



The City of Seattle

# Landmarks Preservation Board

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649, Seattle WA 98124-4649

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 587/16

## MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting  
City Hall  
600 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room  
Wednesday, October 5, 2016 - 3:30 p.m.

### Board Members Present

Deb Barker  
Kathleen Durham  
Robert Ketcherside  
Jordon Kiel, Vice Chair  
Kristen Johnson  
Aaron Luoma, Chair  
Jeffrey Murdock  
Julianne Patterson  
Matthew Sneddon  
Emily Vyhnanek

### Staff

Sarah Sodt  
Erin Doherty  
Melinda Bloom

### Absent

Chair Aaron Luoma called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

**100516.1      APPROVAL OF MINUTES**  
September 7, 2016  
Deferred.

**100516.2      CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

100516.21

West Earth Clock

406 Dexter Avenue North

Proposed changes to previously approved design.

Larry Johnson, The Johnson Partnership, explained proposed revisions to earlier Certificate of Approval. He explained the color was original green all the way through and they propose now to return it to the original green with gold leaf accents. He said they propose now to use a lower pedestal – 1’ high – so the clock can be enjoyed at a pedestrian level. He said landscaping will be done as backdrop to bring clock to forefront. He said pavers in the area are gray. He said they are working on a skateboard deterrent. He said that an artifact was found inside the clock – a 1938 Spanish American War reunion souvenir pin.

Ms. Sodt said that these changes are more in line with board comments at having the clock at eye level.

Mr. Luoma asked about vandalism concerns.

Mr. Johnson said it will be alarmed.

Mr. Ketcherside asked if they considered adding a bollard to protect it from cars.

Mr. Johnson said he will check.

Ms. Sodt said that placing a bollard wouldn’t require review.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Ketcherside said that there are eight faces on this clock; the lower clock is there so people could view it at pedestrian level since the other clock was so high.

Mr. Johnson said there are only three or four of these clocks in the world. He said the restorer had the original clock works for this clock.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed street clock restoration and re-installation.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Report on Designation, as the proposed restoration work

preserves the distinctive materials, features, finishes, and examples of craftsmanship that characterize the landmark, as per Standard #5 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*; and the proposed relocation of the street clock will retain the spatial relationship of the clock to the corner of Dexter Avenue N. and Harrison Street, as per Standard #1 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.

2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/RK/JP            10:0:0 Motion carried.

100516.22

901 Harrison Street

Proposed changes to previous approval.

Dave Heater, Ankrom Moisan, explained that changes are proposed to existing Certificate of Approval: column and gasket, materials at entry, and heat height of windows in landmark building. He said what was presented at ARC was not preferred and now they have a better option for the column that ARC has not seen yet.

Amanda Russell, Ankrom Moisan, indicated on approved rendering the previously approve column treatment and said they now proposed a slanted glass version to conceal the column. It will have a different geometry from the landmark; the angle touches the landmark and becomes the entry. She said they studied a few options for entry feature wall and prefer a wall with peek-a-boo moments relating to the sand and gravel of the building's early use by Pioneer Sand and Gravel Company, with a gabion rock feature. She said this ties in better with the podium. She said they will keep the head height of landmark building windows; the ceiling will be at the shadow line but it won't be visible.

Mr. Luoma asked about glass differentiation at gasket and tower.

Mr. Heater said glazing will be very transparent at the gasket and will allow visibility into the amenity spaces. He said the rest is different – more reflective. He provided samples.

Ms. Patterson asked about the size of glazing units at the column area.

Ms. Russell said there is a slight change to spandrel there for constructability. She said it eventually matches up at tower. She said there is a double height space there and the spandrel hides the beam.

Mr. Luoma asked what type rock is planned for gabion.

Ms. Russell said sandstone with maximum size at 6".

Mr. Heater reminded board that the original tenant was Pioneer Sand and Gravel.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Murdock said the historic building has made a lot of concessions with regard to the column; structural elements could have been better planned early on. He said the wide beam looked like a smokestack and the change makes sense. He said where the landmark is connecting with the base of the tower it is so close and feels a little awkward but is better than it was.

Mr. Luoma thanked the team for looking at alternatives and said this is the most successful option.

Mr. Kiel thanked the team and noted the improvement.

Ms. Barker said this will never be taken for a left over smoke stack so she was supportive.

Mr. Ketcherside said it is appropriate and raising the head height was good.

Mr. Luoma agreed with Mr. Ketcherside's comments.

Ms. Sodt said the applicant will provide revised construction drawings; no Certificate of Approval will be issued until she has that.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed design revisions to previously approved exterior alterations, at 901 Harrison Street; with angled glass option surrounding interior column, gabion wall, and floor-height component.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. **125022** as the proposed work is compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/DB/JM            10:00 Motion carried.

100516.23

Loyal Heights Elementary School

2501 NW 80<sup>th</sup> Street

Proposed building rehabilitation, addition, and site improvements.

Jonah Jensen, BLRB Architects, presented via PowerPoint (full report in DON files). He went over process to date, attributes for design, and landmarked features. He said Phase I will include demolition of existing covered play area, removal of seven portables, and demolition of stair and guard rail. He said they will add 80' x 6' underground storm detention system – geothermal wells. He went over existing trees – which will remain, which will not, and why. He pointed out the exceptional trees. He identified the location for one future portable classroom building. He said vertical rails with acorn caps will be preserved and painted black; the vinyl chain link will be replaced with black.

He provided a 'virtual' walk about the building via photos and noted brick will be cleaned and repointed to match historic tooling and color. He said the Naramore bay window will become part of the new entry sequence; the other bay window will become part of a new conference room. He said helical anchors will be used at brick masonry where required for seismic/life-safety; they will be mortared over within joints so they won't be visible. He said there is not much work to be done on the north side.

Mr. Jensen said that bricks from the covered play area will be removed and salvaged to be reused as needed for patching. He said a courtyard will be added; it will be used for programming – gathering and presentation space. He said that the stair and canopy will be demolished. He said that the entry vestibule doors will be replaced with what was intended for the 1946 building. He said they will create a secure vestibule. He said the connection to the landmark is light and reversible; there will be no negative impact to the landmark. He said the expansion joints will allow the buildings to move independently. He said they propose 16" brick in the new building to differentiate it from the historic brick. He noted use of glass with colored glazing, gray panels, for differentiation and wayfinding. He said they will use helical anchors between quoins at the entry.

He went over evolution of the west elevation and directed board members to packets; he went through iterations and changes made due to ARC suggestions and preferences. He went over proposed materials: smooth face CMU, Castle White, and metal panels in two colors – light above and dark below. He said they may not need new lights and may be able to get enough foot candles out of what is there.

Mr. Jensen said hollow clay tiles on the first floor classroom interiors will be removed; the plaster walls along the corridor will be preserved. He said they will insulate exterior walls and fir out to allow for conduit. He said on the second floor they will remove hollow clay tile walls similar to first floor. He

said that they will remove fixtures and dropped ceiling as detailed in trim sheets. He said the lockers will be removed and a vinyl wall cover added there for student art work. He said the original school house lights are there and will be supplement as needed. He said they will add linoleum flooring, refinish stairway and rails, and remediate magnesite on stairs and then re-stain them. He said that casework will be refinished. He said they will maintain the classroom ceiling height.

He said that they plan to keep the height and volume of the auditorium / lunchroom and will use it as the library. He said they will keep the light fixtures at historic locations and will add lighting to wash up. He said they will paint the proscenium. He said they will protect the stage flooring and will use the area as a classroom area for storytelling. He said they will add seating to the stage front which will also act as safety element.

Ms. Patterson said the alternate west elevation information is not in packet.

Mr. Jenson put the information on the screen and said the information will be added to the construction drawings with Ms. Doherty.

Ms. Barker asked who is on the School Design Advisory Team.

Steve Moore, Seattle Public Schools, said it is the principal, staff, and parents.

Ms. Barker asked about the geothermal installation.

Mr. Moore said it will be used for building heating and cooling.

