



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649 Seattle WA 98124-4649
Street Address: 700 5th Ave Suite 1700

LPB 35/15

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
Seattle Municipal Tower
700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor
Room 4060
Wednesday, January 21, 2015 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker
Nick Carter
Robert Ketcherside
Aaron Luoma
Jeffrey Murdock, Vice Chair
Sarah Shadid
Mike Stanley
Alison Walker Brems, Chair

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Valerie Porter
Matthew Sneddon
Elaine Wine

Chair Alison Walker Brems called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

012115.1 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
December 17, 2014 Tabled.

January 7, 2015
MM/SC/DB/AL 5:0:2 Messrs. Murdock and Carter abstained.

012115.2 **CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

012115.21

Exchange Building

821 Second Avenue

Proposed exterior signage and lobby directory alterations

Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill Leary, reported that seismic work was completed and cleanup was next.

Andy Wattula said the goal is to retain a consistent look and feel to the building in line with the historic building.

The applicant representative said that retail signage is needed at the 2nd Avenue storefront; he noted there are two storefronts. He said the existing storefront is not original – it was installed in the 1970s or 1980s. He said they would add signage for Goody Box and Tully's; it will be added to mullion bar between transom. Sign will be laser cut aluminum panel backlit with acrylic; aluminum will be painted black. He said the sign panel can be slipped out and recut for a new tenant. He said they will use a low wattage light. He said the fasteners will all be concealed inside the box.

Mr. Wattula said currently there is a cacophony of signs; they have long term leases with Tully's and Goody Box and want uniformity.

Ms. Sodt said there is still uncertainty about long term tenants on 1st Avenue and they will come back with 1st Avenue signage.

Mr. Stanley arrived at 3:36 pm.

Mr. Wattula said there is a neon sign inside their space.

Mr. Ketcherside asked if the finish around the window opening would conflict with proposed colors.

The applicant representative said it shouldn't be a problem. He said they are showing the color a bit darker and will provide a sample to match.

Ms. Barker asked what was on the other side of the sign.

The applicant representative said it is covered with a box to match the storefront. He said the existing tenant directory in the 1st Avenue lobby has a bronze surround and 1980s light-box and said it is hard to use. He said they propose to move the directory to the lobby facing the elevator; the light box will be replaced with digital monitors. He said the directory will be on the left. He said the other ¾ of the display will page through historical photos of the building and noted they found a treasure trove of photos.

Mr. Betuline said that the directory will have greater visibility at the proposed new location.

The applicant representative said there is no damage to the bronze frame and it will be flush with the wall the way it is supposed to be.

Ms. Walker Brems asked if the directory was still in its historic location.

Mr. Betuline didn't know.

Ms. Sodt said the Ordinance doesn't give the exact location of the directory and that the lobby is not intact; she said the 2nd Avenue side is more intact.

Responding to questions Mr. Betuline said the card reader swipe is not access because it is public space. He said that when the directory is relocated the wall will be repaired.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Murdock said that ARC was supportive; he said the revisions are an improvement.

Ms. Walker Brems said the signage is a great improvement and is very elegant.

Mr. Betuline said next steps will focus on exterior work – clean, repoint, repair, reseal; he said they would repair water penetration issues. He said they would work administratively with Ms. Sodt.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations and interior alterations.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 115038, as the proposed exterior alterations and interior alterations are 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/AL/NC 8:0:0 Motion carried.

012115.22 Alexis Hotel (First Avenue Group)
1003 First Avenue
Proposed new business signage

Ms. Sodt presented on behalf of the applicant and said that Cicada is moving to another of the First Avenue Group buildings. She said the current sign will slide out of current bracket and into existing sign bracket at the Alexis Hotel.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Murdock said that ARC was supportive.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed signage.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed signage does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 111058, as the signage 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/NC/JM 8:0:0 Motion carried.

012115.23 Washington Hall
153 Fourteenth Avenue
Proposed exterior and interior alterations

Ron Wright, Ron Wright Associates said the east and west sides of the building have different floor heights, and that they had functioned as two separate buildings.

Jocelyn Schmidt, Ron Wright Associates, explained that a second means of egress is needed to bring the building up to code and to provide ADA compliance. She said they have received funding from the City for an elevator and the existing stair is non-conforming. She went over proposed plans for the building (detail in DON file) and went through the packet page by page.

Mr. Wright said that the brick veneer is not original to the building but was added later. He said they need to support it from falling off the building.

Ms. Doherty said that Historic Seattle believes the previous tenants had brought in the old theater seating, and that they were not likely original to this building.

Ms. Schmidt said that Note 27 (for a new fixed bar) should be removed. She said that from the south side the elevator overrun is not visible. She said they did not want false historicism so the balcony rail will be clearly new and will have as light a presence as possible.

Mr. Stanley asked if they had considered fixed seating on the east end.

Responding to questions Ms. Schmidt said noted the rail will be at code height.

Ms. Barker and Mr. Ketcherside noted the thorough layout and attention to detail.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Murdock said that ARC went through the proposal. He noted it was a beautiful and elegant solution to reconciling different floor heights. He said the back side is service. He noted the varied assemblage of openings lends itself to what is proposed. He said that it is okay to see the stair landing floor plate behind the windows and that he is satisfied and excited about the proposal and the improved access.

Mr. Luoma asked about the new exterior light fixtures.

Mr. Murdock said ARC had no problem.

Ms. Schmidt said that many exterior lights had been vandalized and that this fixture had been successful on other parts of the building.

Mr. Murdock said that from the primary elevation you don't see the elevator overrun.

Ms. Walker Brems said it is an elegant solution.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior and interior alterations at Washington Hall, 153 Fourteenth Avenue, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed exterior and interior alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 123346, as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, 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/RK/NC 8:0:0 Motion carried.

012115.3 DESIGNATION

012115.31 White Motor Company Building
1021 E. Pine Street

Larry Johnson, Johnson Partnership, prepared and presented the report (full report in DON file). He provided context of the site and Capital Hill location; he noted the building sits on a corner. He said the original main entry is on the west. He went over changes to original glazing and said there are some non-original muntins and non-original glazing and sash. He said that the building retains a sense of what it was although the doors and storefronts have been replaced. He said that the north façade is non-original. He said that the new elevator is smaller than the original one that moved trucks. He said the west façade is blank. He said the building's terracotta ornament and cartouches were removed as were the original metal sconces. He said that some of the terracotta cladding needs repair.

He said that the interior basement is of reinforced concrete. He said that new plumbing and data were installed. He said the main floor is now a bar/restaurant – the open expanse with open beam system is there but the finishes are non-original. He said that the second floor is partitioned and has a drop ceiling and non-original finishes. He said that the third level has exposed heavy timber truss system. He said that the trusses on the mezzanine level are from a 1984 renovation. He said that at night the trusses are not visible from the public ROW. He said that the old auto lift penthouse is on the roof.

He said that the building does not meet any of the standards to be a landmarks and noted that rooftop equipment has been added, the building is in poor condition with non-original storefront and upper glazing, sconces were removed, automobile entry has been changed, terracotta ornament has been removed and noted that most terracotta elements were removed in 2013 because terracotta was falling on the sidewalk. He showed photos of terracotta pieces removed and said they are being stored in basement awaiting reinstallation. He said that the integrity of the exterior is there but there is none on the interior.

Mr. Johnson said the building doesn't meet criteria A, B or C and noted that while it is associated with Capital Hill neighborhood development, White Motors, auto row and REI, it doesn't meet the double significance. He said although REI occupied the building – included its main store - it expanded from the building next door and is better associated with the Kelly Springbrook building.

He said that regarding Criterion D early auto row buildings there are better Seattle examples including Templar Dealership, Central Pontiac, Pacific and Ford McKay, Eldridge Buick, and S. L. Savidge. He said that there are better examples of terracotta buildings in Seattle including the Joshua Green building, Smith Tower, Pacific and Ford McKay buildings. He noted that there is no consistent theme in this building and the terracotta looks like it was picked out of a catalog.

Mr. Johnson said that while this building is a handsome building it is not an outstanding example of the work of architect Julius Everett and named others that he thought were better including Pilgrim Congregational Church, Leamington Hotel and Apartments, and the Kelly Springfield building. He said that the building is on a corner lot and may or may not be recognizable. He said it is a borderline building that meets no criteria.

Responding to questions he said that for this style of architecture steel girders were intended but concrete was used and has become brittle impacting the structure integrity. He said that structural integrity must be addressed.

Jessica Clawson, McCullough Hill Leary, said they did not support designation because the building lacks integrity, has been altered and there is nothing original. She said there is very little fabric inside; she said that the third floor has been altered and is not open to the public and there is no ability to convey if no one can see it. She said that there are better examples – Elliott Bay Book, Kelly Springbrook, and Melrose Market, among others – and the wood truss on the 3rd floor is not outstanding compared to others.

Owner representative Will Nelson talked about the building's Boston style.

Public Comment:

Dennis Saxman said he studied auto row buildings and the style has nothing to do with Boston – Chicago style – but not Boston. He said the building doesn't have to be an outstanding example to be a landmark. He spoke in support of designation on criteria A, C, D and F. He said that a number of renovations were done to keep it from being landmarked.

Chris Moore, Washington Trust, supported designation and said the building has the integrity to convey that. He said to include the truss and said that just because it can't be seen doesn't mean that it doesn't deserve designation.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, supported designation. She said that condition is not part of the designation standards and concrete is not an issue. She noted the letter from community member Andrew Haas. She noted the truss system and said that it is significant to interior spaces – part of structure and very

important. She said there are some interior alterations but the building is definitely significant with auto row and REI.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker supported designation on criteria C, D, and F noting the association with Jim Whitaker and REI and Steve Arai's association with a renovation. She noted the terracotta components, association with auto dealership, key location and said it is easily identifiable. She supported the exterior, interior and the wood truss because it is still there even if the blinds are pulled and makes the building stand up.

Mr. Carter supported designation on criteria C, D, and F. He said that it is a great example of auto row building. He said that he likes the roof and truss and could go either way – it is not accessible and not seen but is part of the building.

Mr. Ketcherside supported designation of the exterior and the truss system on criteria C, D, and F. He said that whether or not it is seen is not relevant but noted that compromises might be made at Controls.

Mr. Luoma supported designation on criteria C, D, and F. He said it is a significant auto row building with three stories. He said the massing and window size are still present as are the garage entrance and elevator. He noted it is on a corner and adjacent to a public park. He said he was hesitant to include the truss system because he didn't know if it was consistent with way the board has voted in the past and that it was left out of Staff Report. He noted the value of the truss system and said they haven't been saved in other cases. He said it is not as critical and doesn't make or break his decision. He said the truss is of value and he was interested in hearing what other board members thought.

Mr. Murdock supported designation on criteria C, D, and F. He noted the structural system that is a hybrid of concrete and heavy wood truss system. He supported inclusion of the truss system.

Ms. Shadid supported designation on criteria C, D, and F. She noted Ms. Wine's comments about trucking and the logging business. She said the building has three stories and the architect was more flamboyant with this building. She said it is elegant and beautiful. She said she could go either way on the truss system but noted that it is part of the fabric and speaks to the wide expanse.

Mr. Stanley said he supported designation on criteria D and F. He said the building is a great representation of auto row style. He noted the prominent

location. He said he was ambivalent on criterion C. He asked for clarification on what designation of interior truss item does.

Ms. Sodt explained that the Waterfront Piers internal truss system is designated and that recently Pier 57 took out one truss to fit in a large piece of equipment.

Ms. Walker Brems supported designation on criteria C, D, and F and supported inclusion of the truss system. She said that heavy timber truss system is relevant to its time period.

Ms. Barker noted that the pier truss was saved and the flexibility that allowed the owner. She said that you can see the volume of the building and the truss lends itself to the building.

Mr. Luoma and Ms. Shadid said they would not vote against designation if the truss system was included.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the White Motor Company Building at 1021 E. Pine Street as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C, D, and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the exterior of the building and the timber roof truss system.

MM/SC/RK/DB 8:0:0 Motion carried.

012115.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

012115.41 P-I Globe
Request for an extension

Mr. Stanley recused himself.

Jack McCullough explained that they decided to do the Controls and Incentives even though there is no specific place yet and asked for 30 days.

Ms. Doherty said that there will be a placeholder for the site.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the P-I Globe until March 4, 2015.

MM/SC/DB/JM 7:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Stanley recused himself.

012115.42 Lloyd Building
601 Stewart Street

Jack McCullough said the negotiation process is ongoing and asked for a 60 day extension.

Ms. Sodt supported the 60 day extension to March 18, 2015.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Lloyd Building at 601 Stewart Street to March 18.

MM/SC/JM/AL 8:0:0 Motion carried.

012115.43 901 Harrison Street
Request for an extension

Jack McCullough said they have finished up design review and that the MUP will be complete March 18.

Ms. Sodt explained that they are working on completing Certificate of Approval and are going through the building permit set. She said they are actively moving forward.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the 901 Harrison until March 18, 2015.

MM/SC/DB/RK 8:0:0 Motion carried.

Ms. Barker left at 5:20 pm.

012115.5 BRIEFING

012115.51 Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center
4000 NE 41st Street
Briefing on proposed development

Nathan Rimmer represented for the ownership (4000 Property LLC) and said they looked at how to preserve the site in a sustainable manner and said a letter had been provided by the owners. He said they are working with several groups – landmarks staff, neighborhood, Historic Seattle – to come up with plans that meets their needs. He said that Bill Bain, original designer of the site, suggested hiring Susan Jones with Mr. Bain overseeing her work to come up with ideas for the site. He said they met with landmark staff who requested alternative options.

Rich Hill, McCullough Hill Leary, said they appreciate the time to brief the board and asked for comments.

PowerPoint in DON file.

Susan Jones said it is an honor to work with Bill Bain. She said she has familiarity with the site and has walked it thoroughly. She said it is stupendously beautiful and the landscape is at its peak and maturity. She said the buildings have held up well. She went through the packet and photos and said the landscape is strong. She provided context and history of the neighborhood.

Mr. Stanley left at 5:30 pm.

Mr. Bain said the theme/concept was a metaphor given by Battelle – that it be an example of the Tungsten Tower. He said that if one did contemplative research there was need for protection and they looked for ways to shield the researcher. He said the center should be preserved; Rich Haag created the pond and landscaping – it is quiet inside and met the metaphor Battelle was after. He said they didn't want it to be totally isolated from the community – they wanted some porosity and for people to walk their dogs through, jog, go for evening walks. He said they wanted a symbiotic relationship. He said that the facilities are porous – you can see in from all directions. He said they to preserve the center part as a contemplative place.

Ms. Jones said that they went through all the buildings. She said that the Phase I buildings were constructed in 1966 and Phase II in 1971. She said the Phase II buildings have less charm, and are less integrated with the landscaping, with lesser historic value. She said that Building G (Office) would be difficult to renovate. She said that the site is within single family zoning and that they would enhance and preserve the natural features of the site and allow for affordable housing. She said that the Laurelhurst Community Club had suggested this some time ago. She went over three versions showing the increase in density of development (see report in DON file for details; following are board questions, comments and public comment). The first version maintains all existing buildings; the second version proposes demolition of Building G (Office); the third version – which is the applicant's preferred – proposes to demolish Building G (Office) and Building E (Lodge).

Mr. Bain said the heart of the site is the Japanese type pond with weeping willow tree and a resident crane family; he said it is individual yet porous.

Ms. Jones said the area is kept open to retain views as well as open vistas/views. She said the experience of the site will be similar. She said they will preserve what is essential and let the neighbors enjoy it.

Mr. Bain said that is what Battelle wanted.

Mr. Murdock asked if they have envisioned new uses for the historic buildings.

Ms. Jones said they don't know but the area is already residential in nature so perhaps a dining area or homeowner's association (HOA) recreation space or office.

Mr. Rimmer said they are working with Columbia Hospitality to see what it will look like to keep operating as a destination conference center.

Mr. Carter asked about new units on the site of Building G (Office).

Ms. Jones said the slope happens right at the toe of the existing building. She said they will keep existing tree cover. She said that at the slope they will come in to the garage floor of a 3-story building single family buildings in line with the neighborhood; the two-story will be experienced from the alley.

Mr. Ketcherside asked about parking once Building E (Lodge) goes away.

Ms. Jones said the road shifted south to accommodate four single family houses and there is some parking loss, but that they are putting back parking in the units themselves.

Mr. Murdock said the alley on the east side is very narrow.

Ms. Jones said that there is a 10' gravel alley that backs up to a fence. She said that all the single family houses are accessed by the road. She said it will come in to the ground floor of three-story house and would go up to living spaces. She said there will be some grading and a retaining wall along the alley.

Mr. Luoma appreciated the conversation about the views. He said that the site was designed to be experienced from the center. He asked if they intended the units – townhome or single family - to buffer and hide the new units or integrate them as part of the view. He expressed concern for maintaining the mature landscape and tree canopy.

Ms. Jones said she didn't know. She said that maturity of the landscape is beautiful as existing buffer so they think the new structures as integrated as possible to the beautiful landscape. She said there is a very strong architectural character that is beautiful and noted the strength of material palette that will need to be preserved and cared for. Strong architectural language and she said they can pick up on some of those aspects. She said the scale clearly relates to the existing neighborhood so the house will also have a relationship across the street.

Mr. Bain said the original concept of the protected roofs and now mature tree canopy have huge effect on where they put buildings.

Mr. Luoma said he is concerned that what looks like shared open space on the plan will likely be privatized for each new home. He was hoping they would not see long stretches of cedar wood plank fences, it would change the entire character of the site.

Mr. Carter left at 6:05 pm.

Ms. Jones said that there will be 300 square feet of open space private to each townhome and some kind of fence will be needed – it will be designed carefully as they design the front and back door and will not be slapped together. She said she sees a controlled environment – it needs to be - and HOA will have control.

Public Comment:

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, thanked the presenters. She said she appreciated their courtesy of showing the plans at their meeting. She said it is unique to hear from the original designers – Bill, Rich, David – and from Susan who understands the era and the northwest. She said the site could fit in with contemporary design. She said that it is a win to preserve land and buildings and allow compatible buildings. She said she would like to see all buildings preserved and most landscape. She said Building G (Office) is a graceful building and follows topography; Building E (Lodge) is her least favorite. She preferred options 1 and 2. She said it is a process and encouraged a continued dialog.

Story Swett, Friends of Battelle, said they provided a letter to staff for board review (in DON file). He said the proposal should first be reviewed by board in terms of practicality and change of use from study to residential. He said to look at the possibility of sustaining conference center use. He said that the design began as a concentric ring of development spreading out progressively to less and less developed; he said this is a reversal of that. He said to consider the original use. He said that there are interests in more dispersed conference center opportunities throughout the city.

Ms. Doherty said Mr. Swett's letter was provided to all board members.

Jeannie Hale, Laurelhurst Community Club, said they received the three options and said she appreciates the owner working with them. She said they presented the planned residential version initially and is glad there are options 2 and 3. She said they will continue with the relationship and with their lawsuit in Superior Court. She said she hopes everything continues to move in a positive direction to meet the owner's goals and the goals of her community.

Colleen McAleer, Laurelhurst Community Club, appreciated the ownership's hiring of quality visionary people. She said she appreciates the openness and recognition of the porous nature of their community.

Chris Moore, Washington Trust, said he is appreciative of ownership, Mr. Bain and Ms. Jones. He said it is like a historic district and to consider infill. He said it is appropriate to look at infill for site from exterior looking in to keep the core. He said that Option 1 could have new units in northwest corner, and it is the version that changes the site the least. Certainly there is middle ground. He said he would like to see a scheme with new units in the NW corner, keeping Building G (Office), and removing Building E (Lodge). He would like to know what number of new units that option would yield. He said he was glad that everyone was working together.

Board Feedback

Mr. Ketcherside said it is jarring to see any development on the property – because all we have seen is the pristine way it has been handed down. He said he would like to see the site before they go too far and see the views being discussed and consider the impacts. He said to revisit the core tenets that the architects went through in initial design. He said that adding new roads is a compromise, and if they can, accompany it with something else that is added; find a balance that is least intrusive. He said he wants to see the site to know if demolition would bother him. He is glad the conversation has started and options are being looked at.

Ms. Walker Brems said there is lots of great potential in the options. She said she lives nearby and is familiar with the site. She said the existing roads are so beautifully curvilinear and the new ones seem pretty straight. She said the site is designed like a pebble dropped in to the water to radiate out. She said the street on the south is so wide, that the relationship across the street is not strong. She said she would like the new buildings to dissolve or blend more, especially the townhouses in the center. She suggested shifting the townhouses to create triangular outdoor areas between them. She thought the geometry of existing and proposed needed to be

better integrated. She said that fencing private space is not required by code, and on this site it would be a travesty. She said she preferred a combination of Option 1 and said there are ways to add more units in the NW and NE corners without removing buildings. She said to preserve the view of looking to the pond. She said the existing east edge is the least successful and has no problem with proposing new buildings there to hide the neighboring alley.

Mr. Murdock said he appreciated weighing in and to meet David, Bill, Rich and Susan. He said there is always opportunity to leave a level of density across the back yard. He said that working from center and increasing density to meet that of surrounding neighborhood is the way it should be approached and that is what is happening. He said it is serious to change a Landmark. He said he needs a better understanding of the character of the buildings proposed to be removed. He said he likes Building G (Office) – and questioned if there is a possibility for adaptive reuse. He said that all three schemes involve the least sensitive areas of the site. Reinforce the character of what remains. He said he is happy the site will be reused in a way that allows for appreciation of a beautiful part of the city. He said he needs to see the buildings in person.

Ms. Shadid said she didn't see the nomination or designation but appreciated the thoughtful presentation. She said she appreciates the proposal to replace "built with built" – it is more in line with the property. She said she wants a tour of the site. What felt out of place for her was the addition of road on west side and the properties there because west side is only place where traffic really changes. She said no to fences.

Mr. Luoma said that what was presented was reflective of who designed it. He preferred the least intrusive scheme – Option 1. He said he is not familiar with Building G (Office) and Building E (Lodge). He said that there are a minimal amount of buildings on the site and to remove two is a big deal. He said that Building G (Office) has more character in the way it is designed with the topography than Building E (Lodge). He said he wants a tour to know more about the buildings. He said that one concern is if the new buildings will be designed in a compatible way and if there will be room for them to breathe. But if they are going to be real modern and differentiated from existed building then he thinks of cedar fences and boxed townhomes with bright colors on them, and is concerned. He said regarding the removal of trees they need to add some; there are opportunities to soften with new and existing landscape. He said the location of new units has been thoughtfully done. He said that Option 1 has room to add more townhouses – in groups of three. He asked how the new building would work with the existing topography. He said the east side and southeast side there are more opportunities for development without significant impacts. The buildings close to center need to be well thought out. All new building placement is critical.

Mr. Hill thanked board members for their comments.

Ms. Doherty said that a site meeting/tour would be set up to look at the whole site. She suggested bringing the design team to answer questions.

012115.6 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator