



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 29/18

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
City Hall
600 4th Avenue
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room
Wednesday, January 17, 2018 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker
Kathleen Durham
Garrett Hodgins
Kristen Johnson
Nicole McKernan
Julianne Patterson
Steven Treffers

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Jordon Kiel
Russell Coney

Vice Chair Deb Barker called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

011718.1

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

November 1, 2017

MM/SC/KJ/JP 7:0:0 Minutes approved.

November 15, 2017

MM/SC/ST/JP 6:0:1 Minutes approved. Ms. Johnson abstained.

011718.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

011718.21 Bleitz Funeral Home
316 Florentia Street

Proposed exterior alterations and window replacement

Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill Leary, said they have been to ARC for review and were looking for guidance on the pattern of window restoration and replacement.

Brian Collins-Friedrichs, SkB Architects, said they are excited about bringing new life to the building and they are committed to making it a great project. He provided context of the building and site and said they will clean up the building and remove non-original components; repair/restore select windows, repaint, and replace deteriorated historic elements. He indicated on the elevations which elements were original and existing and which were later additions. He proposed to restore all windows and doors on the primary (south) façade; and replace windows on the secondary façades except for the leaded glass windows which will be restored.

He proposed to add a railing at the porch on the north elevation, open blocked opening and replace garage door with one with a light in it, infill existing arch, and add a window to light interior of basement. The proposed color scheme is off-white for the body, dark window surround brick detail and sills, and deep green windows. He said the standing seam metal roof is non-original and they propose to paint it dark charcoal; it is green now. He proposed light fixtures more in keeping with original size fixtures. He said security cameras will be tucked away up in the roof overhang.

Mr. Collins provided a window sample, aluminum-clad wood sash; they will match operations and configuration of divided lights. He went over the window survey and said that where they are replacing windows they will use Marvin windows to match what is there.

Ms. McKernan asked about the new basement windows.

Mr. Collins indicated on the plan and said it is a light well windows that is boarded up now.

Mr. Treffers said ARC generally supported the window plan but there were mixed comments about the need to replace the upper level east façade because they are in good condition.

Public Comment:

Michael Herschensohn, Queen Anne Historical Society, supported the project as proposed, and said the community is looking forward to it.

Ms. Patterson asked if reglazing the original sashes with an insulated glass assembly was something that they explored.

Mr. Collins said they looked at that and felt it wasn't feasible due to the width and configuration of divided lights.

Ms. Patterson asked if they considered this for the 1/1 sashes on the first floor.

Mr. Collins said no.

Ms. Barker said they did a great job on the window survey; there are so many good windows on the eastern façade. She was concerned the replacing restorable windows would set a bad precedent.

Mr. Treffers said that good windows shouldn't be replaced; they are character defining and visible on the façade. He said if restored properly they could closely meet energy needs.

Ms. Johnson noted the effort to restore the really character defining windows and considering the give and take, it seems acceptable.

Ms. Patterson said historically, keeping windows that are in good condition is not a huge ask, especially when it is less expensive to do so. She noted the possibility of restoring the ground level windows using double pane glazing. She noted that all windows are listed as good or fair in the BOLA report.

Ms. Durham asked for clarification on the window plan.

Mr. Treffers said they are replacing just the secondary façades and non-original windows.

Mr. Collins-Friedrichs said their plan provides consistency, allows for maintenance and are not character defining windows.

Ms. Patterson said they are character defining windows; she said they are 100 years old.

Mr. Hodgins said he had no strong opinion.

Ms. Durham supported replacement for first floor windows on the east side. She said it is an uncomfortable precedent to replace good windows. She asked about dormers.

Mr. Collins-Friedrichs said they are not planning to replace the dormer windows.

The owner said he is willing to refurbish the east dormer.

Ms. McKernan noted the consistency issue with some replaced and some restored. She suggested consistency by floor.

Mr. Treffers supported the application and suggested replacement of the first-floor windows, noting security issues; he suggested retaining and repairing upper floor windows. He noted that windows are already inconsistent.

The owner said he could live with that; he noted they will retain and restore the dormer windows and will replace north side.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations at Bleitz Funeral Home, 316 Florentia Street, as per the attached submittal, noting the condition to also restore the second floor and dormer windows on the east facade.

This action is based on the following:

1. Proposed selective removal of original windows affects the features or characteristics specified in the Report on Designation LPB 282/17, as the proposed work removes historic materials that characterize the property. However, the applicant has demonstrated the need to make these alterations to address security issues and programmatic needs.
2. The remaining proposed exterior alterations, do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Report on Designation LPB 282/17, 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*.
3. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/ST/GH 6:1:0 Motion carried. Ms. Patterson opposed.

011718.22

Lake City Library
12501 28th Avenue NE
Proposed exterior and interior building alterations

Matt Inpanbutr, SHKS, proposed changes to a previously approved application for interior renovations that will open up the space for more programming.

Hannah Allender, SHKS, provided historic photos and noted the curved brick walls, low arch openings, bronze entry gate will be retained. She said that

over time the collection has grown, and the natural light has been diminished with building alterations. She said they propose to improve sightlines, upgrade HVAC, and mechanical. She noted that one courtyard has been previously infilled. They propose mostly interior upgrades but noted they want to replace glazing, add a window in the entry courtyard, and add a new entry vestibule. She said they will demo the concrete at the double height curtain wall and will create a new pad. She said the original courtyard intent was a nicely scaled entry experience; the 2003 renovation eliminated that. She said they will project into the courtyard 4'-3" and add an accessible entry; it won't detract from the courtyard experience. She said people will be able to directly enter library from courtyard.

Mr. Inpanbutr said interior modifications to the window stops will be made to accommodate the thicker insulated glazing. He said the exterior ramp replacement will comply with ADA.

Ms. Allender said the aluminum curtain wall will match existing. She said they will relocate the art wall to the community café. She said the ceiling lighting, glass system and brick will remain the same. She said they will demolish the walls in the public meeting room; wood slats and ceiling will remain. She said they will repaint the reading room; brick and ceiling will remain the same. Responding to questions she said they will create ADA access and allow room for opening a sequence of doors.

Ms. Johnson said ARC reviewed this. She said the building is currently disorienting when you walk in, and this is a nice change. She said not much is happening to historic material and the window being added is in non-historic storefront. She said it seems reasonable.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Treffers said his concern was that the lobby/courtyard was being altered again, and it is a missed opportunity to correct the previous changes. He said now you are stepping further into the courtyard with the vestibule but you kind of have to; he noted the challenge of how to address accessibility.

Ms. McKernan said when viewing from inside looking out you will look at the side of the new projected opening rather than at the courtyard.

Mr. Treffers said they talked about the window opening being vertical rather than horizontal; horizontal differentiates it.

Ms. McKernan asked what determined the width of the window.

Ms. Allender said the windows are sandwiched between existing columns that are furred out, without having to demolish more original fabric than they had to.

Ms. Patterson said the design intent of the stucco panel doesn't serve its purpose anymore; she had no problem putting the window in.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior and interior alterations and site improvements at the Lake City Library, 12501 28th Avenue NE, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 121105, 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/JP/GH 7:0:0 Motion carried.

011718.23

Pier 56
1201 Alaska Way
Proposed storefront alterations

Dick Causey, Seattle Shirt, explained they are expanding into the adjacent tenant space. They want to construct an accordion wall to allow them to open it up and stack when it is nice outside and to close it when weather is inclement. He said they will paint the wood frame to match existing and will extend the soffit from the column.

Ms. Sodt provided a cut sheet for the accordion doors. She said they are not changing flooring – it is all concrete. She said the storefront system is non-original.

Mark Astor, property manager, read from the Controls and Incentives agreement and said it is easily restorable if the tenant changes; they are leaving the columns and column cladding.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Johnson said it was straightforward.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed storefront alterations at Pier 56, 1201 Alaskan Way, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 123858 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/JP/GH 7:0:0 Motion carried.

011718.3 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

011718.31 Century 21 Coliseum / Key Arena
305 Harrison Street
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for a three-month extension. She said the team is working on the proposed renovation and expansion, and the owner has made design briefings about Key Arena and the Bressi Garage. She said they hope to make a briefing to the full board in February.

Mr. Treffers said they came to ARC and things are progressing well; they are headed in the right direction. He supported a three-month extension.

Ms. Barker agreed.

Public Comment:

Leanne Olsen, Queen Anne Historical Society, said they are moving in the right direction and just need to refine things.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Century 21 Coliseum, 305 Harrison Street, for three months.

MM/SC/KJ/ST 7:0:0 Motion carried.

011718.32 Bressi Garage
226-232 1st Avenue North
Request for extension

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Bressi Garage, 226-232 1st Avenue North, for three months.

MM/SC/KJ/GH 7:0:0 Motion carried.

011718.33 Broad Street Substation
319 6th Avenue North
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty said she sent the owner a draft of the agreement and they requested some more time; she said their request for two-months seemed reasonable to her.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Broad Street Substation, for two months.

MM/SC/KJ/GH 7:0:0 Motion carried.

011718.34 Wayne Apartments
2224 Second Avenue

Ms. Sodt read from staff memo (in DON file) and said the due diligence was performed; analysis was done and there are limited development opportunities. She said no controls are recommended.

Mr. Treffers appreciated the information presented but was undecided; he said it is outside his area of expertise. He was not comfortable looking at a proforma and rate of return; it is over his head in some ways yet what the board has to look at per the Ordinance and the Hearing Examiner.

Ms. Johnson said the potential for redevelopment is challenging. She said it is a small site; the roofline is defined, it is hard to develop and to provide a reasonable rate of return. She said she was trying to understand all the pieces and said it is unfortunate. She said that scenarios were reasonable to explore and didn't pencil out. She supported no controls.

Ms. McKernan supported no controls. She trusted that it didn't pencil out and that all resources would have been tried.

Mr. Hodgins supported no controls; he noted he was part of the review committee. He cited the Ordinance section.

Ms. Patterson said the board can't delay the vote noting requests by public; she said it would be in violation of the Ordinance.

Ms. Barker said the recommendation was written without an ounce of joy – it was written with sorrow. She said the Code does not give credence to the fact we are in a real estate market no one could have predicted, and it is sad.

Public Comment:

Brian Platt, building ownership, said they reached out to every historic organization and some developers; all had extensive rehabilitation expertise. He said they still invite anyone interested in rehabilitation to contact them.

Tiffany Jorgenson, Friends of Historic Belltown, asked the board not to approve the no controls decision. She said the rents were intentionally kept too low with no improvements. She said the information is outdated; the business has been there less than a year. She said there is not enough information to support no controls.

Steve Hall, Friends of Historic Belltown, said it is difficult to argue against staff and board who share their values and are trying to do the best for the community. He requested an extension. He said the law says it has to go to the board, but it does not say the board has to vote. He said the record is lacking; it doesn't meet comparables. He said the \$4.5 millions assessment is high. He wanted to see the rehabilitation scenarios. He wanted more time to work with Historic Seattle and the City to provide realistic scenarios.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, echoed Mr. Hall's comments. She said it is difficult for the board and staff; staff did her due diligence. As mentioned in their letter, Historic Seattle was in the midst of Washington Hall rehabilitation at the time and had no capacity to take on another large project. She said Historic Seattle wants to talk and asked that 'no controls' not be approved. She said Historic Seattle is interested in working with the community and property owner. She noted a recent similar situation with the Galbraith House and said she did not want to see any more after seeing two in the span of two months.

Michael Herschensohn, Queen Anne Historical Society, said the Wayne is a significant building that tells the history of the neighborhood and the regrade. He agreed with Mr. Hall and Ms. Woo and asked the board to vote no. He said after 30 years on Historic Seattle council there is no mention of this happening with frequency; it is a bad precedent.

Nicholas said this is one of the oldest buildings downtown; if this goes, so too will the rest of the block. He said he has never seen anyone try to work on it or do anything. He said people love and support this building and people are interested.

Ms. Sodt said that if SEPA is applied to a project, then the Landmarks Board's decision on designation, controls & incentives, and/or a certificate of approval would provide compliance with SEPA.

Mr. Treffers said it ties impact to resource to financial consideration.

Ms. Patterson asked about legality of deferring vote.

Patrick Downs said this is the time to make a decision.

Ms. McKernan asked about information in the documents that may not be factual.

Mr. Downs said that doesn't undermine staff's decision. He didn't think claims of false information would undermine board's ability to support staff's decision.

Ms. Sodt said that there will be no controls on the building; later an owner could possibly renegotiate Controls and Incentives to take advantage of incentives. She said they would have to come back and negotiate and then come before the board; she noted FUMC is an example of this occurring. She said the Seattle Tower had a Controls agreement; there were some legal issues and it was never codified. They renegotiated and that will be reviewed by the board.

Mr. Hodgins supported staff recommendation.

Ms. Patterson said it is difficult; it is a significant building to the neighborhood and the City. She noted all the community support backs that up. She noted the ridiculous real estate market. She said the Ordinance and how it was written is clear what can and can't be done. She said dirt is more valuable than this building. She was encouraged by the owner's comment that they are interested in finding a sympathetic buyer; hopefully that will happen.

Ms. Durham was troubled with the situation and the frequency with which it is happening. She said no one is happy and no one wants this. She said the bigger question is what do we do to improve the Ordinance so this – and demolition by neglect, and deferred maintenance - can be prevented. She hoped the advocates can send a message to City Council. Now there is no language to prevent demolition by neglect; it is done in other cities and should be done here. She said the board's hands are tied; reluctantly she would support staff decision.

Ms. Johnson said she looked at the materials. She said reluctantly she would support.

Ms. McKernan echoed Mmes. Johnson and Durham's comments; she saw no other alternative.

Mr. Treffers said he was troubled and struggled with the decision. He said he does not have technical experience solely related to real estate and financial environment. He appreciated the information presented and said that staff weighed heavily and looked for alternatives. He said it takes creative minds and approaches to fulfil preservation Ordinance. He said was torn between civic pride and a decision that is tied back to financial concerns. He said it is not his decision to make – it is the Hearing Examiner's decision to make if they have not looked at all the alternatives. He said they should impose controls and let it go to the Hearing Examiner; if information is not addressed, that will provide opportunity. He recommended following Controls and Incentives like what was done at Shannon and Wilson building, where the owner was non-responsive.

Ms. Barker said staff has bent over backwards for years on this. She said she was excited when the building was nominated and designated because the building survived the regrade. She said the landmark code was written at a time that reflective of that time; it has not kept up with the real estate boom time. A lot of people make speculative purchase and hope to make a windfall. She didn't want to give the green light to demolish a building that withstood the regrade. She said people really tried; she said she couldn't support no controls.

Mr. Treffers said we need people to push for stronger Ordinance; it is discouraging and not easy. He said to do what you can to change it.

Action: I move to approve no controls on the Wayne Apartments, 2224 Second Avenue.

MM/SC/KJ/JP 5:2:0 Motion carried. Ms. Barker and Mr. Treffers opposed.

011718.4 BRIEFING

011718.41 Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center
4000 NE 41st Street
Briefing on proposed rehabilitation and new development

Jack McCullough said they are trying to resolve the landmark issue and use the space. He provided an overview and history of the site.

Bonnie Geers, Quadrant Homes, provided an overview of their company and said they will be creative and work with the community.

Mr. McCullough said ownership went through a process to take the property to market; many looked at re-zoning. He noted the history with Laurelhurst Community Club and said they hope to maintain a single-family approach to a portion of the site. He said they want to retain the single-family sense and agreement in covenants.

Ms. Geers proposed to bring a new neighborhood to the property; she said the park-like setting is important and they will utilize the existing street and majority of buildings. She said they will develop the perimeter and create a harmonious community. She said they are assembling the team which will include consultation with Bill Bain. She said they will continue to work with the Laurelhurst Community Club, Landmarks Preservation Board, Friends of Battelle, and City of Seattle directors (SPU, SDCI). She said they have developed a site plan that encapsulates the vision and that respects current zoning. She said lots will be 5,500 square feet; 63 homesites are planned. She said access will be from existing roads which will be maintained as private roads. She said the conference center, dining room, Buildings A, B, C, D and F are significant and will be kept. She said they propose to demolish the lodge (Building E) and the offices (Building G). She showed a site plan with the insertion of the new homesites.

Mr. McCullough said they are trying to build on work done earlier. They plan to have ARC briefings, to look at site plans, and space, and what can go away; and then look at issues of houses. He noted the design book used at Ft. Lawton as possible process.

Ms. Barker disclosed having worked in the Federal Way planning department and she reviewed many Quadrant plans.

Neither the board nor the owner's representatives had issues with her participation.

Ms. Patterson said there will be one ordinance for the landmark and she asked how they would deal with that, if they would 'condominiumize' the site.

Mr. McCullough said they looked at platting the site, unit lot subdivision. He said they can play with lot size and land form to minimize grading. He said they will keep interior buildings.

Ms. Patterson asked if board will review design.

Ms. Doherty said yes.

Mr. Treffers questioned the appearance of the site in 20 years.

Mr. McCullough said that they will use a design book approach and will build on the experience of other areas.

Ms. Doherty said there is no Ordinance in place yet. She said an agreement would be crafted but they aren't there yet.

Ms. Sodt said there is precedent with the First Avenue Group and Waterfront Piers; design Guidelines are attached to the Controls agreement.

Ms. McKernan asked about ownership.

Mr. McCullough said there will be an HOA, but they aren't there yet and haven't figured out the mechanism yet.

Ms. Geers said they will explore that.

Ms. Durham asked about community use; it was an amenity at one point but not now.

Ms. Geers said they have no plan for fences. There will be connections; they will be part of the larger neighborhood and not separate and apart. She said you will be able to see in, enter in, and have pedestrian access.

Mr. Treffers said 63 single family homes are planned; he asked what is the minimum they need to make their project pencil out.

Mr. McCullough said it is too early to know.

Ms. Geers said they are working to reassemble the original campus design team as much as possible.

Mr. Treffers said it is helpful to have identification of character defining features.

Ms. Barker said another site visit is important for the Board.

Ms. McKernan asked who is using the property and how will it be used. Will kids be playing, will fences go up?

Ms. Patterson said she is more amenable to new building if the existing buildings are incorporated holistically.

Mr. Hodgins asked about access.

Mr. McCullough noted the existing access points.

Ms. Barker asked if there will be setback for wetlands. She said the southwest portion is low and wet; she asked about lots 19 and 20 relative to the stream.

Mr. McCullough said there is a culvert as part of Yesler Creek underground.

Ms. Barker asked about the eagle's nest.

Community member said the nest is still there.

Ms. Geers said it is in a cluster of trees near the southwest portion of the site.

Ms. Barker said it is a curvy road with light traffic; people stroll and walk dogs. She asked about issues with rebuilding it and storm drainage.

Ms. Geers said they are starting that conversation.

Mr. McCullough said they want to keep the road as it is.

Ms. Geers said they want to keep the character.

Ms. Barker said density may destroy that especially with trucks coming in. She said to plan pedestrian corridors, entrances, private streets, tracks. She requested a vegetation plan, tree maintenance plan, so there are no retroactive reviews. She said that there have been five instances and there is always different staff.

Public Comment:

Jan Sutter, Friends of Battelle, said they submitted the landmark nomination. She said the site reflects Japanese architecture and spiritual feeling. She said Rich Haag studied in Japan and that inspired him. She said it is scary to think of development. She said three days after landmark designation the property owner put a fence around the site; no one was allowed to walk around anymore. She noted the wetlands. She said a family of coyotes was shot in the middle of the night at the behest of the owner. She said the sense of trust is low. She appreciated the presentation. She said you must see the site to truly appreciate it.

Jeff Davies, Friends of Battelle, said the group was formed with intent to nominate the site with Historic Seattle. He said it is a spectacular example. He said the buildings reflect 1960's architecture. He said the landscape has the affect of a stone dropped in pond echoing outward with building and landscape part of the entire effect.

Deborah Binder, Orion Center, provided handouts (in DON file) and said the Integrative Medicine Cancer Care is campaigning to purchase the property for the center. She said they want to preserve is as an urban oasis. She said it should be a wellness center for families and caregivers and community. She said that is the original intended purpose of the built site.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, said they worked with Friends of Battelle on the nomination. She encouraged a site visit to explore it and get a feel for it. She said Rich Haag and David Hodemaker were part of the original design team. She said having a use that is more compatible with the design would be a more sensitive project. She said Phase 1 and Phase 2 design is all together, all buildings are significant. She said this site plan is not sensitive approach to landscape. She said this is not the suburbs nor is it the east side. She said what is proposed would have an adverse impact on the campus.

Michael Herschensohn, Queen Anne Historical Society, said he has spent many hours at Talaris; he said he was alarmed by the proposed density on the south side, and the suggestion that the Phase 2 buildings can be dismissed. He encouraged a site visit and said to go alone and experience the place.

Colleen McAleer, Laurelhurst Community Club, thanked the board and said three major proposals have been looked at. She said to take the time to visit the site. She said the site is in the heart of their neighborhood and it is important to its look and feel. She said they have a settlement agreement for the property. She said the buildings relate to the site and the history going back to Battelle.

Jim Romano said he is a neighbor. He said the site is an integral part of the neighborhood and to keep the property open and inviting. He said developing private homes in a private neighborhood suggest something other than an open community. He said to integrate it into the bigger neighborhood. He said the openness makes it special. He said he wasn't sure 63 homes can be done.

Marylee McRoberts said it is a magical amazing property. She said she has done events there. She said when McGregor moved onto the property there was a steering committee that was interested in the advance use of the property the way it is now. She said history is important and putting houses and construction there will destroy it.

Leslie McGowan said this proposal will damage the feel of the place. She said they need to think it through, plan, research and work with arbitration and mediators to help community shape the conversation. She said a Buddhist community showed interest. She asked Quadrant what they will do with the existing buildings. She asked if non-profits or research groups have been explored.

Carol Arnold, Friends of Yesler Swamp, said they rescued it and turned it into a community asset. She said Richard Haag was aware of Yesler Creek flow. She said there has always been hope that that part could be daylighted. She said Talaris is a receptacle of Yesler Creek. She said it is a community asset that was used by all before the new owner fenced it and put up 'no trespass' signs.

Leslie McGowan said there are catacombs below the building.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Treffers thanked the presenters for starting the dialog early. He said he read the nomination to gain insight into the significance of the resource. He said a site visit will be helpful. He said we can't immediately write off Phase II buildings and need

informed discussion and report noting the period of significance, character defining features, and where there might be room for alterations. He said introduction of housing seems a way to make it work within reason, to respect the solace of the property. He said we need to retain that and finding balance is key. He said what are the numbers, realistically, and where can we limit and manage change the best we can. He said in a perfect world it would be a park, but we are working with what is in front of us. He wondered what all can gain – opening back up to public, repairing things. He noted concerns about the infill of interior of landscape. He said to keep development to outer perimeter. He was glad they are attempting to retain the circular pattern. He said a holistic approach – not piecemeal – is needed. He said they need a plan for the existing buildings first.

Ms. McKernan said there is potential here but be careful to protect the experiential qualities – meadow, pond, view. She said all units in the inner circle compromise that; you would be looking into backyards / houses. She said to increase side yard setbacks to allow views into the larger site.

Ms. Durham said single family use is not outside the realm of possibility, but she questioned the density and impact to character of the site. She said not to write off Phase 2 buildings. She said to make sure the site – landscape – continues to be accessible. She said you need permission to go there. She said it is an important piece of the community. She noted mini planned development concerns about what happens to semi-public space; when does the HOA put up a gate. She said the plan has potential but to approach it carefully.

Mr. Hodgins said he is encouraged and it seems possible. He said it feels tight and balance is the key. He thanked the presenters for getting ahead of the process. He said keep communication open with all parties.

Ms. Patterson said she read the nomination and has been to the site. She said it seems possible and could be compatible. She said the site was holistically planned; the existing buildings were incorporated into the site and are integral. She said to preserve all historic buildings. She said losing 9 – 11 lots would preserve two buildings. She said she wants to see a virtual reality rendition of the site – what is there now and the impact to the site and scale of changes. She wants to get a sense of what is happening to the site holistically.

Ms. Doherty said she will work with the ownership representatives to arrange a tour. She reminded the Board members that it is private property and to please not go in without an invitation.

011718.5 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator