that flows into the north and west entrances of the building from the plaza outside.
- Certain interior elements including: Main (3rd floor) lobby.

#### **B. Denial of Designation**

The Commission retains the option of not designating any or all of the Specified features.

#### **C. National Register Listing**

The Commission could recommend that the property be listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

#### **D. Preservation Plan**

The Commission could recommend development and implementation of a preservation plan for the property.

#### **E. Site Interpretation**

The Commission could recommend that the owner develop and install historical interpretive materials at the site.

### **6.2 Impact of alternatives**

#### **A. Designation**

Designation under Chapter 772 would require review of physical changes to Boston City Hall in accordance with the Standards and Criteria adopted as part of the designation.

#### **B. Denial of Designation**

Without designation, the City would be unable to offer protection to the Specified Features, or extend guidance to the owners under chapter 772.

#### **C. National Register Listing**

Boston City Hall could be listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Listing on the National Register provides an honorary designation and limited protection in cases when federal funds are involved in proposed physical changes. It also creates incentives for preservation, such as tax incentives for income-producing properties and possible eligibility for grants through the Massachusetts Preservation Projects Fund (MPPF) from the Massachusetts Historical Commission. National Register listing provides listing on the State Register, affording parallel protection for projects with state involvement and also the

availability of state tax credits. National Register listing does not provide any design review for changes undertaken by private owners at their own expense.

**D. Preservation Plan**

A preservation plan allows an owner to work with interested parties to investigate various adaptive use scenarios, analyze investment costs and rates of return, and provide recommendations for subsequent development. It does not carry regulatory oversight.

**E. Site Interpretation**

A comprehensive interpretation of the history and significance of Boston City Hall could be introduced at the site.

## **7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

The staff of the Boston Landmarks Commission makes the following recommendations:

1. That the exterior and interior main lobby space (on third level) of Boston City Hall be designated by the Boston Landmarks Commission as a Landmark, under Chapter 772 of the Acts of 1975, as amended (see Section 3.4 of this report for Relationship to Criteria for Designation);
2. That the boundaries corresponding to Assessor's parcel #0302615000 be adopted without modification;
3. And that the Standards and Criteria recommended by the staff of the Boston Landmarks Commission be accepted.

## 8.0 STANDARDS AND CRITERIA, WITH LIST OF CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES

### 8.1 Introduction

Per sections 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 of the enabling statute (Chapter 772 of the Acts of 1975 of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, as amended) Standards and Criteria must be adopted for each Designation which shall be applied by the Commission in evaluating proposed changes to the historic resource. The Standards and Criteria both identify and establish guidelines for those features which must be preserved and/or enhanced to maintain the viability of the Designation. The Standards and Criteria are based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.<sup>32</sup> Before a Certificate of Design Approval or Certificate of Exemption can be issued for such changes, the changes must be reviewed by the Commission with regard to their conformance to the purpose of the statute.

The intent of these guidelines is to help local officials, designers and individual property owners to identify the characteristics that have led to designation, and thus to identify the limitation to the changes that can be made to them. It should be emphasized that conformance to the Standards and Criteria alone does not necessarily ensure approval, nor are they absolute, but any request for variance from them must demonstrate the reason for, and advantages gained by, such variance. The Commission's Certificate of Design Approval is only granted after careful review of each application and public hearing, in accordance with the statute.

Proposed alterations related to zoning, building code, accessibility, safety, or other regulatory requirements do not supersede the Standards and Criteria or take precedence over Commission decisions.

In these standards and criteria, the verb **Should** indicates a recommended course of action; the verb **Shall** indicates those actions which are specifically required.

### 8.2 Levels of Review

The Commission has no desire to interfere with the normal maintenance procedures for the property. In order to provide some guidance for property owners, managers or developers, and the Commission, the activities which might be construed as causing an alteration to the physical character of the exterior have been categorized to indicate the level of review required, based on the potential impact of the proposed work. Note: the examples for each category are not intended to act as a comprehensive list; see Section 8.2.D.

- A. Routine activities which are not subject to review by the Commission:
  - 1. Activities associated with normal cleaning and routine maintenance.

---

<sup>32</sup> U.S. Department of the Interior, et al. *THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR'S STANDARDS FOR THE TREATMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES WITH GUIDELINES FOR PRESERVING, REHABILITATING, RESTORING & RECONSTRUCTING HISTORIC BUILDINGS*, Secretary of the Interior, 2017, [www.nps.gov/tps/standards/treatment-guidelines-2017.pdf](http://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/treatment-guidelines-2017.pdf).

- a. For building maintenance, such activities might include the following: normal cleaning (no power washing above 700 PSI, no chemical or abrasive cleaning), non-invasive inspections, in-kind repair of caulking, in-kind repainting, staining or refinishing of wood or metal elements, lighting bulb replacements or in-kind glass repair/replacement, etc.
  - b. For landscape maintenance, such activities might include the following: normal cleaning of paths and sidewalks, etc. (no power washing above 700 PSI, no chemical or abrasive cleaning), non-invasive inspections, in-kind repair of caulking, in-kind spot replacement of cracked or broken paving materials, in-kind repainting or refinishing of site furnishings, site lighting bulb replacements or in-kind glass repair/replacement, normal plant material maintenance, such as pruning, fertilizing, mowing and mulching, and in-kind replacement of existing plant materials, etc.
2. Routine activities associated with special events or seasonal decorations which do not disturb the ground surface, are to remain in place for less than six weeks, and do not result in any permanent alteration or attached fixtures.
- B. Activities which may be determined by the staff to be eligible for a Certificate of Exemption or Administrative Review, requiring an application to the Commission:
1. Maintenance and repairs involving no change in design, material, color, ground surface or outward appearance.
  2. In-kind replacement or repair.
  3. Phased restoration programs will require an application to the Commission and may require full Commission review of the entire project plan and specifications; subsequent detailed review of individual construction phases may be eligible for Administrative Review by BLC staff.
  4. Repair projects of a repetitive nature will require an application to the Commission and may require full Commission review; subsequent review of these projects may be eligible for Administrative Review by BLC staff, where design, details, and specifications do not vary from those previously approved.
  5. Temporary installations or alterations that are to remain in place for longer than six weeks.
  6. Emergency repairs that require temporary tarps, board-ups, etc. may be eligible for Certificate of Exemption or Administrative Review; permanent repairs will require review as outlined in Section 8.2. In the case of emergencies, BLC staff should be notified as soon as possible to assist in evaluating the damage and to help expedite repair permits as necessary.
- C. Activities requiring an application and full Commission review:

Reconstruction, restoration, replacement, demolition, or alteration involving change in design, material, color, location, or outward appearance, such as: New construction of any type, removal of existing features or elements, major planting or removal of trees or shrubs, or changes in landforms.

D. Activities not explicitly listed above:

In the case of any activity not explicitly covered in these Standards and Criteria, the Landmarks staff shall determine whether an application is required and if so, whether it shall be an application for a Certificate of Design Approval or Certificate of Exemption.

E. Concurrent Jurisdiction

In some cases, issues which fall under the jurisdiction of the Landmarks Commission may also fall under the jurisdiction of other city, state and federal boards and commissions such as the Boston Art Commission, the Massachusetts Historical Commission, the National Park Service and others. All efforts will be made to expedite the review process. Whenever possible and appropriate, a joint staff review or joint hearing will be arranged.

### **8.3 Standards and Criteria**

The following Standards and Criteria are based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.<sup>33</sup> These Standards and Criteria apply to all exterior building alterations that are visible from any existing or proposed street or way that is open to public travel.

#### **8.3.1 General Standards**

1. Items under Commission review include but are not limited to the following: exterior walls (masonry, wood, and architectural metals); windows; entrances/doors; porches/stoops; lighting; storefronts; curtain walls; roofs; roof projections; additions; accessibility; site work and landscaping; demolition; and archaeology. Items not anticipated in the Standards and Criteria may be subject to review, refer to Section 8.2 and Section 9.
2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alterations of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property shall be avoided. See Section 8.4, List of Character-defining Features.
3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, shall not be undertaken.

---

<sup>33</sup> U.S. Department of the Interior, et al. *THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR'S STANDARDS FOR THE TREATMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES WITH GUIDELINES FOR PRESERVING, REHABILITATING, RESTORING & RECONSTRUCTING HISTORIC BUILDINGS*, Secretary of the Interior, 2017, [www.nps.gov/tps/standards/treatment-guidelines-2017.pdf](http://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/treatment-guidelines-2017.pdf).

4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved. (The term “later contributing features” will be used to convey this concept.)
5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new material shall match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used.
8. Staff archaeologists shall review proposed changes to a property that may impact known and potential archaeological sites. Archaeological surveys may be required to determine if significant archaeological deposits are present within the area of impact of the proposed work. Significant archaeological resources shall be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be required before the proposed work can commence. See section 9.0 Archaeology.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of a property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.
11. Original or later contributing signs, marquees, and canopies integral to the building ornamentation or architectural detailing shall be preserved.
12. New signs, banners, marquees, canopies, and awnings shall be compatible in size, design, material, location, and number with the character of the building, allowing for contemporary expression. New signs shall not detract from the essential form of the building nor obscure its architectural features.
13. Property owners shall take necessary precautions to prevent demolition by neglect of maintenance and repairs. Demolition of protected buildings in violation of Chapter 772 of the Acts of 1975, as amended, is subject to penalty as cited in Section 10 of Chapter 772 of the Acts of 1975, as amended.

### **8.3.2 Masonry at exterior walls (including but not limited to stone, brick, concrete, and mortar)**

1. All original or later contributing masonry materials shall be preserved.

2. Original or later contributing masonry materials, features, details, surfaces and ornamentation shall be repaired, if necessary, by patching, splicing, consolidating, or otherwise reinforcing the masonry using recognized preservation methods.
3. Deteriorated or missing masonry materials, features, details, surfaces, and ornamentation should be replaced with materials and elements which match the original in material, color, texture, size, shape, profile, and detail of installation. Alternative materials will be considered on a case-by-case basis.
4. When replacement of materials or elements is necessary, it should be based on physical or documentary evidence.
5. Sound original mortar shall be retained.
6. Deteriorated mortar shall be carefully removed by hand raking the joints.
7. Use of mechanical hammers shall not be allowed. Use of mechanical saws may be allowed on a case-by-case basis.
8. Repointing mortar shall duplicate the original mortar in strength, composition, color, texture, joint size, joint profile, and method of application.
9. Sample panels of raking the joints and repointing shall be reviewed and approved by the staff of the Boston Landmarks Commission.
10. Cleaning of masonry is discouraged and should only be performed when necessary to halt deterioration.
11. If the building is to be cleaned, the masonry shall be cleaned with the gentlest method possible.
12. A test patch of the cleaning method(s) shall be reviewed and approved on site by staff of the Boston Landmarks Commission to ensure that no damage has resulted. Test patches shall be carried out well in advance. Ideally, the test patch should be monitored over a sufficient period of time to allow long-range effects to be predicted (including exposure to all seasons if possible).
13. Sandblasting (wet or dry), wire brushing, or other similar abrasive cleaning methods shall not be permitted. Doing so can change the visual quality of the material and damage the surface of the masonry and mortar joints.
14. Waterproofing or water repellents are strongly discouraged. These treatments are generally not effective in preserving masonry and can cause permanent damage. The Commission does recognize that in extraordinary circumstances their use may be required to solve a specific problem. Samples of any proposed treatment shall be reviewed by the Commission before application.
15. In general, painting masonry surfaces shall not be allowed. Painting masonry surfaces will be considered only when there is documentary evidence that this treatment was used at some significant point in the history of the property.

16. New penetrations for attachments through masonry are strongly discouraged. When necessary, attachment details shall be located in mortar joints, rather than through masonry material; stainless steel hardware is recommended to prevent rust jacking. New attachments to cast concrete are discouraged and will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.
17. Deteriorated concrete shall be repaired by cutting damaged concrete back to remove the source of deterioration, such as corrosion on metal reinforcement bars. The new patch shall be applied carefully so that it will bond satisfactorily with and match the historic concrete.
18. Joints in concrete shall be sealed with appropriate flexible sealants and backer rods, when necessary.

### **8.3.3 Wood at exterior walls**

1. All original or later contributing wood materials shall be preserved.
2. Original or later contributing wood surfaces, features, details, and ornamentation shall be retained and, if necessary, repaired by patching, piecing-in, consolidating, or reinforcing the wood using recognized preservation methods.
3. Deteriorated or missing wood surfaces, features, details, and ornamentation should be replaced with material and elements which match the original in material, color, texture, size, shape, profile, and detail of installation. Alternative materials will be considered on a case-by-case basis.
4. When replacement of materials is necessary, it should be based on physical or documentary evidence.
5. Cleaning of wood elements shall use the gentlest method possible.
6. Paint removal should be considered only where there is paint surface deterioration or excessive layers of paint have coarsened profile details and as part of an overall maintenance program which involves repainting or applying other appropriate protective coatings. Coatings such as paint help protect the wood from moisture and ultraviolet light; stripping the wood bare will expose the surface to the effects of weathering.
7. Damaged or deteriorated paint should be removed to the next sound layer using the mildest method possible.
8. Propane or butane torches, sandblasting, water blasting, or other abrasive cleaning and/or paint removal methods shall not be permitted. Doing so changes the visual quality of the wood and accelerates deterioration.
9. Repainting should be based on paint seriation studies. If an adequate record does not exist, repainting shall be done with colors that are appropriate to the style and period of the building.

#### **8.3.4 Architectural metals at exterior and interior walls (including but not limited to wrought and cast iron, bronze, steel, pressed metal, terneplate, copper, aluminum, and zinc)**

1. All original or later contributing architectural metals shall be preserved.
2. Original or later contributing metal materials, features, details, and ornamentation shall be retained and, if necessary, repaired by patching, splicing, or reinforcing the metal using recognized preservation methods.
3. Deteriorated or missing metal materials, features, details, and ornamentation should be replaced with material and elements which match the original in material, color, texture, size, shape, profile, and detail of installation. Alternative materials will be considered on a case-by-case basis.
4. When replacement of materials or elements is necessary, it should be based on physical or documentary evidence.
5. Cleaning of metal elements either to remove corrosion or deteriorated paint shall use the gentlest method possible.
6. The type of metal shall be identified prior to any cleaning procedure because each metal has its own properties and may require a different treatment.
7. Non-corrosive chemical methods shall be used to clean soft metals (such as lead, tinplate, terneplate, copper, and zinc) whose finishes can be easily damaged by abrasive methods.
8. If gentler methods have proven ineffective, then abrasive cleaning methods, such as low pressure dry grit blasting, may be allowed for hard metals (such as cast iron, wrought iron, and steel) as long as it does not abrade or damage the surface.
9. A test patch of the cleaning method(s) shall be reviewed and approved on site by staff of the Boston Landmarks Commission to ensure that no damage has resulted. Test patches shall be carried out well in advance. Ideally, the test patch should be monitored over a sufficient period of time to allow long-range effects to be predicted (including exposure to all seasons if possible).
10. Cleaning to remove corrosion and paint removal should be considered only where there is deterioration and as part of an overall maintenance program which involves repainting or applying other appropriate protective coatings. Paint or other coatings help retard the corrosion rate of the metal. Leaving the metal bare will expose the surface to accelerated corrosion.
11. Repainting should be based on paint seriation studies. If an adequate record does not exist, repainting shall be done with colors that are appropriate to the style and period of the building.

#### **8.3.5 Windows (also refer to Masonry, Wood, and Architectural Metals)**

1. The original or later contributing arrangement of window openings shall be retained.

2. Enlarging or reducing window openings for the purpose of fitting stock (larger or smaller) window sash or air conditioners shall not be allowed.
3. Removal of window sash and the installation of permanent fixed panels to accommodate air conditioners shall not be allowed.
4. Original or later contributing window sash, elements, features (functional and decorative), details, and ornamentation shall be retained and, if necessary, repaired by patching, splicing, consolidating, or otherwise reinforcing using recognized preservation methods.
5. Deteriorated or missing window sash, elements, features (functional and decorative), details, and ornamentation should be replaced with material and elements which match the original in material, color, texture, size, shape, profile, configuration, and detail of installation. Alternative materials will be considered on a case-by-case basis.
6. When replacement of sash, elements, features (functional and decorative), details, or ornamentation is necessary, it should be based on physical or documentary evidence.
7. If replacement is approved, replacement sash for divided-light windows shall have through-glass muntins or simulated divided lights with dark anodized spacer bars the same width as the muntins.
8. Tinted or reflective-coated glass shall not be allowed.
9. Metal or vinyl panning of the wood frame and molding shall not be allowed.
10. Exterior combination storm windows shall have a narrow perimeter framing that does not obscure the glazing of the primary window. In addition, the meeting rail of the combination storm window shall align with that of the primary window.
11. Storm window sashes and frames shall have a painted finish that matches the primary window sash and frame color.
12. Clear or mill finished aluminum frames shall not be allowed.
13. Window frames, sashes, and, if appropriate, shutters, should be of a color based on paint seriation studies. If an adequate record does not exist, repainting shall be done with colors that are appropriate to the style and period of the building.

#### **8.3.6 Entrances/Doors (also refer to Masonry, Wood, Architectural Metals, and Porches/Stoops)**

1. All original or later contributing entrance elements shall be preserved.
2. The original or later contributing entrance design and arrangement of the door openings shall be retained.
3. Enlarging or reducing entrance/door openings for the purpose of fitting stock (larger or smaller) doors shall not be allowed.

4. Original or later contributing entrance materials, elements, details and features (functional and decorative) shall be retained and, if necessary, repaired by patching, splicing, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing using recognized preservation methods.
5. Deteriorated or missing entrance elements, materials, features (functional and decorative), details, and ornamentation should be replaced with material and elements which match the original in material, color, texture, size, shape, profile, configuration and detail of installation. Alternative materials will be considered on a case-by-case basis.
6. When replacement is necessary, it should be based on physical or documentary evidence.
7. Original or later contributing entrance materials, elements, features (functional and decorative) and details shall not be sheathed or otherwise obscured by other materials.
8. Storm doors (aluminum or wood-framed) shall not be allowed on the primary entrance unless evidence shows that they had been used. They may be allowed on secondary entrances. Where allowed, storm doors shall be painted to match the color of the primary door.
9. Unfinished aluminum storm doors shall not be allowed.
10. Replacement door hardware should replicate the original or be appropriate to the style and period of the building.
11. Buzzers, alarms and intercom panels, where allowed, shall be flush mounted and appropriately located.
12. Entrance elements should be of a color based on paint seriation studies. If an adequate record does not exist, repainting shall be done with colors that are appropriate to the style and period of the building/entrance.

**8.3.7 Porches/Stoops (also refer to Masonry,, Architectural Metals, Entrances/Doors, Roofs, and Accessibility)**

1. All original or later contributing porch elements shall be preserved.
2. Original or later contributing porch and stoop materials, elements, features (functional and decorative), details, and ornamentation shall be retained if possible and, if necessary, repaired using recognized preservation methods.
3. Deteriorated or missing porch and stoop materials, elements, features (functional and decorative), details and ornamentation should be replaced with material and elements which match the original in material, color, texture, size, shape, profile, configuration and detail of installation. Alternative materials will be considered on a case-by-case basis.
4. When replacement is necessary, it should be based on physical or documentary evidence.

5. Original or later contributing porch and stoop materials, elements, features (functional and decorative), details and ornamentation shall not be sheathed or otherwise obscured by other materials.
6. Porch and stoop elements should be of a color based on paint seriation studies. If an adequate record does not exist repainting shall be done with colors that are appropriate to the style and period of the building/porch and stoop.

### **8.3.8 Lighting**

1. There are several aspects of lighting related to the exterior of the building and landscape:
  - a. Lighting fixtures as appurtenances to the building or elements of architectural ornamentation.
  - b. Quality of illumination on building exterior.
  - c. Security lighting.
2. Wherever integral to the building, original or later contributing lighting fixtures shall be retained and, if necessary, repaired by patching, piercing in or reinforcing the lighting fixture using recognized preservation methods.
3. Deteriorated or missing lighting fixture materials, elements, features (functional and decorative), details, and ornamentation should be replaced with material and elements which match the original in material, color, texture, size, shape, profile, configuration, and detail of installation. Alternative materials will be considered on a case-by-case basis.
4. When replacement is necessary, it should be based on physical or documentary evidence.
5. Original or later contributing lighting fixture materials, elements, features (functional and decorative), details, and ornamentation shall not be sheathed or otherwise obscured by other materials.
6. Supplementary illumination may be added where appropriate to the current use of the building.
7. New lighting shall conform to any of the following approaches as appropriate to the building and to the current or projected use:
  - a. Reproductions of original or later contributing fixtures, based on physical or documentary evidence.
  - b. Accurate representation of the original period, based on physical or documentary evidence.
  - c. Retention or restoration of fixtures which date from an interim installation and which are considered to be appropriate to the building and use.
  - d. New lighting fixtures which are differentiated from the original or later contributing fixture in design and which illuminate the exterior of the building in a way which renders it visible at night and compatible with its environment.

8. The location of new exterior lighting shall fulfill the functional intent of the current use without obscuring the building form or architectural detailing.
9. No exposed conduit shall be allowed on the building.
10. Architectural night lighting is encouraged, provided the lighting installations minimize night sky light pollution. High efficiency fixtures, lamps and automatic timers are recommended.
11. On-site mock-ups of proposed architectural night lighting may be required.

**8.3.9 Storefronts (also refer to Masonry, Wood, Architectural Metals, Windows, Entrances/Doors, Porches/Stoops, Lighting, and Accessibility)**

1. Refer to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (Storefront section).

**8.3.10 Curtain Walls (also refer to Masonry, Wood, Architectural Metals, Windows, and Entrances/Doors)**

1. Refer to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (Curtain Walls section).

**8.3.11 Roofs (also refer to Masonry, Wood, Architectural Metals, and Roof Projections)**

1. The roof forms and original or later contributing roof material of the existing building shall be preserved.
2. Original or later contributing roofing materials such as slate, wood trim, elements, features (decorative and functional), details and ornamentation, such as cresting, shall be retained and, if necessary, repaired by patching or reinforcing using recognized preservation methods.
3. Deteriorated or missing roofing materials, elements, features (functional and decorative), details and ornamentation shall be replaced with material and elements which match the original in material, color, texture, size, shape, profile, configuration and detail of installation.
4. When replacement is necessary, it should be based on physical or documentary evidence.
5. If using the same material is not technically or economically feasible, then compatible substitute material may be considered.
6. Original or later contributing roofing materials, elements, features (functional and decorative), details and ornamentation shall not be sheathed or otherwise obscured by other materials.
7. Unpainted mill-finished aluminum shall not be allowed for flashing, gutters and downspouts. All replacement flashing and gutters should be copper or match the original material and design (integral gutters shall not be replaced with surface-mounted).

8. External gutters and downspouts should not be allowed unless it is based on physical or documentary evidence.

#### **8.3.12 Roof Projections (includes satellite dishes, antennas and other communication devices, louvers, vents, chimneys, and chimney caps; also refer to Masonry, Wood, Architectural Metals, and Roofs)**

1. New roof projections shall not be visible from the public way.
2. New mechanical equipment should be reviewed to confirm that it is no more visible than the existing.

#### **8.3.13 Additions**

1. Additions can significantly alter the historic appearance of the buildings. An exterior addition should only be considered after it has been determined that the existing building cannot meet the new space requirements.
2. New additions shall be designed so that the character-defining features of the building are not radically changed, obscured, damaged or destroyed.
3. New additions should be designed so that they are compatible with the existing building, although they should not necessarily be imitative of an earlier style or period.
4. New additions shall not obscure the front of the building.
5. New additions shall be of a size, scale, and materials that are in harmony with the existing building.

#### **8.3.14 Accessibility**

1. Alterations to existing buildings for the purposes of providing accessibility shall provide persons with disabilities the level of physical access to historic properties that is required under applicable law, consistent with the preservation of each property's significant historical features, with the goal of providing the highest level of access with the lowest level of impact. Access modifications for persons with disabilities shall be designed and installed to least affect the character-defining features of the property. Modifications to some features may be allowed in providing access, once a review of options for the highest level of access has been completed.
2. A three-step approach is recommended to identify and implement accessibility modifications that will protect the integrity and historic character of the property:
  - a. Review the historical significance of the property and identify character-defining features;
  - b. Assess the property's existing and proposed level of accessibility;
  - c. Evaluate accessibility options within a preservation context.
3. Because of the complex nature of accessibility, the Commission will review proposals on a case-by-case basis. The Commission recommends consulting with the following document which is available from the Commission office: U.S. Department of the

Interior, National Park Service, Cultural Resources, Preservation Assistance Division; Preservation Brief 32 “Making Historic Properties Accessible” by Thomas C. Jester and Sharon C. Park, AIA.

### **8.3.15 Renewable Energy Sources**

1. Renewable energy sources, including but not limited to solar energy, are encouraged for the site.
2. Before proposing renewable energy sources, the building’s performance shall be assessed and measures to correct any deficiencies shall be taken. The emphasis shall be on improvements that do not result in a loss of historic fabric. A report on this work shall be included in any proposal for renewable energy sources.
3. Proposals for new renewable energy sources shall be reviewed by the Commission on a case-by-case basis for potential physical and visual impacts on the building and site.
4. Refer to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation & Illustrated Guidelines on Sustainability for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings for general guidelines.

### **8.3.16 Building Site**

1. The general intent is to preserve the existing or later contributing site and landscape features that enhance the property.
2. It is recognized that often the environment surrounding the property has character, scale and street pattern quite different from what existed when the building was constructed. Thus, changes must frequently be made to accommodate the new condition, and the landscape treatment can be seen as a transition between the historic property and its newer surroundings.
3. All original or later contributing features of the building site that are important in defining its overall historic character shall be retained and, if necessary, repaired using recognized preservation methods. This may include but is not limited to walls, fences, steps, walkways, paths, roads, vegetation, landforms, furnishings and fixtures, decorative elements, and water features. (See section 9.0 for subsurface features such as archaeological resources or burial grounds.)
4. Deteriorated or missing site features should be replaced with material and elements which match the original in material, color, texture, size, shape, profile, configuration and detail of installation. Alternative materials will be considered on a case-by-case basis.
5. When replacement is necessary, it should be based on physical or documentary evidence.
6. The existing landforms of the site shall not be altered unless shown to be necessary for maintenance of the designated property’s structure or site.

7. If there are areas where the terrain is to be altered, these areas shall be surveyed and documented to determine the potential impact to important landscape features.
8. The historic relationship between buildings and the landscape shall be retained. Grade levels should not be changed if it would alter the historic appearance of the building and its relation to the site.
9. Buildings should not be relocated if it would diminish the historic character of the site.
10. When they are required by a new use, new site features (such as parking areas, driveways, or access ramps) should be as unobtrusive as possible, retain the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape, and be compatible with the historic character of the property. Historic rock outcroppings like puddingstone should not be disturbed by the construction of new site features.
11. Original or later contributing layout and materials of the walks, steps, and paved areas shall be maintained. Consideration will be given to alterations if it can be shown that better site circulation is necessary and that the alterations will improve this without altering the integrity of the designated property.
12. When they are necessary for security, protective fencing, bollards, and stanchions should be as unobtrusive as possible.
13. Existing healthy plant materials which are in keeping with the historic character of the property shall be maintained. New plant materials should be appropriate to the character of the site.
14. Maintenance of, removal of, and additions to plant materials should consider restoration of views of the designated property.
15. The Boston Landmarks Commission encourages removal of non-historic fencing as documentary evidence indicates.
16. The Boston Landmarks Commission recognizes that the designated property must continue to meet city, state, and federal goals and requirements for resiliency and safety within an ever-changing coastal flood zone and environment.

**8.3.17 Interior Spaces, Features, and Finishes (only applicable if one or more interior spaces have been designated)**

1. The floor plan and interior spaces, features, and finishes that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building shall be retained and preserved.
2. Original or later contributing interior materials, features, details, surfaces and ornamentation shall be repaired, if necessary, by patching, splicing, consolidating, or otherwise reinforcing the materials using recognized preservation methods.
3. Deteriorated or missing interior materials, features, details, surfaces, and ornamentation should be replaced with materials and elements which match the original in material, color, texture, size, shape, profile, and detail of installation. Alternative materials will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

4. When replacement of materials or elements is necessary, it should be based on physical or documentary evidence.
5. When necessary, appropriate surface treatments such as cleaning, paint removal, and reapplication of protective coating systems shall be applied to historic materials (including plaster, masonry, wood, and metals) which comprise interior spaces.
6. Damaged or deteriorated paint and finishes shall be removed only to the next sound layer using the gentlest method possible prior to repainting or refinishing using compatible paint or other coating systems.
7. New material that is installed shall not obscure or damage character-defining interior features or finishes.
8. New or additional systems required for a new use for the building, such as bathrooms and mechanical equipment, should be installed in secondary spaces to preserve the historic character of the most significant interior spaces.
9. New mechanical and electrical wiring, ducts, pipes, and cables shall be installed in closets, service areas, and wall cavities to preserve the historic character of interior spaces, features, and finishes.
10. New, code-required stairways or elevators should be located in secondary and service areas of the historic building.

### **8.3.18 Guidelines**

The following are additional Guidelines for the treatment of the historic property:

1. Should any major restoration or construction activity be considered for a property, the Boston Landmarks Commission recommends that the proponents prepare a historic building conservation study and/or consult a materials conservator early in the planning process.
  - a. The Boston Landmarks Commission specifically recommends that any work on masonry, wood, metals, or windows be executed with the guidance of a professional building materials conservator.
2. Should any major restoration or construction activity be considered for a property's landscape, the Boston Landmarks Commission recommends that the proponents prepare a historic landscape report and/or consult a landscape historian early in the planning process.
3. When reviewing an application for proposed alterations, the Commission will consider whether later addition(s) and/or alteration(s) can, or should, be removed on a case-by-case basis. Since it is not possible to provide one general guideline, the following factors will be considered in determining whether a later addition(s) and/or alteration(s) can, or should, be removed include:
  - a. Compatibility with the original property's integrity in scale, materials and character.

- b. Historic association with the property.
- c. Quality in the design and execution of the addition/alteration.
- d. Functional usefulness.

#### **8.4 List of Character-defining Features**

Character-defining features are the significant observable and experiential aspects of a historic resource, whether a single building, landscape, or multi-property historic district, that define its architectural power and personality. These are the features that should be identified, retained, and preserved in any restoration or rehabilitation scheme in order to protect the resource's integrity.

Character-defining elements include, for example, the overall shape of a building and its materials, craftsmanship, decorative details and features, as well as the various aspects of its site and environment. They are critically important considerations whenever preservation work is contemplated. Inappropriate changes to historic features can undermine the historical and architectural significance of the resource, sometimes irreparably.

Below is a list that identifies the physical elements that contribute to the unique character of the historic resource. The items listed in this section should be considered important aspects of the historic resource and changes to them should be approved by commissioners only after careful consideration.

The character-defining features for this historic resource include:

1. Architectural style: Brutalist.
2. Ornamentation: large, projecting cast-in-place concrete hoods; projecting precast concrete fins.
3. Building materials and finishes: concrete and red brick.
4. Roof type, forms, and features (chimneys, cupolas, dormers, etc.): Flat roof with light shaft perforations, mechanical vents, and mechanical equipment integrated into the design to be viewed from taller buildings above as a "fifth façade."
5. Interiors: Central courtyard and third floor lobby
6. Cornices: The upper three floors act as an oversized, stepped out cornice, made of precast concrete panels and fins.
7. Doors and windows: Continuous glass doors and windows at recessed entrances around buildings; vertical windows at upper levels separated by pairs of precast concrete fins.
8. Porches and/or balconies: Outdoor balconies are formed at the inner courtyard as each of the top three floors steps out on the exterior, and steps in around the courtyard.
9. Visible elements of structural systems (columns, beams, trusses, etc.): Massive, poured concrete columns supporting precast Vierendeel trusses support the building's superstructure.
10. Massing of building: Inverted pyramid, set in a tripartite massing forming a brick base, a concrete body, and a stepped-out attic.
11. Relationship of building to lot lines, sidewalks, and streets: The windowless red brick three-tiered base of the building on Congress Street serves as an effective visual closure to Dock Square. The building flows openly from the plaza through the central courtyard and back out the other side.
12. Vegetation and landscaping: Central interior courtyard paved in brick with a pyramidal skylight rising out of the center.
13. Topography and landforms: Brick-clad terraced ramp along east elevation.
14. Views: Faneuil Hall, Government Center, City Hall Plaza, Customs House, the waterfront, State Street and Washington Street, the Old State House and Beacon Hill.

## **9.0 ARCHAEOLOGY**

All below-ground work within the property shall be reviewed by the Boston Landmarks Commission and City Archaeologist to determine if work may impact known or potential archaeological resources. An archaeological survey shall be conducted if archaeological sensitivity exists and if impacts to known or potential archaeological resources cannot be mitigated after consultation with the City Archaeologist. All archaeological mitigation (monitoring, survey, excavation, etc.) shall be conducted by a professional archaeologist under a state-issued archaeological permit. The professional archaeologist should meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Archaeology.

Refer to Section 8.3 for any additional Standards and Criteria that may apply.

## **10.0 SEVERABILITY**

The provisions of these Standards and Criteria (Design Guidelines) are severable and if any of their provisions shall be held invalid in any circumstances, such invalidity shall not affect any other provisions or circumstances.

## 11.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The City Hall Look," *Boston Herald*, May 5, 1962.

"The Way We Were: Boston in the 1960s," *Architecture Boston Roundtable*, 8:3 May/June 2005.

"Visual Arts Commentary: Boston City Hall – A 'Triumph' of Brutalism," *The Arts Fuse*, July 23, 2015,

<https://artsfuse.org/131504/fuse-visual-arts-commentary-boston-city-hall-a-triumph-of-brutalism/>

Architectural Record, "The New Boston City Hall," February 1969.

Boston Landmarks Commission Survey Form, Boston City Hall, 1980, Boston Landmarks Commission archives.

Boston Society of Architects, *Architecture Boston*, 1976, 11-16.

DeCosta-Klipa, Nik, "Why is Boston City Hall the way it is?" *Boston.com*, July 25, 2018,

<https://www.boston.com/news/history/2018/07/25/boston-city-hall-brutalism/>

Eldridge, Joseph, "City Hall -- At Midpoint It Begins to Show Its Style," *Boston Globe*, February 20, 1966.

Government Center Commission, "A Competition to Select an Architect for the New City Hall in the Government Center of the City of Boston," 1961.

Heyer, Paul, *Architects on Architecture: New Directions in America*, Walker & Co, 1978, 256-263.

Hodgkinson, Harold D. "Miracle in Boston," *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*: 81.

Huxtable, Ada Louise, "An Architectural Shot Heard Round the World," *New York Times*, September 28, 1980.

Kallmann, Gerhard and Michael McKinnell, "Original Thinking: Reflections on the Genesis of Boston City Hall," *Architecture Boston*, 8:3 May/June 2005.

Logue, Edward J. "Seven Years of Progress: A Final Report," Boston: Boston Redevelopment Authority, 1967. <https://archive.org/details/seven-years-of-progress>

Moss, Henry, "Boston City Hall, Boston Landmark Petition Support," letter to Ellen Lipsey, April 20, 2007, Boston Landmarks Commission archives.

O'Connor, Thomas H. *Building a New Boston*, Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1993.

Pasnik, Mark, Michael Kubo and Chris Grimley, *Heroic: Concrete Architecture and the New Boston*, New York: Monacelli Press, 2015.

Mildred Schmertz, "The New Boston City Hall," *Architectural Record*, February 1969.

Schweitzer, Sarah, "In Praise of Ugly Buildings," *The Boston Globe Magazine*, January 24, 2010.

Sirman, Brian, *Concrete Changes: Architecture, Politics and the Design of Boston City Hall*, Amherst: Bright Leaf, 2018.

Stein, Jeff, "Inside Story: What's it like to work at City Hall?," *Architecture Boston*, 8:3 May/June 2005.

Utile Design, Building Conservation Associates, and OverUnder, "Boston City Hall Conservation Management Plan," prepared for Mayor Martin J. Walsh. Published with assistance from the Getty Foundation, January 2021.

Whitehill, Walter Muir and Lawrence W. Kennedy, *Boston: A Topographical History*, Cambridge: Belknap Press, 2000.

Wurster, William W. Chairman, et al, Letter to Lawrence B. Anderson, Professional Advisor, Boston City Hall Competition, May 3, 1962, Boston Landmarks Commission archives.



FOR BLC USE ONLY

Petition number: 224.07

Received on: 4/10/07.

Attest: *[Signature]*  
Secretary

# LANDMARK PETITION FORM

RECEIVED  
APR 10 2007

Schedule for preliminary hearing: 4/24/07

Boston Landmarks Commission

City of Boston  
The Environment Department

Boston City Hall/Room 805  
Boston, Massachusetts 02201  
617/635-3850

BY: \_\_\_\_\_

NOTE: This petition must be completed in full in order to be accepted and scheduled for a preliminary hearing. *The petition may be returned if all questions have not been answered completely.* Please type or print. Call the BLC staff at 635-3850 if you have any questions regarding the petition process.

→ Marks sections to be filled out by petitioners.

\*\*\*\*\*

## PETITION

We, ten registered voters of the City of Boston, petition the Boston Landmarks Commission as authorized by Chapter 772 of the Acts of 1975 of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, as amended.

→  TO DESIGNATE                      \_\_\_\_\_ TO AMEND THE DESIGNATION OF                      \_\_\_\_\_ TO RESCIND THE DESIGNATION OF

→ THE FOLLOWING: 1 CITY HALL PLAZA, BOSTON 02201  
(street address, neighborhood and zip code or street boundaries if district)

→ BOSTON CITY HALL (NEW CITY HALL)  
(name, historic and/or common)

\*\*\*\*\*

→ OWNER'S NAME AND MAILING ADDRESS FROM ASSESSOR'S RECORDS CITY OF BOSTON, 1 CITY PLAZA, BOSTON MA 02201

→ WARD & PARCEL NUMBER FROM ASSESSOR'S RECORDS WARD 03, PARCEL 026151-000  
The assessor's office is on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor of Boston City Hall; a copy of the tax bill, available at City Hall, may be attached to the petition form.

03 02615000

\*\*\*\*\*

→ We recommend the designation category to be: (check one; see information sheet for details)  
 LANDMARK (check one...)                      Exterior only                      Interior only                       Exterior and Interior Main Lobby  
 LANDMARK DISTRICT                       ARCHITECTURAL CONSERVATION                       PROTECTION AREA DISTRICT

→ We recommend this action for the following reasons:  
(note architectural and/or historical significance)

SEE FOLLOWING PAGES OF TEXT (1-12),  
PHOTOS AND OTHER ILLUSTRATIONS

# BOSTON CITY HALL PETITION

→ We recommend this action for the following reasons (continued):

**SEE FOLLOWING PAGES**

(Use additional space on back of page if necessary)

\*\*\*\*\*  
→ Attach a location map with the outline of the building, structure, site or district. Clearly delineate petitioned sections.  
(The City of Boston Topographic and Planimetric 100" Survey, available at the BRA on the 9<sup>th</sup> floor of City Hall is preferred.)

→ Include photographs of the property or district petitioned. Black and white photographs are preferred; slides are helpful for the preliminary hearing presentation.

\*\*\*\*\*  
→ PETITIONERS must be residents and registered voters of the City of Boston.  
Home Address, Ward and Precinct must be provided for each petitioner: the petition may be returned if this information is not complete. Names must be typed or printed legibly under the signature.

→ SIGNATURE AND NAME                      ADDRESS                      ZIP CODE                      WARD                      PRECINCT

Paul Douglass Shand-Tucci                      160 Commonwealth Ave                      02116                      5                      7 ✓  
PAUL DOUGLASS SHAND-TUCCI                        

2.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
6.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
7.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
8.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
9.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
10.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

→ Spokesperson for the petitioners: DOUGLASS SHAND-TUCCI Phone Number: 617 236-7105

(1 of 6)

→ We recommend this action for the following reasons (continued):

# BOSTON CITY HALL PETITION

(Use additional space on back of page if necessary)

→ Attach a location map with the outline of the building, structure, site or district. Clearly delineate petitioned sections.  
(The City of Boston Topographic and Planimetric 100" Survey, available at the BRA on the 9<sup>th</sup> floor of City Hall is preferred.)

→ Include photographs of the property or district petitioned. Black and white photographs are preferred; slides are helpful for the preliminary hearing presentation.

→ PETITIONERS must be residents and registered voters of the City of Boston.  
Home-Address, Ward and Precinct must be provided for each petitioner; the petition may be returned if this information is not complete. Names must be typed or printed legibly under the signature.

→ SIGNATURE AND NAME	ADDRESS	ZIP CODE	WARD	PRECINCT
1. <u>Janet Holtz Kay</u> JANE HOLTZ KAY	<u>65 Marlborough St.</u>	<u>02116</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
2. <u>Barry L. Solar</u> SOLAR	<u>180 Beacon St</u>	<u>02116</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u> ✓
3. <u>Trigava</u> AL KEI TRIGAVO	<u>4 Fidelis Way</u>	<u>02135</u>	_____	_____
4. <u>J. Micim Roffi</u> ROFFI	<u>27 WAREMIST</u>	<u>02118</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>1</u>
5. <u>Thomas Parks</u> THOMAS PARKS	<u>28 UPTON ST. #3</u>	<u>02118</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>1</u> ✓
6. <u>Frederick L. Stahl</u> FREDERICK L. STAHL	<u>57 HAUCOCK ST</u>	<u>02114</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u> ✓
7. <u>Steven S. Feinberg</u> STEVEN S. FEINBERG	<u>412 Beacon St</u>	<u>02116</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>9</u>
8. <u>Stanford Anderson</u> STANFORD ANDERSON	<u>63 Commercial West</u>	<u>02116</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u> ✓
9. <u>Henry Lee</u> HENRY LEE	<u>51 Beacon St.</u>	<u>02108</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u> ✓
10. <u>Joan Lee</u> JOAN LEE	<u>51 Beacon St</u>	<u>02108</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>

→ Spokesperson for the petitioners: DOUGLASS STAND - TUCCI

Phone Number: 617 236-7705

→ We recommend this action for the following reasons (continued):

(Use additional space on back of page if necessary)

→ Attach a location map with the outline of the building, structure, site or district. Clearly delineate petitioned sections.  
 (The City of Boston Topographic and Planimetric 100" Survey, available at the BRA on the 9<sup>th</sup> floor of City Hall is preferred.)

→ Include photographs of the property or district petitioned. Black and white photographs are preferred; slides are helpful for the preliminary hearing presentation.

→ PETITIONERS must be residents and registered voters of the City of Boston.  
 Home Address, Ward and Precinct must be provided for each petitioner: the petition may be returned if this information is not complete. Names must be typed or printed legibly under the signature.

→ SIGNATURE AND NAME      ADDRESS      ZIP CODE      WARD      PRECINCT

1. <u>KIM MARKERT</u> <u>Kim Markert</u>	<u>71 Eastland Rd.</u>	<u>02130</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>7</u> ✓
2. <u>Joseph A. Rognanelli</u> <u>Joseph Rognanelli</u>	<u>29 Milford St. #1</u>	<u>02118</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>7</u>
3. <u>MATTHEW GIFFORD</u> <u>Matthew Gifford</u>	<u>71 HALIFAX ST</u>	<u>02130</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>3</u>
4. <u>JEFFLE WOLD</u> <u>Jeff Wold</u> LEOPOLD	<u>72 WARREN AVE</u>	<u>02116</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>
5. <u>KATHERINE B PEPPARD</u> <u>Katharine Peppard</u>	<u>97 MONTEBELLO RD</u>	<u>02130</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>5</u>
6. <u>JOHN A. WALLACE</u> <u>John Wallace</u>	<u>650 HUNTINGTON RD</u>	<u>02115</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>1</u>
7. <u>Ed Gordon</u> <u>Edward Gordon</u>	<u>1 Menlo St</u>	<u>02135</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>3</u> ✓
8. <u>Jane Amels</u> <u>Jane Amels</u>	<u>159 CHESTNUT HILL</u> <u>BRIGHTON, MA</u>	<u>02135</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>9</u>
9. <u>FRANCES DUFFY</u> <u>Frances Duffy</u>	<u>289 HARLBOROUGH ST</u>	<u>02116</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>8</u>
10. <u>Susan D. Prindle</u> <u>Susan Prindle</u>	<u>140 Marlborough St.</u>	<u>02114</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>7</u> ✓

→ Spokesperson for the petitioners: DOUGLASS STAND-TUCCI

Phone Number: 617 236-7705



→ We recommend this action for the following reasons (continued):

(Use additional space on back of page if necessary)

\*\*\*\*\*

→ Attach a location map with the outline of the building, structure, site or district. Clearly delineate petitioned sections. (The City of Boston Topographic and Planimetric 100" Survey, available at the BRA on the 9<sup>th</sup> floor of City Hall is preferred.)

→ Include photographs of the property or district petitioned. Black and white photographs are preferred; slides are helpful for the preliminary hearing presentation.

\*\*\*\*\*

→ PETITIONERS must be residents and registered voters of the City of Boston. Home Address, Ward and Precinct must be provided for each petitioner: the petition may be returned if this information is not complete. Names must be typed or printed legibly under the signature.

→ SIGNATURE AND NAME                      ADDRESS                      ZIP CODE                      WARD                      PRECINCT

1. *Pauline Chase Harrell*                      15 Concord Square                      02118                      4                      4  
Pauline Chase Harrell

2. *Fenwick Smith*                      4 Belgrade Ave                      02131                      20                      2  
FENWICK SMITH

3. *Dale Linder*                      40 Comm St                      02116                      5                      6  
Dale Linder

4. \_\_\_\_\_

5. \_\_\_\_\_

6. \_\_\_\_\_

7. \_\_\_\_\_

8. \_\_\_\_\_

9. \_\_\_\_\_

10. \_\_\_\_\_

→ Spokesperson for the petitioners: DOUGLASS SHAND-TUCCI                      Phone Number: 617 236-7705

→ We recommend this action for the following reasons (continued):

(Use additional space on back of page if necessary)

\*\*\*\*\*

→ Attach a location map with the outline of the building, structure, site or district. Clearly delineate petitioned sections.  
(The City of Boston Topographic and Planimetric 100" Survey, available at the BRA on the 9<sup>th</sup> floor of City Hall is preferred.)

→ Include photographs of the property or district petitioned. Black and white photographs are preferred; slides are helpful for the preliminary hearing presentation.

\*\*\*\*\*

→ PETITIONERS must be residents and registered voters of the City of Boston.  
Home Address, Ward and Precinct must be provided for each petitioner: the petition may be returned if this information is not complete. Names must be typed or printed legibly under the signature.

→ SIGNATURE AND NAME                      ADDRESS                      ZIP CODE                      WARD                      PRECINCT

1. Jonathan A. Smith                      2 DARTMOUTH PLACE                      02116                      4                      1  
JONATHAN A. SMITH

2. \_\_\_\_\_

3. \_\_\_\_\_

4. \_\_\_\_\_

5. \_\_\_\_\_

6. \_\_\_\_\_

7. \_\_\_\_\_


8. \_\_\_\_\_


9. \_\_\_\_\_

10. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

→ Spokesperson for the petitioners: DOUGLASS SHAND-TUCCI                      Phone Number: 617-236-7705                      (6 of 6)





Aerial Photograph

**Continuation Sheet, page 1**

**We recommend this action for the following reasons:  
(note architectural and/or historical significance)**

**A. HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE**

Boston City Hall is the major public edifice associated with the social and economic re-birth of Boston that began in the 1960's. As such, it is the symbol of the progressive thinking and bold initiatives that transformed Boston into a "world-class" contemporary city. Since its completion in 1969, City Hall has been the locus of numerous significant events and decisions in the city's history, and it is the structure within which planning for much of Boston's subsequent transformation occurred.

This building has housed the administrations of Mayors Kevin White, Raymond Flynn and Thomas Menino, mayors who oversaw the continuation of Boston's renewal in addition to initiating important new programs and addressing the issues of the day. While in office in City Hall, these leaders helped foster undertakings that addressed Boston's past as well as its future: the development of Faneuil Hall Marketplace, and of the New England Aquarium; of the Charlestown Navy Yard, and of Post Office Square; of neighborhood restoration, and of Tent City; the removal of the Central Artery, and the construction of the Holocaust Memorial. Most of the City's involvement in these initiatives, including planning for or reviewing and approving their concepts and details, took place within this structure.

Additionally, City Hall witnessed significant events in Boston government and in the City's history over nearly four decades. The openness of the building's form well symbolizes the increasingly open social and political arena of the decades since City Hall's completion: Felix Arroyo became the first Hispanic on the Boston City Council; Bruce Bolling presided here as the first African-American President of the Boston City Council, as did Louise Day Hicks as the first woman president of the Council; Thomas Menino has occupied the Mayor's Office in City Hall since 1994, as the first Boston mayor of Italian-American background. The Boston Landmarks Commission was created here.

Since its opening, and especially during the tenure of Kevin White, City Hall has hosted hundreds of civic events involving local neighborhood groups, school children, visiting dignitaries, musical performances, art exhibits, and celebrations associated with the country's Bicentennial in 1976 and with Boston's tercentennial in 1980. Unlike many traditional, formal and perhaps, less open, city halls, this building has accommodated a very wide range of community activities over the decades, both inside its grand lobby and

outside on its stage. As the popular tourist guide, Eyewitness Travel: Boston, observes in its entry on “New City Hall,”

...City Hall combines the offices and services of the municipal government with ample space for holiday-season concerts, school band and glee-club performances, and community art exhibits. An outdoor stage on City Hall’s north side is often the venue for evening rock and pop concerts during the summer months.

Herbert Gleason, the City’s corporation counsel from 1968 to 1979, recalled in ArchitectureBoston’s City Hall issue two years ago that

There were lots of gatherings, lots of parties, lots of community meetings. And that is what really contributed greatly to the building’s original good looks and to its positive feeling of hospitality. (p. 22)

Among the major political and social gatherings of import at City Hall were pro- and anti-war rallies during the Vietnam War, protests and debates over Boston’s school busing crisis, and historic public celebrations for championships of the Boston Celtics, the Bruins, the New England Patriots and the Boston Red Sox, drawing fans to City Hall in the hundreds of thousands.

Since opening in 1969, this building has played a significant role in Boston politics, civic life, and society.

## **B. ARCHITECTURAL SIGNIFICANCE**

In addition to its place in Boston’s history, City Hall is an internationally recognized landmark of modern architecture, whatever the controversy over its design. It was the product of a nearly unprecedented (in America) open design competition for a major public building, and the resulting design launched its unknown architects—two of them immigrants—on a path to becoming a major national firm, an office that would produce buildings across the country and beyond, and one that would have an impact on Boston comparable to that of Charles Bulfinch or H.H. Richardson.

### **1.) Significance of the city-sponsored design competition for Boston City Hall**

Attracting 256 entries, the open design competition for Boston’s new city hall was itself a rare event of great import, the first public competition for an American city hall in half a century. (Alex Krieger, p. 22) Just as significant as the contest itself, however, was the City’s exceptional commitment to seeing the process through: it hired the winning team of architects and then built its first-place design! This was no minor achievement, for, in addition to the shock of the modern winning design, its design team comprised, as David Dillon observed, “three young architects, two of them foreigners without a building to their name.” (Dillon, p. 6)

Boston historian Walter Muir Whitehill favorably appraised the boldness of the City's decision in the annals of design competitions: "Often in the past, a winning design in competition has been laid aside, unused. This one was promptly executed." (Quoted in Freeman, p. 57)

Horizon magazine, in a lengthy article about the competition entitled "Boston Chooses the Future," wrote that the "original, not to say daring" design—by "absolute underdogs"—was being realized

Because a city, hitherto anything but notorious for civic incorruptibility, determined to do the right thing and, more important still, to carry through on it. ... The example Boston has set, as the architect Percivil Goodman has written, "Could be a turning point in American architecture."

This article concluded that "Boston's jury...has turned in a decisive verdict that will stand for some time as a model of responsible civic conduct."

The now-historic competition for City Hall carried authority for a number of reasons explored in ArchitectureBoston, edited by Elizabeth Padjen. As Tad Stahl recalled in the round-table discussion: "Of all the places in the world to sell a competition of this magnitude for this kind of building, Boston was the least likely." (p. 20)

But the project had broad-base support of labor people, business people and politicians, recalled South End activist Joan Wood. (p. 20) Robert Morgan, the president of the Boston Five Cent Savings Bank, served as the chairman of the Government Center Commission, which sponsored the competition and acted as the client. (p. 21) As Padjen reported, the final jury included nationally renowned architects, Pietro Belluschi, Walter Netsch, Ralph Rapson, and William Wurster, along with local business leaders Harold Hodgkinson, chairman of Filene's; Kelley Anderson, the president of New England Mutual Life; and Sidney Rabb, chair of Stop and Shop. Lawrence Anderson, head of the MIT architecture department, served as the competition advisor. Padjen observed:

The jurors were unanimous in their selection. The business community bought into it unanimously. And what is even more amazing, the building was built exactly as it was presented in the competition. Clearly, something was happening in the city—as we know from our own recent experience, illustrious juries and commission don't guarantee results. (p. 21)

## **2. Urban planning significance of Boston City Hall**

Architecture starts at the level of the site plan, and City Hall's significance begins here. Although much criticism has been leveled at the government center development over the years with respect to the loss of historic urban fabric and the demise of such connections as Hanover Street in the plaza's design, City Hall itself—as a building—forges essential,

often overlooked connections with historic Boston. In urban design terms, decisions regarding the shape of this new structure and its placement on the site helped to lock the new building into Boston's historic center, despite the bold modernism of its forms. The result of these design decisions was a new, expanded concept of Boston's urban center. As such, the planning of City Hall can be seen as helping to prepare the way for the rejuvenation of Quincy Market.

Despite the wide-open, irregular shape of the City Hall plaza site and the hodge podge of remaining streets, City Hall is located where it engages key elements of the historic city that were preserved nearby. While I.M. Pei's site plan provided the approximate location of the new building, KMW's design responded deliberately to its context. Paradoxically, the building's elevated monumental concrete forms belie the fact that this is not the typical "object building" of the 1960's, created without reference to its surroundings. City Hall is located so that Washington Street, the original historic road connecting the mainland to Boston from the south, concludes at this new seat of City government. City Hall is built on the same orthogonal orientation as Faneuil Hall below it to the east. This means that, in spite of its bold new shape, the structure, in effect, defers to the historic building of 1742. This respectful attitude is especially evident in the architects' shifting of the building just far enough north so that the new stairs alongside City Hall, that carry the pedestrian down toward the markets, are centered on Faneuil Hall's main entrance doors. (The same idea is expressed in the dramatic views to Faneuil Hall provided from, and through, City Hall.)

Aligned this way, City Hall reinforces the decision made nearly a century and a half earlier, in 1823, when Quincy Market's three new, long buildings on the opposite side of Faneuil Hall were also aligned with its geometry, making a new coherence in place of the earlier juxtapositions of docks, wharves, buildings and streets. Thus, two of Boston's grandest undertakings of their day created a new grouping of important civic structures embracing 220 years of Boston history—an ensemble that lies at the heart of the multifarious city. Anyone who has experienced this coherent ensemble will, upon catching a glimpse of City Hall from Cambridge Street, from Washington Street or from the Rose Kennedy Greenway, immediately know where Faneuil Hall and Quincy Markets are as well.

Furthermore, on City Hall's east side, KMW located the tall brick base at the edge of the new Congress Street, where it reflects the brick massing of the Blackstone Block across from it, and begins in line with it. Although today we may look for greater sympathy with the existing city—for instance, perhaps by building shops within or against the brick base, so that it can become an occupied, less formidable wall—these deliberate relationships between old and new represent a remarkably "contextual" attitude for a 1960's building.

City Hall is widely known as an unexpected contemporary building that nevertheless engages its historic setting in these ways. Views of City Hall amidst Washington Street's older buildings were included as favorable examples of urban design in planner Kevin Lynch's photo essay on "Boston Time" in his book, What Time Is This Place? As

another example, in the 1996 book Revitalizing Historic Urban Quarters, the authors (from the University of Nottingham, England) illustrate City Hall as evidence of the “Value for Environmental Diversity,” and observe that

At a larger scale, architectural diversity also contributes to an environmental diversity. Particularly in many North American cities, there is often a stimulating contrast between the human scale environment of an historic quarter and the monumental scale of the more modern central business district. In Boston, there is a vibrant environmental juxtaposition between the Government Centre and Quincy Market.

This juxtaposition works as effectively as it does because of the many ways that City Hall engages the historic city of Boston.

### **3.) Local architectural significance of Boston City Hall**

In Boston, City Hall has been acclaimed by knowledgeable critics, despite the controversy of its design. Historian Whitehill proclaimed that City Hall was “As fine a building for its time and place as Boston has ever produced.” (Freeman, p. 57) Douglas Shand-Tucci, author of the definitive history of Boston architecture since 1800, called City Hall “arguably the great building of twentieth-century Boston.” (p. 279)

In their book, Boston Architecture 1975—1990, architectural historians Naomi Miller and Keith Morgan wrote of this building that

Kalmann, McKinnell & Knowles’s award-winning design for the New City Hall competition produced a monument that became the “keystone” of the [Government Center] complex and, more, of the entire downtown area.... Concern for the pedestrian and a public space belonging to the people set City Hall apart from all other structures of the new Boston. Various types of interaction between citizens and government and among the people themselves occur inside and outside this rugged concrete and brick building, designed to express a “celebration of government.” (p. 51)

Surveys of the architecture of Boston and New England attest to City Hall’s architectural stature. The AIA Guide to Boston, now in its second edition, includes City Hall along with the little “temple” indicator that guides readers to sites “of special architectural interest.” In Boston: The City Observed (1982), noted architect and theorist Donlyn Lyndon wrote a perceptive and sympathetic entry about City Hall that concludes that “There are few buildings to match it in architectonic daring and spirit.” (p. 36)

When the DeCordova Museum published a 142-page catalog to accompany its 1974 exhibition, New Architecture in New England, author Eva Jacob wrote of City Hall that “The magnificent south lobby is like no other place in the city. People gather here for every conceivable purpose.” (p. 20)

Henry Lee, president of the Friends of the Public Garden, discussed City Hall's monumentality in the ArchitectureBoston round-table:

...that was something that everybody was very much looking for at that time. As a layman looking at the building, I was, and I still am, impressed. I liked the fact that it had a stateliness. Maybe it's because I'd been working in Washington, and that's the way I felt public buildings ought to be—impressive. It's important for a city hall to have presence, not because your city government is all-powerful and great, but because it is yours. (p. 22)

As confirmation of its local acclaim, in 1970 the Boston Society of Architects (BSA) awarded City Hall its prestigious Harleston Parker Medal as the best new work of architecture in greater Boston.

#### **4. Local significance of Boston City Hall for the tourist**

As an example of the significance accorded City Hall in a broader, more popular context, guides to Boston and souvenir books of the city often include this building and point visiting tourists in its direction. It is clear that for much of its existence, City Hall has been seen as one of the key attractions of modern Boston—worth the visitor's attention.

For instance, a long-standing favorite, the 32-page Boston: Souvenir Guide (more than 448,000 copies sold, according to the copy on the inside back cover!), features a brief description of the “award winning public building” below a color photo of City Hall. This coverage is the equivalent to that given to most of the city's older landmarks and sites in this guide, including, on the same 2-page spread, a map of Paul Revere's Ride and an overview of Boston National Historic Park. (p. 21)

Eyewitness Travel: Boston was already cited for its attention to City Hall. The traveler referring to this guide finds City Hall getting equal billing across the page from historic Faneuil Hall and the Blackstone Block.

As another example of this building's rating among tourist attractions, the first edition of the widely-read New England regional volume in the international series of travel guides published by Michelin, New England, gives Boston City Hall two stars, the same rank as that of such landmarks as Old South Meeting House, Faneuil Hall, the Old State House, Beacon Hill, and Back Bay. For comparison, this is one star more than such historic sites as Paul Revere House, Bulfinch's State House, Peter Harrison's King's Chapel or the Public Garden. (It is one star less than the popular attractions Old North Church, Quincy Market and the Museum of Fine Arts.)

In a paragraph devoted to the building, the Michelin guide succinctly informs the tourist planning a visit to Boston that “The architecturally striking City Hall is considered one of

the major achievements of contemporary architecture.” (p. 97) (Despite changes in focus and attitude over twenty-five years, the current Michelin guide still rates City Hall as a two-star attraction.)

### **5.) National architectural significance of Boston City Hall**

The drama of Boston’s national design competition and the resulting design attracted attention far beyond Boston. Newspapers and magazines across the country featured articles on the competition and on the new building that resulted. The Guardian and The New Statesman in London carried reviews of it. The New York Times praised it. Time magazine heralded the design, saying that

The winner...in the Boston competition is as exotically daring as anything Boston has ever seen. ...it combines traditional Boston brick with reinforced concrete, but the most striking thing about it is its use of ancient secrets to produce modern magic.

Beyond the popular press, the designs and/or the finished building appeared throughout the professional journals of the day, often with articles written by major contemporary critics. Publications included Architectura, Architectural Forum, Architectural Record, Architectural Review (London), Casabella, Interiors, Japan Architect (Tokyo), Perspecta, and Progressive Architecture, among others.

The architectural journal, Casabella, in an article subtitled “The Rebirth of a City” by Francesco Tentori, opined

...the award given to the Kallmann group is worth much more than a simple acknowledgement of what is unquestionably the best project [among the competition entries]. It opens a new phase in American Architecture.

Especially notable among the many reviews at the building’s completion, given the unpopularity of City Hall’s spaces today, the magazine Interiors declared simply that Boston City Hall was “the best public building of our time.” (April 1969) The year that the building opened, the American Institute of Architects (AIA) recognized City Hall with a national Honor Award.

Many scholarly works on modern architecture have accorded City Hall a place in history, often not just in American architectural history, but in an international context. These include William J.R. Curtis’ Modern Architecture Since 1900, Francesco Dal Co and Manfredo Tafuri’s Modern Architecture, Charles Jencks’ Modern Movements in Architecture, Carole Rifkind’s A Field Guide to Contemporary Architecture, Dennis Sharp’s Twentieth Century Architecture: A Visual History, and Marcus Whiffen and Frederick Koeper’s American Architecture, 1607—1976.

Widely published and admired, City Hall became influential as a civic undertaking and as a design, one that was referred to by other municipalities and by other architects. The Southworths, in their AIA Guide to Boston, note that “Since its completion, the City Hall has inspired similar buildings across the country.” (p. 26) Comparing this impact of City Hall on other buildings to that of earlier Boston landmarks, Shand-Tucci wrote that

Just as there was hardly a city in the United States without some version of the Old North Church or the Bulfinch State House, or of Trinity Church, Copley Square, or All Saints, Ashmont, or the Boston Public Library, so now critic Nathan Silver of the New Statesman would write of “the winning design of the Boston City Hall competition of 1961, following which half the towns in American got little Boston City Halls.” (p. 282)

In its Bicentennial listing, “Highlights of American Architecture, 1776—1976,” an AIA Journal survey had Boston City Hall tied with Trinity Church with the sixth-most citations of all the buildings in American history!

(While this ranking will surprise many people, that surprise itself is evidence of the fact that tastes change over time, and that City Hall is perhaps at the nadir of popularity today. As historians will attest, acclaimed structures of an age no longer held in esteem typically regain their reputations with the passage of time, whether the building is of the Gothic or Baroque age in Europe—each once out of fashion—or of the Second Empire or another Victorian-era style in the US, distained for much of the twentieth century.)

#### **6.) Significance of Boston City Hall as the first work of a major, internationally acclaimed architectural firm**

Aside from the importance of its conception, design, and influence, Boston City Hall also is significant as the building that launched the career of its architects, Kallmann McKinnell & Wood (KMW). This young, new office followed its competition-winning Boston City Hall with a string of major works that established its reputation as an internationally-known, highly admired firm, one that has had a major hand in shaping the architecture of Boston over the subsequent decades. Discussing KMW’s many notable Boston buildings, University of California/Berkeley professor Donlyn Lyndon wrote in the Boston Globe recently that City Hall merits preservation as the “inception of this trail of civic accomplishment,” as “a marker of historic importance in the annals of American architecture.” (March 18, 2007)

While the firm has gone on to design influential buildings world-wide, its role in shaping Boston is unparalleled. This is not because of the number of KMW’s buildings in Boston, but because of their prominence as works of architecture. Evidence of their reputation can be seen in the fact that, starting with City Hall, KMW’s Boston-area buildings have won the BSA’s Harleston Parker Award a record six times, more than any other architect since the initiation of the award program in 1923. (Other firms who have been recognized in the program include Benjamin Thompson and Associates; Cram and

Ferguson; Graham Gund Architects; I.M. Pei and Partners; Sert Jackson & Associates; Shepley Bulfinch Richardson and Abbott; and The Architects Collaborative, among others.)

KMW's national stature was confirmed more than twenty years ago when the AIA in Washington honored it as the Firm of the Year, in 1984. The subsequent international scope of the office's practice is evident in substantial buildings for the United States Embassy in Bangkok, Thailand, for the World Headquarters in the Hague of the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, and in Singapore for the National Institute of Education at Nanyang Technological University.

Following the bold debut of City Hall, KMW's buildings have received critical acclaim throughout the world. Its work has been the focus of numerous publications, including monographs edited by Alex Krieger (Harvard University Graduate School of Design/Rizzoli, 1998) and by David Dillon (Edizioni Press, 2004), the latter featuring City Hall on its cover. Without Boston's national design competition for its new city hall and without the City's commitment to realizing the winning design, this internationally known firm, following in the footsteps of such influential Boston architects as Charles Bulfinch and H.H. Richardson, might never have built a building.

### C. CONCLUSION

The historic significance of Boston City Hall's design is perhaps best summarized by Lawrence W. Kennedy in his study, Planning the City Upon a Hill: Boston Since 1630 (1992, The University of Massachusetts Press). Kennedy wrote:

This new City Hall shocked people into a new vision of Boston: the Hub was no longer a provincial backwater, home of historical relics and corrupt politicians; to many, City Hall symbolized the spirit of a new and more confident Boston ready to face the future. (p. 179)

A description of the building's design from Whiffen and Keoper's study of American architectural history, American Architecture, 1607—1976, outlines City Hall's symbolic role as a great, inventive work of civic architecture tied to the city:

[Kallmann, McKinnell & Wood] have conceived their city hall not as a static, isolated monument but as an active form embedded in the matrix of the city, drawing upon the movement of people across the square, into and through the building. The red brick paving is a traditional Boston feature; it is used here not only for that reason but also as a means of uniting building and square and of symbolizing the breaking down of barriers between the people and their city government, which was the central philosophical aim of the architects. (p. 390)

Following the building's opening, Ada Louise Huxtable, the respected architectural critic for The New York Times, praised City Hall's design with the following words:

The monumentality of this public building—and it is magnificently monumental without a single one of those pompous pratfalls to the classical past that building committees clutch to like Linus’s blanket—is neither forbidding nor austere.... It is an open City Hall. At the ground level, it is meant to serve as a concourse to other parts of the city, and there are views of the city from every part of the structure.... The result is a tough and complex building for a tough and complex age, a structure of dignity, humanism, and power. (February 8, 1969)

This building surely merits designation as a Boston City Landmark.

#### **D. CLOSING NOTE ON FUTURE CHANGES**

While those who have signed this petition believe that City Hall should be protected as a City Landmark, it is worth mentioning that many believe that this building does not demand the extreme restrictions on future modifications that a more fragile, or a smaller, Landmark might require, be it the Paul Revere House, the Gibson House Museum, or even Faneuil Hall. Changes can occur here, and should occur, as the following comments suggest:

1.) In his end-of-the year reflections for 2005, Boston Globe architecture critic Robert Campbell recommended undertaking a campaign, not to demolish City Hall, but “to refashion City Hall...into the livelier place it could easily be.” (Boston Globe, December 31, 2006, p. N9)

2.) Such a renovation at City Hall might be comparable to the dramatic “intervention” that transformed Holyoke Center’s formerly open gallery in Harvard Square, observed David Fixler, the president of the New England chapter of Docomomo/US. (Boston Globe, January 14, 2007) “Much can be done with City Hall,” he wrote, to “help guarantee an enduring, sustainable renewal for this great civic work.”

3.) Historical architect Robert Neiley has proposed building a greenhouse against the front of the building to house trees through the winter, and the establishment of a café inside. (It is worth mentioning with respect to this proposed café that not only did the original architects and BRA head Edward Logue want to see a rathskeller in the basement of City Hall, but also, according to an article by Jack Thomas in The Boston Globe, Mayor Menino once said that he dreamed of putting a restaurant on the top floor to take advantage of the view. (p. E6)

4.) City Hall’s architects, Gerhard Kallmann and Michael McKinnell, themselves observed that

When we designed City Hall, we regarded the construction of the building to be the start of a process that would engage successive generations of the citizenry in

the embellishment, decoration, and adornment of the robust armature that we had designed. This, to our great regret, has not happened.... (Architecture Boston, May-June 2005, p. 35)

McKinnell had said in 1969,

This isn't a building where the pattern is frozen, where, if you move one detail you ruin everything. The process of democratic government is the meaning of City Hall. It should never be finished. (quoted in Henry Wood's article noted below.)

5.) As an example of a profound change worth considering, fellow KMW principal Henry Wood, who oversaw the construction of City Hall, suggested that the building's open courtyard might be covered with a skylight, to "become the much-needed 'Boston Room,' a place for large gatherings, a winter garden, and a café." (Boston Globe, March 18)

As these comments demonstrate, advocates for the preservation of City Hall also recognize the appropriateness of future renovations. We encourage the Landmarks Commission to consider accommodating leeway for such changes, intelligently designed, as part of designating City Hall as a Boston City Landmark.

Gary Wolf  
4/10/07

## Bibliography

- Dillon, David. The Architecture of Kallman McKinnell & Wood (New York), 2004.
- Freeman, Donald, editor. Boston Architecture (Cambridge), 1970.
- Jacob, Eva. New Architecture in New England (Lincoln), 1974.
- Kennedy, Lawrence. Planning the City Upon a Hill (Amherst), 1992.
- Krieger, Alex. The Architecture of Kallman McKinnell & Wood (Cambridge), 1988.
- Lynch, Kevin. What Time Is This Place? (Cambridge), 1972.
- Lyndon, Donlyn. The City Observed: Boston (New York), 1982.
- Miller, Naomi and Morgan, Keith. Boston: Architecture 1975-1990 (Munich), 1990.
- Rifkind, Carol. A Field Guide to Contemporary American Architecture (New York), 2001.
- Sharp, Dennis. Twentieth Century Architecture: A Visual History (Mulgrave, Australia), 2007.
- Southworth, Susan and Michael. AIA Guide to Boston (Chester), 1992.
- Shand-Tucci, Douglass. Built in Boston: City and Suburb, 1800-2000 (Amherst), 1999.
- Tiesdell, Steven; Oc, Taner; and Heath, Tim. Revitalizing Historic Urban Quarters (Burlington, England), 1996.
- Whiffen, Marcus and Koeper, Frederick. American Architecture 1607-1976 (Cambridge), 1981.
- Boston Souvenir Guide (Hyde Park), 2001.
- DK Eyewitness Travel Guide: Boston (London), 2001.
- The Michelin Guide: New England, 1982.


- Campbell, Robert. "Towers were the height of fashion," Boston Globe, December 31, 2006.
- Campbell, Robert. "Fighting (about) City Hall," Boston Globe, January 7, 2007.
- "City Hall: The hub of The Hub" (editorial), Boston Globe, March 9, 2007.
- Eisen, David. "How to save City Hall," The Phoenix News, December 21, 2006.
- "End of the Glass Box?" Time, May 25, 1962.
- Fixler, David. "New, improved modernity," Boston Globe, January 14, 2007.
- Larrabee, Eric. "Boston Chooses the Future," Horizon, January 1963.
- Lyndon, Donlyn. "Why City Hall is worth saving," Boston Globe, March 18, 2007.
- Padjen, Elizabeth, editor. Architecture Boston, City Hall Issue, May-June 2005.
- Tentori, Francesco. "Boston Government Center: The Rebirth of a City," Casabella, January 1963.
- Thomas, Jack. "I wanted something that would last," Boston Globe, October 13, 2004.
- Wood, Henry. "Doing more with what we have," Boston Globe, March 18, 2007.

American Institute of Architects, "Highlights of American Architecture, 1776—1976"  
(list)


Boston Society of Architects, "Harleston Parker Award Recipients" (list)

Kallman, McKinnell & Wood, "Boston City Hall" (firm project description)







Photos courtesy of Kallmann McKinnell & Wood Architects



Photos courtesy of Kallmann McKinnell & Wood Architects




Photos courtesy of Kallmann McKinnell & Wood Architects



Photos courtesy of Kallmann McKinnell & Wood Architects




Photos courtesy of Kallmann McKinnell & Wood Architects



**Center Plaza**

Cambridge St. **Map 2-13**  
 Government Center

Downtown's old, irregular street pattern has given rise to some unusual buildings, including the Center Plaza, which was designed in the mid-1960s by Welton Beckett & Associates. It was designed specifically to follow the long curve of the existing Cambridge Street, and the long-sloping office complex is often referred to as a "scyscraper laid sideways." Shops and restaurants run at street level along Center Plaza's sidewalk arcade, on the Government Center side, while the plaza behind incorporates some much older city center buildings.



Old-fashioned flower stall on the sidewalk outside Center Plaza


**Government Center**

Cambridge Court, New Sudbury & Congress St. **Map 2-13**  
 Government Center

This city center development was built on the site of what was once South Square, demolished as part of the bid for local urban renewal that began in the early 1960s. Some viewed the development as controversial; others did not lament what was essentially a shatterable cluster of saloons, B-listique theaters, tavern parlors, and salinity hotels. The overall master plan for Government Center was inspired by the Chicago Vitaley and

specialism of Italian piazzas. Architects I.M. Pei & Partners re-created some of this feeling by surrounding Boston's new City Hall with a vast terraced plaza covering 50 acres (25 ha), paved with 1,800,000 bricks. Its spaciousness makes it an ideal venue for events such as parades and concerts, political and sports rallies, food fairs, parades, military marches, and concerts. The Cambridge Street side accommodates a farmers' market on Mondays and Wednesdays from around the middle of May to the middle of November.

A remnant of old Boston hangs from the Sears Block at City Hall Plaza's Court Street perimeter. This 12-ft (3.7-m) tall, 127-gallon Mustang tea kettle was made for the Oriental Tea Company by a firm of coppermiths in 1875. Near New Sudbury Street, the John J. Kennedy Federal Office Building features two pieces of Abstract Art: Bruce Glad's 1960s oil painting *Demographic sculpture*, and Robert Mollard's 1960s *New England Egg*, a mural recalling the maps, assassination of President Kennedy in Dallas in 1963. A memorial standing in front of the building marks the site of Alexander Graham Bell's first telephone breakthrough and his experiment in the "electrical speech machine" in 1876. *See pp 65*



Curved, modernist structure of Center Plaza, on Cambridge Street

**New City Hall**

New City Hall **Map 2-13**  
 Tel: 617-625-4000 Government Center  
 New City Hall  
 www.cityofboston.net

The firm of architects Nathaniel McKinnell & Knowles won a nationwide design competition for their strong, curvy hall, a six-story, top-heavy, cantilevered, Modernist building. Completed in 1968, the concrete-and-brick City Hall contains the offices and services of municipal government, with ample space for holidays-season concerts, school band and cheerleader performances, and community activities. An outdoor stage on City Hall's north side is often the venue for evening rock and pop concerts during the summer months.



New City Hall and Government Center, site of Boston's main focal points

**Blackstone Block**

Blackstone Block **Map 2-13**  
 Government Center

Blackstone's pure Boston is a surviving web of 17th-century lanes and alleyways, a remnant of what was once a vibrant neighborhood of Boston, with historical associations dating back to the colony's period. The street's most famous son, William Brewster, grew up on Union and Hanover streets, where his father owned a candleworks. Pure Boston's lane program that spanned the city, the block, according to the water's edge, and suggested that the names of the streets in this small street, Marsh Lane, Creek Lane, and Salt Lane, the oldest surviving signs in the Blackstone block dates to in 1714. The lane of streets, later to be owned by Francis Lang Jones, shipped was a game horse in his and gave a Dutch tavern support himself while being for birds. Since 1945, the building has housed the firm Oliver House, but in 1950, demolished to its original and now rarely visited. The building's service, during a reconstruction in F. Kennedy, and of use, as a store.



Liberty and Union, Now and Forever by George Mealy, Faneuil Hall

**Faneuil Hall**

See **Map 2-13**  
 Tel: 617-452-4000 Government Center  
 See **Map 2-13** Government Center

A gift to Boston from the wealthy merchant Peter Faneuil in 1742, this Georgian brick landmark has always functioned simultaneously as a public market and town meeting place. Master mason John Dowse modeled the building's grass-topper weatherstone after the one on top of the Royal Exchange in the City of London, England. Bostonians quickly nicknamed it "Old Sturtevant" and as early as 1764 Samuel Adams used the hall as a platform to suggest that the American colonies should rise against British oppression and fight to

establish their independence. *See pp 24, 25* Hence the building's nickname "Cradle of Liberty" and the head posture of the statue of Sam Adams at the front of the building.


Toward the end of the 18th century it became apparent that the existing Faneuil Hall could no longer house the capacity crowds that it regularly attracted. The commission to expand the building was undertaken by Charles Bulfinch (see p 53), who completed the work from 1805 to 1809. The building then remained unchanged until 1878, when it was expanded and further according to long-standing Bulfinch stipulations. Faneuil Hall was restored in the 1970s as part of the wider redevelopment of Quincy Market. *See pp 69*



Sam Adams statue, in front of Faneuil Hall




The Union Oyster House, one of Boston's most famous restaurants, Blackstone Block



### John Hancock Tower

Located in the heart of Copley Square in Boston's Back Bay Area, this magnificent building was designed by I.M. Pei. This 52 story building, is New England's tallest structure and is an important part of Boston's identity and image.



### The Midnight Ride Of Paul Revere

On the night of April 18, 1775, Paul Revere crossed Boston Harbor and rode to warn the towns west of Boston that British troops were marching to seize arms stored in Lexington and Concord. As a result of this warning, the first clashes of arms in the War for Independence occurred at Lexington Green and Concord Bridge.

### City Hall and Government Center


Boston's imaginative City Hall is dramatically accentuated by a unique fountain and broad brick plazas. This award-winning public building is adjacent to the twin towers of John F. Kennedy Federal Building. The 17-story National State office building, and the curving skyscraper living on its side called Center Plaza. The area is colloquially called Government Center... and it is, perhaps, the city's most dramatic change in appearance in


this century. What is now Government Center was, up until the 1950's, South Square... noted for its burlesque houses, drinking places, and other places of unenviable reputation. If Grandpa or Uncle Charlie is looking for an area in which he had some wild times during World War II, tell him it's been completely changed.

### Boston National Historical Park

Several important historic sites in Boston have been grouped together as a National Historical Park. These locations are administered by their traditional owners with the help of the National Park Service. Permanent, interpretive bronze markers have been placed at these sites by National Park Service and specially trained personnel give frequent interpretive talks and are often available to answer your questions at these locations. The National Park sites are The Old State House, Old North Church, Faneuil Hall, The Old South Meeting House, Paul Revere's House, Banker Hill, the Navy Yard where the U.S.S. Constitution and the U.S.S. Cassin Young (a WW II destroyer) may be seen, and Dorchester Heights.

Dorchester Heights (19 miles South of Fenway town in South Boston) were fortified in a single night's work using cannon liberously furnished from Fort Mifflin. This show of strength forced the British to evacuate Boston in 1776. This guide book uses the arrowhead symbol to designate Boston National Park Sites. A visitors' center where rest room facilities, information and a free audio-visual program are available is maintained by the National Park Service at 15 State Street across from the entrance to the Old State House. The Visitors Center has facilities for the handicapped. You may phone them at (617) 242-5642.






Cover from The Architectural Forum, January-February 1969

THE ARCHITECTURE OF  
Kallmann McKinnell & Wood

BY DAVID DILLON



Cover from the monograph The Architecture of Kallmann McKinnell & Wood, (New York) 2004.