Ms. Barker asked if the helical anchors are an administrative review item.

Ms. Doherty said yes the seismic work is administrative, as is the masonry cleaning, and tuck pointing.

Ms. Johnson asked about louvers.

Mr. Jenson said that they will be integrated at the top.

Ms. Barker said the louvers shown on the west elevation drawing are not correct.

Mr. Jenson said it will be updated on construction drawings.

Mr. Luoma asked how the existing lighting in the raised portion of the stage compares with proposed lighting.

Mr. Jenson said what is there is not historic.

Mr. Moore said what is there now is fluorescent but noted there are still historic lights in the lunchroom.

Mr. Jenson said what is behind the stage is linear fluorescent.

Public Comment:

Chris Jackins, Seattle Committee to Save Schools, was not supportive of the application and asked the board to say 'no'. He read from written comments which are in DON file.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Luoma said the board has been briefed on this project multiple times.

Ms. Patterson expressed previous concern about the west and south elevations but noted the new west elevation is a big improvement.

Mr. Murdock said the proportion of fenestration to solid is better now and he said he is happier with the patterning. He said the south facade is more utilitarian and more opaque. He noted the more rigorous proportion of the windows.

Mr. Sneddon agreed and noted issues with symmetry. He said this is distinctive on its own and it is good that they re-thought it. He said he did not like the loss of the lockers and classroom built-ins – they provide a window into a time period. He said they are not significant to the legacy of curriculum so can let it go but they are losing something of a way of accommodating kids. He said he understood the structural issues with hollow clay tile.

Ms. Barker said the landmark buildings are respected. She said seeing the iterations of design development was helpful. She said the addition is pushed back and not three stories and respects the landmarks. She said it is not against a sidewalk. She said she likes that the alternative west elevation is much more sympathetic. She said she encourages other vents or other features to be camouflaged to avoid disruptions to this façade.

Mr. Luoma said it is a balance of educational specifications and programming, with the landmark site and existing structure. He said that what they have done is commendable and at a good spot now. He said they identified the significant features of the site. He said that while there is loss of open play space the district standards are being met. He said it is difficult with the size of the site, but the scale of the addition with two stories is successful. He said the alternative west elevation is a big improvement. He said it is a good

balance. He said to consider the height of the auditorium lights and to raise them so one is not staring at modern linear lights.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed building additions, exterior and interior building alterations, and site improvements at Loyal Heights Elementary School, 2501 NW 80<sup>th</sup> Street, as per the attached submittal and with updated west elevation.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed additions, exterior and interior building alterations, and site improvements do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Report on Designation (LPB 171/15), as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. Some of the proposed classroom alterations affect the features or characteristics specified in the Report on Designation (LPB 171/15), as the proposed work removes historic materials that characterize the property. However, the applicant demonstrated the need to make these alterations to address seismic safety issues.
3. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/JP/JM                      8:0:2    Motion carried. Mr. Kiel recused himself and Ms. Vyhnanek abstained.

**100516.3                      CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

100516.31                      Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, Seattle Branch  
1015 Second Avenue

Ms. Sodt explained the request for extension until February 15, 2017.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls & Incentives for the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, Seattle Branch, 1015 Second Avenue, until February 15, 2017.

MM/SC/RK/DB                      10:0:0    Motion carried.

**100516.4                      BRIEFINGS**

100516.41                      Seattle Asian Art Museum  
1400 East Prospect Street  
Briefing on proposed rehabilitation, addition, and site improvements

Kim Rorschach, Director, Seattle Asian Art Museum, explained the proposed changes are imperative to operate a viable museum. She said not much has been done since they became the Seattle Asian Art Museum and noted the seismic upgrade and climate control are needed. She said that it is necessary to eat up square footage



in the lower levels of the building's footprint in order to make these upgrades. She said they are cognizant of Volunteer Park and see the museum as an enhancement to the park; she said they have had productive communication with ARC, DOPAR groups and Olmsted groups. She noted the importance of balancing two important landmarks to provide public benefit.

Sam Miller, LMN, provided historical background of Olmsted, the park, the 1933 Bebb and Gould museum building, and Hoggson landscape updates. He presented via PowerPoint (report in DON file). He said that the original building was symmetrical and now the rigorous symmetry is no longer presented. He said that many windows have been covered up over the years. He said that the monumental façade is on the west side; the 1950 addition is on the east and the stair on the south side. He went over building addition history. He said there are significant trees that have impacted design for proposed expansion and they have determined there are only two possibilities.

He went over program needs: new gallery space, new education space, and meeting space improvements. He noted the hollow clay tile and unbraced walls and the said seismic improvements are needed. He said that there are challenges to movement of art with inability to get truck in. He said a new freight elevator is needed as well as an enhanced loading dock. He said environmental controls are needed; at this time there is no air conditioning or humidity controls and he said there are condensation issues. He went through concepts explored and how they came to what they think is the best option – Option D which fits within significant trees, provides good gallery size and circulation, and maintains windows from historic gallery.

On the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor level Mr. Miller explained that two new openings will be made on the east side. He said they will restore the garden court and existing fountain. He said the level 3 “park lobby” is a glazed element that cantilevers out – suspended and transparent. He said that it connects the museum experience to the significant Beech tree and provides eyes on the park and a connection to the park. He said that on 2<sup>nd</sup> floor level the auditorium, library, Gardner center remain; they will add a loading dock to freight elevator by enclosing the space under the gallery. He said that on level 1 they will utilize the unexcavated area; the mechanical will be housed in the old art storage space. He said they will add a new generator and transformer. He said the mechanical will take up more space and the offices will be moved to the back side; there will be community meeting space and interior stair. He said they will get rid of the external stair on that side. He said they will use precast cladding on the new section and it will be differentiated from the historic building. He said it will be compatible in color – not exact – and they will use neutral colors in keeping with the original building. He said there is almost no change to the west side except for the proposed elevator addition on the north end. He went over proposed materials.

Chris Jones, Walker Macy, said they engaged with the Seattle Friends of Olmsted Parks who provided a letter (in DON file). He said this is a rehabilitation project. He said the concert grove is gone and replacing it is not a viable option. He said they are proposing a terrace so it is not a restoration. He said there is lawn now but it doesn't do what it needs to do. He said they need to resolve how the museum meets the park. He said the Hoggson Plan for the east side was never realized.

Mr. Kiel asked why it was never incorporated.

Mr. Jones didn't know. He went over site circulation and said they propose rerouting of paths because of conflict with loading dock and delivery trucks. He said they will improve ADA accessibility issues, extend patch, add ADA staff entry, add more ADA stalls at the southernmost walkway.

*Ms. Patterson left at 5:55 pm.*

Mr. Jones said that terrace grading on the east will address a significant grade change. He said they will bring back Olmstedian forms, with rich layering and richness in materiality.

Mr. Sneddon asked about the extent of wall surfaces – if they will be reclad.

Mr. Miller said that all but the stone façade will be replaced, and noted where the west stone façade wraps the north and south ends. He said they will insulate. He said the rest will be built up with modern insulation and cladding.

Mr. Sneddon asked why the insulation can't be installed from the interior.

Mr. Miller said there is significant plaster coving that comes down particularly in the west gallery. He said on the west there is a flatter condition that won't be as noticeable; it is not as possible on other elevations. He said there is a patchwork there now – lots of conditions; he said they will modernize and clean it up.

Ms. Barker asked about the redwood tree and landscape components on the east site – whose plan are they from – Hoggson? Olmsted?

*Mr. Sneddon left at 6:05 pm.*

Mr. Jones said that they are not from a specific plan. He said there are some exceptional trees to remain, some other trees they plan to remove, and some they plan to relocate; the redwood is not associated with any plan.

Ms. Barker asked about the condition of the Beech tree.

Mr. Miller said it is very good; it is a heritage tree and was not part of either the Olmsted or Hoggson plans.

Ms. Barker asked who planted the redwood.

Mr. Miller said there have been a lot of changes since Olmsted and Hoggson.

Ms. Barker asked who has oversight of the park.

Ms. Doherty explained that DOPAR manages the building and the park; it is their property. She said she understands that Parks has a long-term vision to go back to the original Olmsted planting plan, but they have not yet come to brief the Landmarks Board on their approach to achieve this.

Mr. Jones said that there is a long term vegetation plan and the majority of that will happen outside the scope of this project.

Mr. Miller said that they adjusted placement of the addition around significant trees.

Ms. Barker asked about the rationale for not choosing option C.

Mr. Miller said there are circulation issues.

Mr. Kiel asked the team to describe the Olmstedian approach.

Mr. Jones said that most of the vision was lack of building, and to provide respite from the built world. He said rich and multi-layered palette proposed.

Mr. Kiel asked if the cantilevers shown are achievable.

Mr. Miller said they are.

Mr. Luoma asked about interior circulation from 3<sup>rd</sup> to 2<sup>nd</sup> level.

Mr. Miller said the stairs are enclosed within the box. Responding to questions he said the doors at the ground level are typically for emergency exit but they could be used for 'spill out' to the terrace for events in that space.

Ms. Rorschach said that it is better not to signal that it could be an entrance.

Mr. Kiel asked the capacity of the community room.

Mr. Miller said it is 20 – 30 seated and 40 standing.

Mr. Murdock asked how the new glass element will meet the historic building.

Mr. Miller said there will be a reveal between corner of element and building and they will use as light a touch as possible.

Mr. Luoma asked about design intent for original exterior wall that will become part of the interior.

Mr. Miller said they are open to suggestions. He said it needs a similar palette so it reads the same all the way through. He said on the level below there will be the remnant of the old wall.

Public Comment:

Bryn Homsy, Seattle Friends of Olmsted Parks, said it is a contemporary addition and not harmonious with the extant museum. She said that the current design is out of scale with the size of the park. She said the refurbishment is not compliant with walls laid out, and the SOIS. She said the new exterior glass wall doesn't relate. She said that Seattle deserves better.

Eliza Davidson said the addition is a de facto adverse impact on the park. She said it has huge bulk and is dominating on the east side. She said the building reduces the Olmsted greensward. She cited the SOIS and said what is proposed doesn't meet the standards and doesn't let the building shine.

Andy Mitton, Seattle Friends of Olmsted Parks, stressed the importance of the Olmsted landscape in Volunteer Park. He said that the park was nominated in 1975 as a national significant example of the body of work for John C. Olmsted; he said it is a very important historic asset. He said that there are two different landmarks all in one, and noted the complexity of that. He said to try to preserve as much as possible of what is there today. He said he looks forward to working together on how these two things can better come together. He said the original park plan incorporated formal and informal spaces. He said the front took over the role of original concert grove. He said the lawn on the other side is more passive. He asked the Board to give careful consideration to activating the east side of the museum because it is contrary to the original park plan.

#### Board Discussion:

Mr. Murdock said the expressed stair on the outside was an implied point of entry and this has been resolved nicely. He said there are proportional issues. He said the cladding is expressing joint lines and suggested making the glassy more expressive. He said it seems a bit truncated and there is opportunity to do something interesting. He said to have some other resolution where the new meets the historic building but that generally he likes what they have done. He preferred access point at ground but that he was not sure of the best way to merge with the park. He said he likes seeing the three historic windows below. He said it needs more development.

Mr. Ketcherside said the changes at the front are straightforward and the loading dock change is positive. He said cleanup of the north end is great as is exposing windows. He said the south end of the top half of the addition is a lost opportunity – it doesn't match the original in materials or windows. He said they are addressing the right sort of issues. He said that Olmsted would not want continued intrusion and to get back to what it was before problems introduced in the 1950s. He said the glass almost reminds him of a waterfall.

Mr. Kiel said it is a challenge on how to add to the building. He said it is a complex site. He said healing the back of the building is good, which is a failed component, but there are tree dripline issues to consider. He said the design delicately touches the building in places that matter the least, but he questioned how they are touching the landscape. He said he would like to see the glass touch the ground. He said the entry stitches new and old together and connects to the ground. He said the rest makes sense. He disagreed with the public letter about the ADA access and said he likes the approach shown here better. He said he is not a fan of the kink in the path at the north but that he realized it is not your kink; he preferred nice smooth arcs instead which would be more like original paths.

Ms. Barker indicated page 34 and said she is not keen on eliminating the immediate connection from the path. She did not support the dual ADA access on west and the switch of ADA parking. She supported staff accessible entry on the north side and not have dual, symmetrical accessible entry paths. She said that she wished for a

more holistic approach on the back of the building, and to look at the long range park plan. She said the addition feels like a tsunami overwhelming the park and the overhang feels hostile. Page 24...to deal with eastern façade and the historic element holistically – if it is one full glass wall that shows off the historic building façade she said she was not comfortable with how it swings around - it creates hostile areas. She said she is comfortable with the contemporary finishes and window motif on the balance of the addition. She wished they would maintain addition consistent with what is on the north end following the coping line above those windows. She said the addition doesn't seem to meet SOIS #9. She said she likes the terracing. She said to think holistically with what is out there and in connection with what the park is, and to think broader in terms of needs in concert with DOPARs plans.

Ms. Vyhnanek said there are different perspectives going on. She said the 1950's alterations were a missed opportunity. She said the east portion of the park is a different dynamic than the west portion. She said the glass addition 'shouts' over the park. She likes the terracing option – it adds a gradient from the park to the museum. She said the glass jutting out creates dark alcove spaces and it should be extended down somehow. She said it seems imbalanced. She likes the glassy nature but it 'shouts'.

Mr. Luoma said it is challenging working with two landmarks one within another – both equally important and in need of protection. He said there are scale issues but that holistically to look at what is being taken from the park relative to the scale of the park. He said there are some tradeoffs with potential improvements. He said it will be interesting to see further grading detail on the paths proposed on the west side. He said he would like to see a single radius turn in the path rather than a squiggle. He said he would like to see a grading plan to understand how they are impacting the hedges and the wall on the west side where they meet the existing fabric. He asked them to further explain the accessible deficiencies, and said more background information is needed. He said to look at DOPAR's ability to maintain (or not) long term the plantings and approach on the east side. He said to reduce and / or simplify. He said the space needs to be quiet and simple. He said to explore Olmsted Park precedents – what is successful and what is not. He said to look at tree preservation but he wondered about the tree value compared to possible impacts to the park itself and the shape and size of the addition. He said maybe there is a compromise. He said he generally likes the glass extension better than it was before – it is simpler and quieter. He said you never know what Olmsted would think of this, because the technology didn't exist then, but the glass helps with the ideas of connecting people to nature. He said it is elegant and simple solution.

Mr. Kiel said in the future to show how it will read through will be helpful. He said to look at the building's relationship to the landscape. He said to look at the glass element and to explore if it should drop down, or be taller or step the floor plate back, and begin to dissolve the corner a bit. He said to look at ways to break down the scale or the sense of scale and to reinforce the element of prospect in the park.

Ms. Barker said to get a 3-D laser scan of the building so they know exact dimensions and shapes of everything; need good as-built documents.

Mr. Murdock said the new elevator looks bigger than previously shown, and would like to see if it can be reduced in size. He said the west side of the building is

sacrosanct, and it has already lost some of its symmetry. The proposed elevator tower worsens that problem.

Ms. Barker said the mechanical area would be a good place to add the elevator.

Ms. Doherty said it would be helpful for DOPAR to attend future briefings so they could answer the board's questions, like the direction provided to the design team to preserve the trees when citing a possible building addition.

Mr. Miller said he met with DOPAR today and encouraged them to come and they declined.

Ms. Doherty reiterated her recommendation that Parks come to the meetings; it would be helpful for the board and public to understand their perspective as the property owner. She also said the city gathers information about building users and visitorship, and maybe the museum has similar types of information. She said it is quite possible that many people are not driving to the museum and need a path that provides accessibility from mass transit. There should be some kind of data to help support the direction they propose.

**100516.5 STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator