



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 273/17

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

600 4th Avenue

L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room

Wednesday, April 19, 2017 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker

Russell Coney

Kathleen Durham

Garrett Hodgins

Jordon Kiel

Kristen Johnson

Julianne Patterson

Matthew Sneddon

Steven Treffers

Emily Vyhnanek

Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Melinda Bloom

Absent

Robert Ketcherside

Chair Jordan Kiel called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

041917.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

March 1, 2017

MM/SC/KJ/DB

9:0:1 Minutes approved; Ms. Patterson abstained.

March 15, 2017

MM/SC/KJ/DB

9:0:1 Minutes approved; Ms. Patterson abstained.

041917.2 BOARD BUSINESS

041917.21 Columbia City Review Committee Appointment
Confirmation of appointment of Colleen Thorpe

Ms. Doherty reported that the Columbia City Business Association has forwarded an appointment, for one of three positions on the Columbia City Review Committee, to fill the seat of outgoing member, Philip Christofides. She requested confirmation by the Landmarks Preservation Board of the appointment for Colleen Thorpe. Ms. Thorpe is an architect/landscape architect, who has worked with Jones & Jones for over 26 years. She is a resident of Columbia City. Colleen was recommended in April 2017 by the Columbia City Business Association as an appointee to the Columbia City Review Committee for a 2-year term starting May 2, 2017.

Action: I move to appoint Colleen Thorpe to the Columbia City Review Committee for a 2-year term ending April 30, 2019.

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

041917.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

041917.31 John B. Allen School
6532 Phinney Avenue North
Proposed alterations to classroom

Bill Fenimore, PNA, introduced Eric Jusino who would be taking over his position when he retires. He explained the flooring in the small classroom was badly damaged and not repairable. He said they proposed to overlay it with maple as has been done elsewhere in the building.

Ms. Barker said it makes sense.

Mr. Coney said it matches other areas already over laid with Maple flooring.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed classroom alteration to the 1904 building at the John B. Allen School, 6532 Phinney Avenue North, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics as specified in Ordinance No. 123845, as the proposed work 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/RC/KJ 10:00 Motion carried.

The following item was reviewed out of agenda order.

041917.5 NOMINATION

041917.51 Colonnade Hotel/Gatewood Apartments
107 Pine Street

Ellen Mirro presented the nomination report (full report in DON file) and noted the owner supports nomination. She provided an aerial view and noted the context of the site. She conducted a 'virtual' walk-around the building. She said the building was constructed in 1900 as a four-story unreinforced masonry building. In 1990's it received steel brace frame seismic upgrade. She said the north entrance at the center of the north façade is non-original and all storefronts are non-original. She said on the west side all the windows have been replaced in-kind. She said on the south side the light well is visible. She said the original entrance was on 1st Avenue. She noted the foyer and elevator and said the stair was reconfigured in the 1990's possibly from salvaged parts and pieces of the 1911 stair. She said upstairs arrangement is double loaded hallway; all units have been re-done, some with kitchenettes.

She said the building was on the north edge of Downtown. The building was originally designed as a three-story but was built with four. She said the first floor was a beer parlor / restaurant. She noted the lack of storefronts on the north side because Pine was being regraded; storefronts were added once the regrade in the area was complete. When the street was widened, the north façade was demolished and rebuilt 11' to the south. She said the cornice is gone. A 1990's renovation included storefronts, seismic, mechanical and creation of 59 low income apartments. She said that all windows were replaced in-kind and the building has enough integrity to convey its significance.

Ms. Mirro said the building did not meet Criterion A but noted it is tangentially associated with F. S. Stimson and the Stimson Mill in Ballard so may meet Criterion B. She said that the building was Charles Bebb's first Seattle commission; Bebb went on to develop many other buildings including the 1411, Liberty Theater, among others. She said the building is associated with the expansion of Seattle northward and the regrade. She noted the modification of the building due to the regrade and said the building may meet Criterion C. She said the building meets Criterion D; it is a classically inspired vernacular building similar to the Klondike, Scargo, and East hotels. She said the type was almost gone after the Ozark fire when owners balked at upgrades. She said the building may meet Criterion E for association with Charles Bebb, who designed every form of building – too numerous to mention; and Mathew Dow, contractor, who build many buildings including Interurban, Chapin, Coliseum Theater, and Lincoln High School among others. She said the building sits on a corner and may meet Criterion F.

Ms. Johnson asked if the storefronts were replaced.

Ms. Mirro said they were all replaced in-kind.

Mr. Treffers asked if the common room original and if it was enclosed later.

Larry Johnson said he had no idea but it had been there since the 1990's.

Ms. Mirro said the lobby was originally in the middle of the building.

Ms. Barker asked if there was access from room out to the infill area.

Ms. Mirro said there are two egress stairs, one exists in to the alley and one to the street.

Mr. Johnson said the only access on to the infill is out the window.

Mr. Coney said, the Plymouth Housing Group (former building operators) made attempts to restore the building's exterior to its original condition and asked if any government funding had been utilized in those efforts and if so, were there any remaining covenants or restrictions remaining in place in regards to that.

Mr. Johnson said he can find out.

Mr. Coney asked about tenant.

Mr. Johnson said the lease ran out. Samis is the owner and didn't renew the lease. The land is retained by Samis; the building was sold. He said the housing units were relocated.

Adam Hasson, Samis, said Samis owns the Liberty lot as well. The nomination is for the building, not the parking lot.

Ms. Sodt noted the building is highly altered inside.

Ms. Vyhnanek asked why the windows in the alley are arched.

Ms. Mirro noted it is the original alley.

Mr. Johnson said steel lintels were more common but they chose arches when they could. He said the alley was done later and noted the regrade line on the north façade in early photos.

Mr. Treffers asked if Dow was the builder.

Ms. Mirro said they will look for original plans and permits.

Mr. Johnson noted that the brick at top is different from lower floors. He said they added the fourth floor during construction.

Mr. Treffers asked if the building had landmark review before.

Ms. Sodt didn't think so.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Patterson supported nomination of the exterior and agreed with the Staff Report. She said it is associated significantly with the Regrade and clearly illustrates that. She said it is interesting that it was designed for three stories and built as four. She noted the association with Bebb.

Ms. Johnson supported nomination for the association with the Regrade. She said Criterion D is reasonable and maybe E.

Mr. Sneddon supported nomination. He noted the physical marks of changes on the building related to the widening of the street. He said the building was at the north end of the business district.

Mr. Treffers supported nomination and noted criteria C and D and the story of SRO. He requested information on similar properties and how this relates. He did not support Criterion E.

Ms. Vyhnanek supported nomination and noted it met the double significance of Criterion C. She said it met D and wasn't sure about E.

Ms. Durham supported nomination and noted the SRO typology and wanted to know more about that. She said the Regrade connection is important.

Ms. Barker supported nomination on criteria C, and D and said it is a nice work of Bebb although chopping off the north ruined some detail. She did not support Criterion F.

Mr. Coney supported nomination and noted the connection to the Regrade. He noted the connection to Pike Place Market.

Mr. Hodgins supported nomination and noted the connection to SROs. He noted that the building survived the Regrade.

Mr. Kiel supported nomination and noted the connection to the Regrade. He requested more information on the re-do of the façade and alley side.

Ms. Patterson supported nomination and noted A or C for the association with the Regrade as an event.

Mr. Coney supported nomination and requested more information on funding history and if there are any contingencies remaining from past grants or funding use to rehabilitate or restore any part of the building.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Colonnade Hotel/Gatewood Apartments at 107 Pine 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 exterior of the building; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for June 7, 2017; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/KJ/EV

10:00 Motion carried.

041917.4 DESIGNATION

041917.41 Bleitz Funeral Home
316 Florentia Street

Owner Bill Pollard noted the unique and historical nature of the structure and said they want to restore and repair it. He asked that the 1980's addition not be included.

Susan Boyle, BOLA, provided context of the site. She said it was constructed in 1921 in a developing area, close to residences on Queen Anne, with ease of connection to transportation. Jacob Bleitz, 1865 – 1939, started in the funeral business when he came to Seattle in 1904. He was known for progressive quality funerals that were affordable for all. She said his sons took over the business when he died; the family sold the business in 1979. Bleitz served the gay community during the AIDS epidemic – when others wouldn't - and continued to offer services to all.

Ms. Boyle said that funeral services were some of the oldest businesses in the city. She noted there was casket manufacturing nearby but didn't find any connection between the two beyond ease of transportation and roads. She said that others in the City – Butterworth, and Johnson and Hamilton – moved to Capitol Hill. She said typical styles for funeral parlors were Classical, Italianate which presented a formal timelessness; and others were homelike. She said the neighborhood was industrial in nature at the Ship Canal and noted the increased traffic and urban auto-related businesses. She said there is a pub and restaurant across the street; there are warehouses and commercial.

She said the original building was constructed in 1921. It was a two-story concrete structure with simple massing, attic, gabled roof, side dormer, portico on front. The front entry was changed in 1960 to a rectangular opening with added marquee. She said in 1988 the new portion was added and replicated the Mission Revival style of the original building. She said the main entry portico was restored. In a 1991 garage remodel, a crematorium with retort with ovens and chimney were added. She said the original building had a chimney within the roof; in the 1960's modernization an additional chimney stack was added on the outside of the building. The vehicle garage was replaced by the 1991 addition. She said that an ornate lantern at the vehicle garage is missing; the roof has been replaced.

She said the west façade is wood frame. The Juliet balcony may have been an exit at one time. She shared photos provided by Michael Emmick, whose father worked at Bleitz. She said the family originally lived on site in a small apartment. She said an ADA ramp was added in 1989. She said that Bleitz was more progressive and that his influence may have extended out into the community; the building may qualify for Criterion C. She said it is a hybrid design with simple forms, false front. She said the 1988-89 addition should not be included; she noted its faux historicism. She said the building is in a pivotal location and meets Criterion F.

Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill Leary, said they support designation but to not include the 1989 addition, or the 1990 retort structure, or the site/parking lot to allow flexibility of use.

Ms. Doherty said there are multiple lots on the one parcel, and recommended that the Board clarify the lots they want to include.

Mr. McCullough requested to exclude lots 1, 2, 3, which are the existing parking lot.

Responding to comments about a KJR broadcast from the funeral home, Craig Emmick, former Bleitz employee, said the broadcast was tied into publicity for the 1915 pipe organ, that was later sent to New Orleans following Hurricane Katrina.

Ms. Patterson asked about an operational covenant.

Mr. Pollard said they cannot lease or operate a funeral home or sell flowers.

Board members discussed which lots to include and how much separation from the landmark to maintain.

Mr. Treffers asked about precedence for excluding an addition.

Mr. McCullough said the 1958 addition on the Washington Athletic Club was excluded.

Ms. Doherty said that has happened with later additions at schools. She suggested reducing the amount of controlled site with a clearly defined boundary.

Mr. Treffers asked about other funeral homes in the area.

Ms. Boyle said the former Arthur Wright (Queen Anne) is still there and there may be others.

Michael Herschensohn, Queen Anne Historical Society, said the Mt. Pleasant Cemetery is a focus on Queen Anne.

Public Comment:

Michael Herschensohn noted the site connection to the interurban, railroad line. He noted that one million bicyclers ride by the building every year. He said the west façade is intact. He supported designation.

Craig Emmick said he started working there in 1975. He said Bleitz served People's Memorial and the AIDs community. He said Bleitz was proud of the building. He said Bleitz would give you the shirt off his back. He said that Jacob Bleitz patented the evaporator.

Leanne Olson, Queen Ann Historical Society, thanked the owners for preserving the building and said it is important to Queen Anne and Fremont. She said a buffer around the building is needed. She said to restore the Western façade and the eastern lawn.

Ms. Patterson spoke in support of including the 1989 addition. She said to keep the property (not the 1980s addition, but the property as a whole) intact.

Ms. Johnson supported designation including the parking lot which, she said, was needed for a buffer. She said to exclude the 1980's addition.

Mr. Hodgins agreed with Mr. Johnson and suggested including lots 4 and 5 for control.

Ms. Patterson said she was OK with not including the parking lot but wanted to include all additions – the entire building as it stands – because it all factors into the integrity.

Ms. Johnson said that additions in schools have not been included.

Mr. Hodgins supported designation and noted criteria F, C for the AIDS story significance, and to retain blocks for buffer.

Mr. Coney said the exclude lots 1, 2, 3; keep the building whole. He said Bleitz was a notable person. He cited Criterion F.

Ms. Barker supported designation and excluding lots 1, 2, and 3. She said the building meets criteria C for the funeral industry, political openness, and affordability, D as an eclectic building, and F.

Ms. Durham supported designation for criteria C, D, and F. She noted the affordable services and the AIDS story. She said the original building is character defining and the 1980's addition is not. She said to remove lots 1, 2, and 3 and designate everything else.

Ms. Vyhnanek supported designation and noted criteria C, D, and F. She said Bleitz served AIDS victims when others wouldn't offer services; the owner of the Gaslight Inn was able to name Bleitz. She said Bleitz offered affordable service and served the LGBTQ community. She said to exclude lots 1, 2, and 3; keep 1980s addition but the 1921 original building is predominantly where character defining elements are. She said it is dicey to pick and choose.

Mr. Treffers supported designation on criteria C, D, and F. He said the building has double significance of early history and community, economic, history as well. He said to look at the property as a whole. He said he did not think the 1989 or 90 additions are character defining features or significant. He said he would not withhold support if lots 1, 2, and 3 were excluded.

Mr. Sneddon supported designation on criteria C, D, and F. He noted the placement at important crossroads near Queen Anne, Fremont and Ballard. He noted the role Funeral Homes play in the community. He said there were fewer and fewer as time went on. He said he is struggling to determine the period of significance as there is lots of compelling history. He said the building is unusual from an architectural standpoint; it was built by Bleitz with elements of Tudor, Mission Revival, and Stickwork styles. He noted the deliberate focus on the façade. He said there is no need to include the 1989 addition but noted a buffer is important and to work with lots instead. He said to exclude lots 1, 2, and 3 and don't include addition.

Ms. Johnson supported designation on criteria C, D, and F, excluding lots 1, 2, and 3. She questioned why you would designate something you are OK with later demolishing. She said the business was culturally significant as a progressive business and individual. She said the 1980-90 additions are not significant culturally and should not be included.

Mr. Sneddon said the additions are like a non-contributing resource in a district.

Ms. Patterson said non-contributing buildings still come before the board. She supported designation on criteria D and F. She said the period of significance ends in 1957 with Bleitz's death. She said significance is tied to the original building. She said that one million cyclists go by every year and she said that she is one. She said to include the additions and adjoining lots. She said the additions are not insignificant to the point of being excluded.

Mr. Kiel supported designation on criteria C, D, and F. He said the site is not necessarily significant. He said the west façade was always meant to be seen. He said the 1980's addition is bad faux historicism and detract from the original.

Mr. Coney said to include Criterion C for Bleitz's progressive approach and the PMA.

Mr. Treffers noted the period of significance and the association with the gay community. He said the 1921 building conveys its significance without the additions. He said to exclude the 1989-90 additions and keep parcels 4 and 5.

Mr. Kiel said the board should act as narrowly as possible to be responsible and allow flexibility for the owner.

Ms. Patterson said it is eligible as is.

Mr. Sneddon said there is precedent in dealing with additions.

Ms. Barker left at 5:55 pm.

Ms. Doherty said that whatever portion of the site is designated will require review for new buildings.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Bleitz Funeral Home at 316 Florentia 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 site and the exterior of the 1921 building, excluding lots 1, 2, and 3, and excluding the 1989 and 1991 additions.

MM/SC/ST/KJ 8:1:0 Motion carried. Ms. Patterson opposed.

Mmes. Johnson and Durham left at 6:00 pm.

041917.61

Seattle Asian Art Museum

1400 E Prospect Street

Briefing on proposed rehabilitation and addition

Sam Miller, LMN, presented via PowerPoint (full report in DON file). He said they met with Friends of Olmsted Parks Trust on mitigation and are moving forward on an agreement. He said the presentation will include park pathway update, east garden court openings and park lobby, and south and underground expansion options.

Expansion East Garden Court Openings:

Mr. Miller said that original Gould drawing envisioned expansion of building. He said there is language in the designation of the building recognizing Gould's design. Gould developed a new architectural approach to museum layout and how to move through it and allow flexibility for different exhibits. He provided diagrams showing the existing building with circulation patterns and said the proposed new construction mimics that. He said Alternative One involves no new east openings and ideal gallery proportions are maintained. He said this option has compromised gallery circulation; compromised circulation to lower floors; new exterior exit stair required; no visual connection to the park; and significant redesign would be required. He said that Alternative Two requires no new east openings in the Garden Court and provides improved access to galleries and lower floors. He said that negatives include compromised gallery configuration, no visual connection to the park; and, significant redesign required.

Mr. Miller said the museum program needs and circulation needs are critical. He said they have explored location and proportion of openings. He said they now propose to reduce the openings to match existing. He said the original geometry has changed; there used to be a lot of visibility into the park. He said that 'eyes on the park' is important. He said there is an opportunity to reconnect the building to the park. He went over previous proposal. He said they now propose to reduce the height of the east side openings and match the height on the north and south openings. He said the proportions are driven by piers on the outside and by fountain. He said they propose to leave the header open or block header down or use contemporary decorative to connect to north and south that have header, and screen. He said the propose to reduce the depth of the park lobby; it was 15' and they propose to pull it in to 12'-6". He said the lower park lobby will go from 23'-1" to 20'-7".

Mr. Miller cited Susan Boyle's letter of support dated April 14, 2017 (in DON file). He cited the Seattle Tree Ordinance, SMC 25.11.060 and said the preservation of exceptional trees is a constraint in limiting the possible design alternatives. He went over under building expansion and said that excavating under the existing building foundation puts the historic building at risk. He said the floor slabs in the historic auditorium and in the art storage area would need to be removed and replaced with structural slabs. He said it is difficult to waterproof an excavated space from one side which is essential for a museum. He said the first floor has a lower ceiling height and would not accommodate the needs of a gallery, education space, or other public space. He provided a letter from a structural engineer (in DON file). He said that underground expansion would require two exits. He said they need art movement pathways, elevator (for which there would be over-run issues), mechanical shaft.

He said that 2nd floor interventions are disconnected programmatically and corridors, mechanical, and functionality are not effective. He said deep excavation undermines the footing all the way down at level 2 and at level 1. He said to get any daylighting they would have to pop up through the designated Hoggson landscape.

Mr. Sneddon asked if they had seen anything to suggest planned expansion in the future like Gould had and if there were planned knock-out panels.

Mr. Miller said no.

Public Comment:

Johnpaul Jones provided a letter (in DON file), and said he is on the SAAM Board of Trustees. He said there is a solution somewhere and wonderful designers adapt to land, place and people. He said to keep flexible. He said this was an important place to his kids; they enjoyed the park. He said architecturally it is a difficult problem – the building doesn't meet seismic codes and something needs to be done about that. He said there is a world class collection here. He said the building needs to remain viable for collection and for visitors. He said there are lots of constraints and asked the architects to work hard and be careful how they intrude into the park. He said the east and south elevations are a mess. He noted drug use on the east side and said that what is proposed will add life there.

Randolph Urmston, neighbor, opposed the expansion. He said SAAM is out of step with art museums and cited a New York Times article that said, 'museums must think/grow inside the footprint'. He said to fully activate the space. He said that small and large museums are going underground. He noted the adverse impact to the Park. He said Proposition 42 does apply.

William Backmus said his four generations of his family spent much time at Volunteer Park. He said to renovate the existing museum in the original footprint. He asked if you would put a modern addition on Smith Tower and said not to destroy this building. He said the park is free, the museum is not. He said that to consider other options.

Eliza Davidson said the park is an Olmsted Park of national significance and a local landmark. She said the Hoggson landscape could be restored if they built below it. She said the design is inappropriate and the design team has made small adjustments and not full blown alternatives. She said to preserve the landscape. She said citizens have had no opportunity to present.

John Colville said the presentation was fascinating. He said it is a compelling case for restoring the east side of the building and exploring the underground options. He said they are starting to get into actual exploration and that is win/win.

Doug Bailey, Volunteer Park Trust, said he supports renovation of the Art Museum but is concerned with the park as a whole. He said that Olmstead was a visionary. He said the museum is there; it is important and significant and it is important that it is sustainable. He said he is impressed with the process; he said they have come up with improvements and he endorsed the process. He said he wants more opinions, concerns – it is important to hear them. He said he loves the comments about the garden court.

Jonathan Mark, Protect Volunteer Park, said there was a smaller project in 2008; there was a funding issue then and there is now. He questioned the ability to do the project.

Ellen Luke, neighbor, Volunteer Park Trust, said that SAAM has listened and she has seen changes. She said she believes they need to do this or they wouldn't be going through it. She said they should come up with mitigation plans. She said the connection to the park is good. She said she is impressed with the ability to listen and civilly reach agreement. She said the park is a landmark and the building is a landmark; you can have both.

Joyce Moty, Protect Volunteer Park, commented that root systems of the trees extend beyond the dripline; proposed expansion would be an impact to the Beech trees. She was concerned about devastation to trees and said to consider the root systems. She suggested moving the buildings and exhibitions and quicker rotations. She said to keep the existing footprint and do seismic upgrades. She said that additions are ugly.

Mr. Coney cited Kim Rorschach's letter of April 14, 2017 (in DON file) and said it sounds like they are making up for lost space. He said it looks like an expansion of the museum gallery space, not just making up for lost space due to the additional mechanical systems.

Mr. Miller said they are not making up for lost space; he indicated how the proposed space will be used for additional mechanical space.

Mr. Coney questioned if there is not loss of gallery space, what the need for expansion is. He said he would like to see how it lays out as currently configured and how the proposed addition is laid out.

He said if they need more, it is all new space. He said to establish a need. He said there is a lot of space downtown that would make storage more efficient. He said that SAAM operated over 20 years; attendance is strong and education program is strong. He said they are not expanding program and service to justify expansion.

Mr. Sneddon said in the past the team has had more extensive presentations.

Ms. Patterson said she has struggled with need and justification. She said it is a lot easier to fundraise around a new gallery than an upgrade. She said she is satisfied with the size and how it has been handled. She said she has seen the evolution of the design and how the addition integrates and mitigates. She said she has done more research on the project because it is so unique and it is a difficult discussion. She said there is impact to the park but it is a fair trade through restoration of park elements. She said not all will be happy but it is a fair tradeoff.

Mr. Treffers said he is satisfied with the need part and thinks it is justified. He said the planning is for needs now and in the future, to keep the museum viable. He said it is a compromise, not all will be happy but he hopes they will have a better design. He said it is a nationally significant park and a national register building and two significant priorities have to be balanced. He said he has seen different options and this is the best approach. He said they are going off non-original additions and there will be less impact to the park.

Mr. Sneddon said the openings are a good change to the garden court. He said they are becoming more accustomed to penetrations. He said the museum is a dynamic place. He said there will be more circulatory space and there will be view into the park. He said the height reads better now. He supports the 2016-17 interpretation of the metal screens. He said to keep the spatial continuity and that spatial limitations are reasonable. He said the evidence presented for the underground expansion is compelling. He said the gallery spaces should be cohesive and connected. He said fire safety issues eliminate the underground option. He said it is probably the best opportunity for expansion; several options and alternatives have been seen and the board has heard from the public.

Mr. Hodgins requested to see a rendering of the park now and an aerial view. He said this is an opportunity to breathe new life into the museum and bring in new people. He appreciated the public comment.

Ms. Durham appreciated the transparency. She noted the change in the height of the park lobby and depth, lowering the door height, and screen addition are a good way to tie in openings. She said the park lobby is jarring. She said it is a lovely way to use the park space. She said the museum occupied a small portion of the park and there is a lot of park to enjoy. She said it is a compromise and we have responsibility that the landmark continues to be viable.

Mr. Coney asked if attendance at the museum has gone down.

Ping Foong, SAAM, said it hasn't.

Ms. Vyhnanek appreciated the exploration of options. She said rehabilitation, update of seismic and mechanical are necessary. She questioned if this is the middle ground. She said these are steps in the right direction but that she wasn't convinced that it won't impact the east greensward. She said expansion would be significant. She said the overhang still create dead spaces. She said that museum attendance is not going down but the park must be respected and there must be equity there. She said the park is free, it is a national landmark; the museum is not free and that is an equity issue. She said opening the Garden Court is a good way to activate the park.

Mr. Kiel said the Garden Court is moving in the right direction. He said he likes the contemporary version of screens above the new openings, and having no backing is appropriate. He said the underground section is telling; two full floors below. He noted the issue with cohesive and connection in programming. He said there are landmarked spaces within the building and that challenges the design. He said that this is the most reasonable way to accomplish this.

Mr. Treffers said the Garden Court always had a monumentality and didn't connect to the park. He questioned if it is feasible to open to the sides instead; you can still get new circulation without altering the space.

Mr. Sneddon cited public comment and said to open up cultural resources that are now in storage.

041917.7 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator