



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 246/16

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
Seattle Municipal Tower
600 4th Avenue, Floor L2
Room L2-80, Boards and Commissions
Wednesday, April 6, 2016 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Marjorie Anderson
Deb Barker
Nick Carter
Kathleen Durham
Robert Ketcherside
Jordon Kiel
Kristen Johnson
Aaron Luoma, Chair
Jeffrey Murdock
Julianne Patterson
Matthew Sneddon
Mike Stanley

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Melinda Bloom

Absent

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

040616.1

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

January 20, 2016

MM/SC/RK/MST

10:0:2 Minute approved. Ms. Barker and Mr. Carter abstained.

February 3, 2016

MM/SC/DB/JK

11:0:1 Minutes approved. Ms. Johnson abstained.

**Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods**

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

February 17, 2016

MM/SC/JK/JM

11:0:1 Minutes approved. Mr. Carter abstained.

040616.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

Applications were reviewed out of agenda order.

040616.22 Sand Point Naval Air Station – Buildings 11 & 40
7777 62nd Avenue NE
Proposed building and site alterations

Seamus Kelly (ZGF) explained the plan to create a community center, pavilion and gathering space. He said the alley will be activated as an educational space. He said that the east side is a destination and rides leave from this location. He said they provide covered seating, water bottle refill. He said they propose to modify the existing overhead door at Building 11 and four windows to support the function. They propose a canopy of plate steel that sticks out 3'. He said on the west side they will renovate Building 40 openings and add second covered bike parking and seating. He said that Building 11 was built in 4-5 phases. He said on the west side four sets of windows will be changed to doors – Pella aluminum clad series divided to match existing. He said they will take out the window units and brick sill, salvage and give to DOPAR.

He explained they will paint Building 40; it is a cast in place concrete structure. He said the metal frame windows are in rough shape and they will replace them with a Pella match. He said the doors are metal clad wood. He said that they will restore the doors – double doors on the east and single on the north; they are steel clad with exposed strap hinges. He said they will remove the threshold so they are barrier free. He said they will take out louvers and add a solid wood panel. He said that the addition is wood frame; they will replace cement board siding to make the building as quiet as possible. He said they will add cement board siding at the infill area as well and will paint it a subtle shade of gray. He said the aluminum clad windows will have no muntins.

He said that east of Building 11 they will construct a 12' free standing structure of timber columns and beams support with canopy to be a shelter for bikes. He said that it will read as a site element rather than an entrance canopy with views of the parapet line preserved; it will align with the building datum line. He said that on the west side they will pour a pony wall to create a bioswale to accommodate the constant water seepage; they will add seating and concrete and timber planters.

Mr. Kelly explained that the alley will be used for educational purposes to simulate riding in traffic, to learn hand signals and bike safety. He said that wall mounted lights exist and they want to increase light coverage and add three more. He said they will add a cell phone antenna on the back side of the parapet.

Ms. Doherty said she can review the antenna administratively but will need a cut sheet. This item had not previously been discussed.

Mr. Murdock asked about light fixtures on the pavilions – if they will be vertically or horizontally oriented.

Mr. Kelly said the image is correct but the rendering is not and the light won't hang below. They will be horizontal.

Mr. Murdock said the roof seems more slender and the front thicker.

Mr. Kelly said it is all the same.

Ms. Doherty said she thought the section looks slender but thinks the rendering makes them look thicker.

Mr. Kelly said the east gutter has a face plate on it at the leading edge. He said the west canopy gutter abuts a steep hill and has no face plate on it.

Mr. Ketcherside noted the transportation garden use.

Tarrell Kullaway (CBC) said this will be the first here; they are used in Europe to teach kids safe riding.

Mr. Sneddon suggested retaining the louvers on the door to give an indication of the building's former use which he said has value; he said to put a panel behind the louvers and keep the louvers on front.

Mr. Kelly said that is possible.

Mr. Luoma asked if the window layout will be replicated.

Mr. Kelly said that they are able to preserve existing muntins within that window and noted that the drawing on page 17 was incorrect.

Kevin Bergsrud, DOPAR, said he looked forward to this addition and said the goal is to revitalize the industrial portion of the district.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Kiel said the project had a great trajectory from ARC reviews. He noted the separation of the bike pavilion from the building and the preservation of the doors. He said the treatment of the building in back has improved.

Ms. Barker said she had no issue with the door change, window change, draining feature. She said Building 40 had morphed nicely and they took ARC suggestions.

Mr. Murdock said that the applicants have responded to ARC and noted the scale of the pavilion and Building 40 materials. He noted concern about the lighting as shown in the drawing and said he was glad to know they will be mounted horizontally – he said it will be cleaner not to see the light.

Mr. Ketcherside said the activation of the buildings is good and what is proposed is compatible with the structure. He said that the bio swale and the transportation park are good.

Mr. Luoma said it is a huge district with a variety of environments and buildings. He noted the relative scale of Building 11 and the new canopy and said it is not too disruptive. He said that Building 40's retention and rehabilitation and activation are great. He said they are keeping remnants of the character and using it.

Mr. Ketcherside said he thought that maintaining the louvers on the doors on Building 40 was good.

Mr. Luoma agreed on keeping the louvers.

Ms. Barker agreed on keeping the louvers.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed site and exterior building alterations at Buildings 11 & 40, 7777 62nd Avenue NE and the retention of louvers on door of Building 40.

The proposal as presented April 6, 2016 does not adversely affect the features or characteristics as specified in Ordinance No. 124850, and complies with the Secretary of Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation, and Sand Point Naval Air Station Landmark District Design Guidelines as follows:

SOI Standards for Rehabilitation - #9

Relevant District Guidelines for:

New Landscape or Site Features

- New landscape features or site features should not radically change, obscure or destroy primary elevations, character-defining features, nearby materials or finishes.
- New site features should be clearly differentiated from historic site features such that character-defining features are not diminished or a false historic appearance created. All new site work should be designed in character with the historic building and be based on established design elements and materials.

New Building Construction - Design Character

- New buildings should be architecturally compatible with the adjacent historic properties within the district and sensitive to the immediate physical context.
- New construction should be clearly differentiated from historic properties such that a false historic appearance is not created *and* new construction should not diminish the presence of adjacent historic properties or character-defining features.
- The scale, mass, form and proportions of new buildings should be similar in character to adjacent historic properties; however, the specific new use, location and adjacent building types may be taken into consideration.
- New buildings may be contemporary in character and may reference design motifs and the established palette of construction materials drawn from adjacent historic buildings.

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

MM/SC/DB/NC 11:0:1 Motion carried. Ms. Durham recused herself.

040616.21

Judge Ronald House

421 30th Avenue South

Proposed window alterations at the rear of the house

Michelle Dirkse (Interior Designer) explained the plan to replace windows to complement historic windows on the rest of the house. She went through photos and noted they will have trim similar to the rest of the house and noted that window will not protrude up into the band of trim at the window heads. Responding to clarifying questions she explained details using photos and showed board members what they proposed to remove.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Murdock said that there was one comment from ARC about window extending into the band at the top; he noted the improvement.

Ms. Barker said that the new windows on the rear elevation of a non-original addition; calms down a loud variety of windows.

Mr. Sneddon said it is a clear pane rather than divided light.

Ms. Doherty noted that the windows are 1/1 sash.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the window alterations at the Judge Ronald House, 421 30th Avenue South, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed window alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 124502 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is compatible with the massing, size and scale 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/NC/RK 12:0:0 Motion carried.

040616.3

CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

040616.31

E.C. Hughes School

7740 34th Avenue SW

Request for an extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for a ten month extension. She said they are working on a proposed rehabilitation with no addition. She said they are still refining the scope that is mostly focused on interior although there will be some window replacement on altered windows.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives of E. C. Hughes School, 7740 34th Avenue SW, for ten months.

MM/SC/JK/DB 12:0:0 Motion carried.

040616.32 Magnolia School
2418 28th Avenue West
Request for an extension

Mr. Doherty explained the request for a ten month extension and said they are planning a rehabilitation with an addition. She said they will brief ARC and want to do an application for Certificate of Approval prior to Controls and Incentives.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives of Magnolia School, 2418 28th Avenue West, for ten months.

MM/SC/JK/JM 12:0:0 Motion carried.

040616.4 NOMINATION

040616.41 Guild 45th Theatre
2115 North 45th Street

Chris Hetzell, (ICF International) owner's representative, explained that they are nominating in anticipation of development requirements and noted they are considering renovation of the building and conversion to four – five screens. He said they have no plans to alter the façade. He provided an overview of the history of the property (full report in DON file). He said that the building as seen today is the result of 1978-79 rehabilitation work. He said that the building lacks integrity and is unable to convey significance. He said there were two buildings, one the theater building built in 1920 and the other an adjacent one story retail building built in 1921. He said the theater, originally called the Paramount, was built by William Code; he and his brother were associated with the Paramount Theater Corporation. He said he started his business in Alaska as part of the Gold Rush. He said the architect, George Purvis, was prolific in the Pacific Northwest. He noted the development boom of the 1920s and said that this building was part of that trend.

Mr. Hetzell said that in 1923 a large addition was commissioned to Henry Bittman to expand the auditorium. He said that changes included extending the length and expanding seating, a new stage and exist doors. He said that the central ticket booth was removed and replaced by central door. He said that the original windows were changed and a marble veneer was added along with projecting canopy. Windows on the first and

second floor were enclosed. He said that the façade was reconstructed to Art Deco style and a new marquee was installed.

He said that in 1931 the building was sold to William Bruen who did a major renovation and added Art Deco elements. He said the foyer was expanded, seating replaced, central ticket booth was reconstructed, entrance vestibule was restructured, parapet replaced, pilasters applied and Bruen's Theater sign was installed.

He said the one story commercial building next door was built in 1921 and was used as café, restaurant, and variety store. A large rear addition was converted to apartment for operator / manager. A 1960's rehabilitation completely separated this from the theater and in 1977 a doorway was cut in between the two buildings. He said that Bruen sold to Jack Neville in 1941 who changed the name to 45th Street Theater. He said that central ticket booth was removed and entrance vestibule rebuilt with two doors and shadowbox. 'Guild' was added to the marquee, seats were replaced / reupholstered, lobby alcove became art exhibition space and the original staircases were altered. Concession was added.

Mr. Hetzell said that in 1965 the tile and the ticket booth were both gone. In 1978-79 the building was sold to Randy Finley, Seven Gables Corporation, the largest chain of independent theaters. The Deco façade was added in 1977-78, second story window enclosed, semi-circular panel added to parapet, double doors installed, first floor windows were reframed, ticket booth moved, corners and door frames were rounded, and decorative belt courses added across the front. On the interior the proscenium was removed, backstage dressing, organ loft, orchestra pit were all removed. He said exits were changed. He said the lobby interior was inset for rotating art, staircases changed, ticket booth changed, and paneling and trim removed, rear wall of lobby pushed back, doors moved forward. The commercial building became the concession area, the doorway between the two buildings removed, there are remnants of the apartment in back, and neon signs in front and on banding are from 1979. In 1989 Landmark Theaters purchased the building.

Mr. Murdock noted the escapism with historicism styles employed early on. He asked if the art deco / moderne look added in the 1970s was part of a trend.

Mr. Hetzell said he was not aware of that, but said it was part of the movie experience that lasted until WWII. He noted the megaplexes built in the 1960s and 1970s. He said the least 10 – 15 years there has been a return to create that experience. He said he sees it as a small arthouse being overshadowed by large cineplexes and this was a way of renovating to give it a historic look and feel.

Mr. Murdock asked about lanterns on interior and coffers in auditorium.

Mr. Hetzell said the coffer was from 1970 construction was for ventilation. When expanded a second one was added.

Mr. Stanley asked about the history of the sign.

Mr. Hetzell said the original blade sign was put up in 1933. He said he thought the neon was re-used but was not sure how much is left from 1933.

Mr. Stanley asked about changes to interior wall space.

Mr. Hetzell said the auditorium and most of what is seen is probably from the late 1970's or 1990's. He said what used to be a mezzanine was pushed back and is now just a ledge.

Ms. Barker asked about stairs.

Mr. Hetzell said the stair configuration has changed. The two original made a 360° turn and faced each other. He said the railings look old. He said the upstairs projection booth is intact but noted the vinyl floor, metal panels on walls, fire door are in bad shape. He said the restrooms have been completely updated. He said the framing of gallery windows, smoking room and glass are original elements that are still there.

Public Comment:

Brian Whitish said he was manager of the theater from 1994-2015. He said he would love to see the building landmarked. He said it is difficult to make a single screen work. He said the building is important to the neighborhood and draws people in to the neighborhood. He said he hopes it continues the movie theater use.

Laura Kaufman spoke in support. She said it was one of the first theaters in Seattle and noted its continuous use as that since it opened. She said the Art Deco stepped parapet has been there long enough to gain significance. She noted the angled marquee around the blade sign.

Brooke Best, Historic Seattle, supported nomination and said that all stages and changes are part of the history and the story of the building. She said it is an identifiable feature of the neighborhood. She said the integrity issues here are similar to that of the landmarked Neptune Theater.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Stanley did not support nomination because of a lack of integrity.

Ms. Patterson said she thought it was already a landmark. She said it is a landmark in its neighborhood and could meet Criterion F. She said that she would like to look further into the changes over time.

Mr. Murdock said he acknowledged integrity issues but said it was compelling that it has had the same use for 90 years. He said that public memory and perception of space lends a different significance to it. He said that the idea that embodies a movie house is still there even though it doesn't look like it did to start but that it looked this way 40 years ago. He noted this theater and its place in Seattle counter culture and coffee shops. He wanted to know how it was related to all the other small theaters. He said there are integrity issues but it has significance in other ways.

Mr. Kiel did not support nomination because of integrity issues. He said that he is intrigued by the story and said the building tells the 1978 story, and not in a good way.

Mr. Ketcherside supported nomination and said he would like further thoughts about the 1970's remodel which he said it not horrible, and one could think it is from the 1930s. He

said this theater started with the silent era. He said it was a well-written report. He asked what other silent era movie houses are left in Seattle. He noted art house era and coffee house culture. He said the space next door has been incorporated into it and throws the balance off and at first read it is awkward. He said at designation meeting he would like to hear more about architectural style even though it is 40 years off. He noted the community history and that it is a visible landmark in the neighborhood.

Ms. Johnson said she was torn. She noted the cultural enthusiasm but not an architectural one. She said that the business type has been there for 90 years. She said the report was interesting. She noted the loss of integrity and seeing a Moderne Building built in the 1980's seems off.

Ms. Durham said her first inclination was to look at the cultural significance. She said that it has been the same use for 90 years. She said it is a significant feature in the neighborhood. She said it has changed over time and has lost integrity and questioned which era is the period of significance. She said it is not a stellar example of the style; it is just culturally important. She said the sign has changed but still characteristic and hasn't changed since the 1940's. She supported nomination to allow more time for exploration.

Mr. Carter supported nomination and said it has changed significantly over 100 years but it has some remaining elements. He said that it is not high style but one can read the Art Deco elements that were added in the 1930's. He said it is worthy of nomination to allow more thought. He was not sure about integrity.

Ms. Barker supported nomination. She said the changes are compelling – the building has adapted to various customer needs. She said it has been a destination for more than Wallingford; it speaks to a larger community. She said that it has been part of this community for a long time. She said it would meet Criterion F for its visual characterization of the neighborhood.

Ms. Anderson said she was not thoroughly convinced it has the ability to convey its whole history. She said it has been in the same state for the last 40 years. She said the many changes are unfortunate. She supported nomination to learn more about it and to think about it more. She did not support including interiors.

Mr. Sneddon supported nomination and noted criteria C and F; he said the architectural elements matter less for C. He said that he would like to know more about the history of small movie theaters in Seattle – size and types. He noted the neighborhood type of theater and said you can still see that. He said it is associated with the development of Wallingford in the 1920s. He noted the size of the auditorium in the 1920's and said it paired live shows with movies. He said that the early technology of the film room – metal walls – and while beat up it still conveys the early days of projection. He said that architects were commissioned to build theaters across the region. He said that the architecture is distinct and has lineage back to what was prevalent in 1920. He said the needs to be updated is part of its historic character and is part of the very nature of the movie business. He noted the art element and counter culture connection and questioned if this was a general trend of small theaters in going up against the large ones. He said the remodel was in contrast to mall based multi-plexes and the change in leisure to going out of neighborhoods. He said he was curious about why the Moderne style was chosen

in the 1970's. He said everyone in Wallingford knows this building – it might be the most distinctive feature in neighborhood.

Mr. Luoma said the significance is unseen even though there are some recognizable elements. He said if there were not a theater there today would it still be considered significant, or are they just considering it because of its continued use. He said the Neptune had much better integrity inside and out, and this is entirely a new façade which he said is troubling to him. He said the cultural aspect is unseen and questioned if this can rise above the integrity issues. He said he was concerned that we may be disrespecting the history prior to the 1970's because there is so little of it left. He did not support nomination.

Ms. Barker suggested inclusion of the projection room and noted the Pathé Building vault where explosive films were kept.

Mr. Sneddon agreed it should be included.

Ms. Doherty said it can't be added later but that elements can be subtracted later.

Mr. Sneddon said he likes the volume and the windows to the lounge.

Ms. Barker did not support the little building or interior but said to include the women's lounge and projection room.

Mr. Ketcherside agreed with Ms. Barker.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Guild 45th Theatre at 2115 North 45th Street for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include the interior and exterior, that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for May 18, 2016; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/DB/JM 7:5:0 Motion carried. Mmes. Johnson, Anderson and Messrs. Luoma, Stanley, Kiel opposed.

040616.5 BRIEFING

Mr. Carter left at 5:52 pm.

040616.51 Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center
4000 NE 41st Street
Briefing on proposed development

Nathan Rimmer, representing owner (4000 Property LLC), and Brad Porter, representing the Academy of Precision Learning made the presentation.

Mr. Rimmer said that the site is zoned single family and currently functions as an institute. He said they have a use for the 18 acre campus as a school and propose changes that would make it functional for that use. He provided an overview of the

area and context of the site – the campus as it is today at 45,000 square feet. He said they propose roadway reconfiguring, reuse of some buildings, some small additions/alterations, and some new buildings.

He said the original Phase III of the campus included Building H to the west of the pond and it was never built. He said they propose to build in that location to give the school what it needs. He said they would add on to Building G and add parking on the existing grass field. He said that the Building G and how it moves down the hillside is difficult with not much usable space. He said that this will be a 250 student program. He said additions to Building D and to dining hall building are planned. He said that a gym would be constructed. He said that Building D would be classroom space and G would be expanded as typical school use – class use. He said the A, B, C buildings – longer term residences – are difficult to use and could be used as transitional housing for kids to learn how to live on their own.

Mr. Porter said transitional housing allows educational opportunities.

Mr. Rimmer said that Building E – the lodge building – with hotel type rooms. He said they would reconfigure the road to accommodate a new building and a roundabout to create circulation. He said that the first floor of the new building would be central facility for the school and the second level would be more classroom space to expand high school. He said the G building, assembly space and the D building, office space on the existing first level. He said they would keep the existing architectural theme. He said that the new school – two stories – would set down more at grade without high foundation; it would be the same height as existing D building. They would use the existing roof lines to keep harmony.

Ms. Barker asked what the lowest part of the site is.

Mr. Rimmer said the wetland; the pond is 2 – 3' higher.

Ms. Barker asked if there is a need for outdoor play areas.

Mr. Porter said they have a concept for play space.

Mr. Rimmer said it would be in buffer for wetlands.

Ms. Barker asked if there are visuals of the Phase III plan for the original site.

Mr. Rimmer said it is dashed in on the plan provided. He said it doesn't work as designed and goes right in to wetland. He said it was seen as a good site.

Mr. Luoma asked if buildings A, B, C and E are included in the square footage numbers.

Mr. Rimmer said he backed them out as extra as far as the school program. He said that 120,000 square feet is total built.

Ms. Patterson asked if they anticipated covered walkways between buildings.

Mr. Rimmer said paved paths meander throughout.

Mr. Porter said that the architects showed some covered walkways but chose not to go with those.

Public Comment:

Colleen McAleer and Jeannie Hale (Laurelhurst Community Club) said it was exciting to see a new concept and noted they had not seen the plans. Ms. McAleer said to keep the site and noted the buildings are landmarks. She noted the relationship of the neighborhood and to building considered. She said that NE 41st is the entry to the neighborhood and it is green now; that relationship is important to keep. She said to check with Bill Bain or Rich Haag.

Janice Sutter, friends of Battelle, said she was excited to see a new scheme, and asked them to have respect for the original architecture and site.

Board Feedback:

Ms. Barker said she preferred this new idea and was excited about the potential. She said to go back and study the relationships of the buildings to the site. She recommended new structures be further north with more balance between D and new building. She said the vista – the pond, wetland, bramble – are part of the vision per Rich Haag and not to disrupt that. She said that the new building should be one story or sunken down into the existing grade so the vista remains. She said the location of the new building is problematic. She said that the D and F buildings additions are OK. She said parking should not be the first thing you see. She noted many new board members have not been to the site.

Ms. Doherty said that staff asked them to look at alternatives rather than capturing and enveloping building G with an addition. The experience of that building is more from pond looking out rather from external looking in.

Mr. Rimmer said the constraint to moving the building north is a 72" storm drain.

Ms. Barker suggested daylighting it, and noted the pipe was not mentioned as a constraint before.

Mr. Rimmer said it is the former Yesler Creek.

Ms. Barker suggested daylighting the stream and move the building.

Mr. Porter cited page 31 regarding the vista.

Ms. Barker said the visual is internal looking up and down and also from the road. She said the view corridors are south to north and internally from Building D to the wetland and from the pond to the expanse.

Mr. Porter said that water is a central theme to unify everything.

Ms. Barker said the new building is crowding the pond.

Mr. Murdock said the board heard about the whole design from original designers and this proposed use is more appropriate to the site – it is better than houses. He suggested reminded them of previous feedback from the board. He said the views from the south meander and are the story of entering the site. He said he was intrigued by the idea of completing the quadrant around the pond, and echoed the suggestion to sink the new building into the ground.

Mr. Luoma said existing vegetation now or planted there is an ‘aha’ moment when turning the corner and heading east; it would be seen until the corner is rounded.

Mr. Murdock said he is hoping the historic buildings are almost caps of hills and read as extension of landscape. He said Building G interior is horrible but the exterior is provocative; it is built down into the ground and maintains the rolling nature of the site. The height changes are highly designed. He said the planned building is too large. He suggested moving the development to the edges and to use Building E better. He said there is a hierarchy of significance of the buildings. He said the north end is less important than the ones more central to the campus. He said to push development to the north of the site. He suggested adaptive reuse of Building G.

Mr. Luoma noted the spatial quality of existing site – the rectilinear form and step down. He said the new building is a large stamp and asked if that could be broken up more so not such a large mass. He said to look at needs and numbers and noted that 3,000 square feet is a big difference. He said there are four buildings not in use and to do what is needed on inside of those to decrease the size of additions. He said that Building G focuses more to the south and to keep this stair stepped. He said that Building E is not as significant of a building and there is more flexibility in seeing an addition to it than in D or F.

Ms. Barker said Building E is already a two story volume and wondered about using it for the gym. She said it will be useful to see shadows of H. She said the low scale followed the hill and to take cues from that. She said the new build should move, or be longer and narrower.

Mr. Stanley said if there is another new building the emphasis should be on the pond. He said that D and F are part of pond experience. He said it is a large building and to make it feel like part of the family. He said that G spills down the hill. He said to pull the addition back into the hill a bit.

Mr. Sneddon said expansion building G should be to the south. He said that a prime character defining feature is the way G lines up with the topography. He said to retain courtyard structure of D without infill and to preserve some of the courtyard structure in the thoroughfare.

Mr. Murdock said he loves the idea of living / learning at buildings A, B, and C and said that part of the site is so separate from site, but almost prefers to see the new building proposed there.

Mr. Sneddon said the residential character of A, B and C is integral to the purpose of the site and should be preserved.

Mr. Porter said they looked at retrofitting A and B to classrooms and it is not workable.

Mr. Murdock said the least significant part of the site is A, B, C and D per the original designers; move the density to the north.

Mr. Ketcherside liked the proposed idea of educational facility. He said the pond area is important. He said to sink the gym down – lower it – windows aren't needed. He said to keep the character and massing of the other buildings. He said to reuse the existing structures prior to introducing new ones. He said to push density to north perimeter. He said to decide where to place priorities. He said he had no negative feelings to the overall plan but to look for other options for locating the new building.

Mr. Rimmer said they are intrigued with the campus use.

Ms. Barker said it seems like a great match.

Mr. Kiel said he would like a tour of the site and noted there are lots of new board members. He said there are priorities on the site and he would like to see options / alternatives. He said it is a great use for the site.

Ms. Doherty said the owner's goal for the briefing was to test the fit of the proposed program with the Board members and get feedback.

Ms. Barker suggested engaging with the original designers and to have them at the table.

Mr. Rimmer said Bill Bain is involved.

Ms. Doherty said the landmark nomination report is on the website under 'Current Nominations'. She said she will work on arranging a tour. She said that board has provided feedback on the test fit. She suggested going back up to the site analysis level. She said to look at where else to put development and to test a few different alternative. She said to look at massing and how to blend with the landscape.

Ms. Barker said she gives the proposed school concept two thumbs up.

040616.6 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator