

Joint Preservation and Parks & Environment Committee  
September 20, 2016

The Preservation and Parks & Environment Committees of Community Board 7/Manhattan met on Thursday, September 20, 2016, at Goddard Riverside Community Center, 593 Columbus Avenue, in the District. The meeting was co-chaired by Gabrielle Palitz and Jay Adolf, co-chairs of Preservation, who called the meeting to order at 6:35 pm. The meeting was attended by Preservation committee members Louisa Craddock, Mark Diller, Miki Fiegel, Meisha Hunter Burkett and Peter Samton, and P&E committee members Ken Coughlin, Sarena Gupta, Meisha Hunter Burkett, and Susan Schwartz. Also attending were CB7 Chair Elizabeth Caputo, Co-Secretary Christian Cordova, and CB7 members Roberta Semer, Dan Zweig, Robert Espier, Paul Fischer, Madge Rosenberg, Sheldon Fine, Manuel Casanova, Michele Parker, Page Cowley, Mel Wymore and Ethel Sheffer.

The following topics were discussed and actions taken.

American Museum of Natural History. Application to the NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission for the construction of a new building on its campus adjacent to Columbus Avenue at West 79<sup>th</sup> Street within Theodore Roosevelt Park.

Elizabeth Caputo:

- Joint committee meeting to consider AMNH's application.

Jay Adolf:

- Reviewing the proposed design for AMNH's planned new building and the design for the proposed reconfiguration of Theodore Roosevelt Park.
- The goal is to arrive at a resolution to provide the LPC with CB7's advisory view on the application.
- The nature of the application is directed to the LPC's issuance of a binding report. This is not an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, although the standards are equivalent.
- Issues related to matters other than the design of the building and the park, such as transportation impacts, construction impacts, program bona fides, etc. are not relevant to this application, and will be considered as part of the separate discussions relating to the preparation and evaluation of an Environmental Impact Statement that is expected to take place early in 2017.
- CB7 will go forward despite those who advocate that consideration of this application be delayed unless and until AMNH submits a master plan for the site as failure to reach a resolution may well result in CB7 forfeiting its opportunity to comment on this application.

Presentations by:

Ellen V. Futter, President of AMNH  
Bill Higgins of Higgins Quasebarth, Preservation Consultants  
Jeanne Gang of Studio Gang, Architects  
Joe James of Reed-Hilderbrand, Landscape Architects  
Sue Golden, Esq.  
Anne Siegel, VP of AMNH

President Futter

- Thanks to the large crowd for participating.
  - Application for the Gilder Center.
  - Museum-wide building to integrate science, exhibition and education space.
  - City-owned land – Parks must obtain a report and approval from LPC. Landmarked building on a public park.
  - The current proposal includes changes that respond to the input received to date from public meetings.
  - This is the first of two sets of public hearings – the second, expected in early 2017, will concern the Environmental Impact Statement.
- 
- AMNH is the proud home of over 200 research scientists, with over
  - 2 million artifacts on site
- 
- Gilder Center will address internal and external needs.
  - Currently the Museum welcomes 5MM visitors per year, including 500K students.
- 
- Center will connect 10 different buildings to relieve congestion.
- 
- External needs addressed by the Gilder Center – science education in the USA is in crisis.
  - Major issues faced by public policy have at their roots the need for science competence.
- 
- Changing the nature of a traditional school visit from looking at the museum to interacting with it on site.
  - Provide access to scientists and authentic scientific materials.
- 
- The proposed building will sit between existing structures and more than 80% of the proposed Center will sit on the footprint of existing buildings on the campus.
- 
- After months of preliminary presentations, AMNH has conducted 3 input meetings with hundreds of attendees.
  - Current footprint for the proposed Gilder Center will occupy ¼ acre of Park land; 80% of footprint will be within the existing space of the Museum.
- 
- Since early 2016, working with a community park group to revise the plan for the park.
  - Saved 2 additional mature trees.
- 
- Footprint modifications affected the cost of the building, will require the demolition of three buildings, affected the program for the building.

#### Bill Higgins

- Demolition of existing structures.
- Demolition allows the Museum to pull the new building back to use less of the surrounding park space.
- The Weston building is 16 years old – not historic.
- Building 15 is a stucco box with no historic value.
- Building 15-A has been severely compromised over the last century.

- Master Plan in place since the 1870s. Theme and variation – followed and varied-from over the years.
- Architecture of the plan is principally rectilinear, but is informed by sculptural rounded edges such as at the towers on the corners of the West 77<sup>th</sup> Street elevation.
- The Museum infill of previously planned interior courtyards has resulted in numerous dead ends within the Museum plan, leading to unfortunate results.
- Park considered historically significant even though not designated part of the individual landmark of the Museum buildings, but is a part of the Historic District that surrounds.
- No master plan for TR Park.
- Frederick Law Olmstead commented in the 1870s that “something should be done” with the open space.
- Park plan has changed over time and as the Museum has evolved.
- Paths through the open space/Park curve – inform design.
- Proposed Gilder Center to continue the tradition of being a Museum in a Park.
- Different architectural styles used for each generation of buildings added to the site over time.
- Each new structure is of high quality, but each quite different.
- Materials – granite has been the primary material.
- Salmon-brown used in various elevations.
- Also used Milford Pink Granite in the TR Memorial structure on CPW.
- Quarry from which the Milford Pink Granite is still open, and will be approached to obtain the cladding for the Gilder Center as opposite on the axis from the TR Memorial.
- Granite on the West 77<sup>th</sup> Street elevation alternates between rusticated stone and smoother accents – akin to strata.

#### Jeanne Gang

- Design began with an analysis of the original master plan – recognizing that circulation and flow intended in the master plan had never been achieved.
- The Guild Center as proposed would complete the axis along the extension of West 79<sup>th</sup> Street into the Park.
- 10 buildings would now be connected.
- Spaces in nature that informed the inspiration for the Center’s design – geologic pathways reminiscent of sculptural Canyonlands such as found in the Southwest.
- Interior of the Center Atrium – will make all of the functions of the Museum accessible and visible immediately upon entering the Museum. Visual accessibility.
- Sustainability features – natural daylight through the atrium in the central hall.
- High performance building envelope – very little exterior envelope because the building is now pulled back into the existing Museum campus.
- Walls in the center atrium are the walls holding up the roof.
- ADA completely accessible – at grade.

- 80% space comprised of Museum functions; 10% back of the house; 5% dining and gift shop, 5% back of the house operations.
- Exterior cladding – bedding layers of stone was inspiration – canyon-like rock space for exterior program.
- Coursing of granite to emulate rock striations.
- Striations would follow the curves of the rounded window openings – not horizontal rows, but following the arch-like openings on the exteriors.
- Color is a light pink.
- Note that the building would be partially obscured by the existing trees both along the street as well as those in the Park.
- Elevation on the West would step back as it rises – both in plan and in section.
- The elevation would have irregular curved-shaped window openings with the atrium in the center.
- Each wing on either side of the atrium has a curved shape facing / heading west. Atrium on a bias between the two curved prongs of the West façade.
- Height of the building aligns with the buildings on either side in the campus.
- The façades of the two wings step back to form a reveal or shadow line where the new meets the existing.
- Existing north façade of building 8 has planned openings for anticipated connectivity that was never built.
- Building steps back once above the ground floor, and again as the building rises.
- North façade – will rise behind the pavilions in the central campus terrace (Ross Terrace) and existing red brick buildings.
- North façade will pick up on the copper banding on the wall above the Terrace. Elevation on the north will be “plaster”.
- Oval window on the east façade will provide sunlight.

#### Joe James

- Three themes for the Park –
- Building reads as set within a park
- Preserving the gem at the end of West 79<sup>th</sup> Street.
- Ensuring ADA access at grade.
- Preserving curvilinear forms in the existing park.
- Proposal for the Park includes widening the entrance at West 79<sup>th</sup>.
- Seven trees to be removed; one will be relocated in the Park. Nineteen new trees will be planted elsewhere in the Park
- New design adjusts Park paths – separating gathering/respice areas from Park circulation and the Museum access.
- Preserving the Pin Oak and another mature tree.

- Planted islands accomplish definition of separate spaces.
- Increased path size makes the Nobel monument more useable.
- Margaret Mead Green expands by appx 2,000 SF.
- Margaret Mead Green with new terrace/private space.
- No fencing shown in images, but under consideration. Will work with Parks Dept. and Parks working group for fence design.
- Adding circulation west and east of the Nobel monument.

Ellen Futter

- Thanks.

Joint Committee Q's

Peter:

- Pink granite looks different than renderings, which appear white.
- Pink actually relates to the TR façade.
- Plan – NW corner shows a deep reveal between the proposed and Bldg 17 – could be a place to hide/sleep not easy to defend.  
A: will address through the landscape.  
A: Need an additional fire escape at that location.

Louisa:

- 7 trees to be removed; large pin oak to be removed.
- A: most of the trees to be removed are shorter.

Gabby:

- Themes for park design

Jay:

- Adding trees  
A: 6 canopy trees plus 13 understory trees

Ken:

- Parks involved in redesign of the Park?  
A: yes – part of the Park working group
- If original rectilinear master plan were used, would take more of the Park.  
A: yes

Sarena:

- Completion:  
A: 2020

Meisha:

- Sense of tremendous effort to fashion a reasonable and thoughtful response to programmatic intention.
- Q: Does not understand the programmatic catalysts. After studying all materials.
- A: Futter – internal and external needs being addressed.
- Growing audience and circulation problems, dead ends create traffic flow problems.
- Programmatically the Museum needs space for all of its mission needs – education, exhibition, and connection to resources – collections, labs and scientists.
- Commends historic research.
- Did not see an evaluation of existing circulation and how the proposed building responds to those needs.
- A: Gang – studied circulation carefully. People travel along axes – E-W or N-S intended to be completed into the big square in the Master Plan. Currently results in reaching dead ends.
- A: With a few edits along the central core of the campus, the proposed Center creates a loop. Creates 30 connections.
- Q: New principal entrance?
- A: no, not intended to be the principal entrance.
- A: Do expect use of the west entrance to increase from 10% to 20% with the new building.
- Q: Materials – applaud the selection of the Milford Pink.
- Q: Concern re plaster.
- A: Plaster is found on interior edifices on campus.
- A: Want the color to emulate the Milford Pink – creates a lighter color (also helps energy use).
- Q: Design intent. Reference to geologic strata. Wondering why that was selected – what other options dismissed.
- A: studied other options.
- A: idea of flow and time in geology. Sense of discovery.
- A: Natural light and ability to see where one was going.
- A: Idea comes from mission of the museum to engage visitors from the moment they enter the space.
- Q: Sustainability. Energy, water – concepts. Assumes want to be at the forefront of these conversations.
- A: Gang – getting the sustainability features to work together. Harvesting natural light. Limited façade reduces energy lost. Atrium requires less to cool. Glass will have frit.

Susan:

- Q: Pleased not moving Nobel monument and increasing space around it.
- Q: Trees being removed – can they be salvaged.
- A: Ann Siegel – explored transplant with Parks – small dogwood can be transplanted; others cannot.
- Q: New trees – similar? How long to reach full size?

- A: Larger than saplings – elms grow quickly – will take 20 years to achieve full stature, but will be significant stature.

#### MND

- Volume of Atrium.
- A: Journey and reveal of Museum mission account for the need for the volume.
- A: Provides natural light.
- A: Solves dead ends in Halls of Gems, Pacific Peoples.
- A: Volume is on a par with the TR entrance Memorial.

#### Public Comment:

##### Claude Beller (with time from Carol Joseph) – Community United:

- Delusional to think a Columbus Avenue entrance will only add 20% more visitors.
- Additional visitors will eat up the new paths and space, along with vendors.
- Will destroy a part of the park that provides relief and repose.
- Change the entire aspect of the neighborhood.

##### Sean Khorsandi – LW!

- EIS scope will impact important public assets, including Museum and TR Park
- Acting on a 140 year old statute, enacted before the City of New York as we know it ever existed.
- Must develop a forward looking plan to balance Museum and Park.
- Met Museum established a master plan in 1971 re Lehman wing.

##### Olive Freud

- Not appropriate to build on public parks.
- Public trust doctrine prohibits alienation.
- In overcrowded neighborhood the priority should be to preserve the Park.
- 150 years of adding to the Museum – can't undo what has been done, but can hold the line.

##### Sidney Goldfischer

- Crisis in education is the problem of standardized tests.
- Many institutions already provide world-class science.

##### Lydia Thomas – Defenders

- Played a significant role in convincing the Museum to use less of the Park.
- Welcome progress, but still have serious concerns.
- Question the 6-story edifice.
- Necessary to resolve circulation.
- Should reduce bulk.

##### Tupper Thomas – New Yorkers for Parks

- Strongly support the revised landscape.
- Applaud the saving of the two large trees.
- Applaud working closely with the Parks Working Group.

Peter Wright – President of Friends of TR Park

- Support the redesigned park (no comment on building).
- Committee work has created an inviting park experience.
- Arthur Ross Terrace is 1 acre; this building uses ¼ acre of parkland.

Steve Anderson – 81<sup>st</sup> Street Block Assn

- Rarely are in favor of anything.
- Design brought forward is one that Block Assn endorses.
- Serious concerns raised over again about buses and congestion, even though not tonight's agenda.
- Need to open up the South side of TR Park.

Barbara Adler – Columbus Avenue BID – ceding time to:

Andrew Ogulnik

- Building and Park are in the BID.
- Building is striking and impressive addition.
- Support redesigned park – more accessible and more inviting.
- Until now, west side was the back side of the Museum – now creating connections to BID entities and neighborhood.
- BID part of the Park Working Group.
- Museum an excellent listener – saving trees, scaling back the design footprint.

Stuart Blumin – Cornell Professor of History

- Member of the Defenders of TR Park.
- Museum and Park are part of UWS/CPW Historic District.
- Distinct package.
- At the heart of the Historic District.
- Invading the park means less of a museum in a park.
- Remain unconvinced that Museum has examined all reasonable ways to achieve its goals – could use less parkland with a less grand entrance.

Cary Goodman (with time from Ms. And Mr. Fernandez and Ann Russel)

- Today starts climate week.
- Sustainability issues at the fore – but no response from Ms Gang.
- Building will put 2MM metric tons of pollution into the atmosphere.
- Chutzpah. Plan around for months – 4,000 people have said we hate it.
- Appropriateness and form – caves and geologic design does not relate to the Park.
- Mass – building will eradicate sunlight for the community and take away the shade.
- Takes away sunlight and air.
- Nothing here will maintain or enhance the historic character of the UWS (Preservation committee purpose).
- Nothing aligns with P&E working principles.

Karen Moore – Goddard Riverside

- Preschoolers at G-R programs benefit from access to the Museum.

Katie White – science teacher, NYC public schools

- Students benefit from access to resources.
- Ignites curiosity to see science in action.

Michael Ong – NYPIRG, Save Great South Bay, Red Cross

- Public and Park has been taken into consideration.
- Building is a nationally and internationally recognized institution that must be allowed to improve to keep pace and remain relevant.

Melissas Schumer – Young Women’s Leadership School

- Students have had extraordinary experiences.
- Student who once was not engaged is now studying astrophysics.

Michael Broomfield – West 81<sup>st</sup>

- Proposal addresses serious concerns.
- Thoughtful response; intelligent design.

Bill Roudenbusch – with time from 5 people (Dee Rieber, Sue Ellen Estey, Carol Ansorge, Hector Perez)

- Contrast to Romanesque revival design of existing structures.
- Curvilinear paths in park are not appropriate models for the form of the building.
- Proposed building is undulating – distinct from convex forms of Romanesque revival design.
- Pink granite not guaranteed.
- LEED sought is Gold. Should seek a higher level of rating.
- Pathways in Park will yield to Museum access and pass-through – Museum traffic.
- Cooling the glass atrium will be expensive.
- Public money being used.

Cristine Maisano – NYC DoE Teacher

- Professional Development at the Museum.
- Connects training to science taught in the classroom – helped learn how to teach science in a more engaging way.

Mack Jeffrey – 386 Columbus – Directly across Columbus Avenue

- In favor of the proposal.
- Will see it every day.
- On balance – will amplify and expand the mission of one of America’s greatest institutions.
- Losing ¼ acre – not thrilled, but once in a generation opportunity to improve the park and make more welcoming.

Rachelle Travis – Teacher – students from NYCHA housing.

- Support expansion of PD and engagement.
- Learning how to make museum visits more meaningful for students.
- Need reflection time on the spot.

Regina Karp

- Personal history – took first trip to the Museum in 1949. Thrilled to be in the museum.
- Should offer more exhibition space, not classrooms.

- Husband studied under Margaret Mead.
- What would Margaret Mead do?

Lynne Glasner

- What percentage of Museum floor space is given over to Gilder University.
- How much of proposed center will be used for the Gilder University.

Martha Dwyer

- Museum programs are wonderful.
- But expansion has to stop.
- Must consider the support of the BID – good for businesses but not for residents/neighbors.
- Mini Times Square.

Faith Steinberg

- Concern for Climate Change.
- Where are the solar panels?
- AMNH Board members are invested in fossil fuels – concern for type of education at the center as a result.
- How will trees survive against the traffic.

Barbara Sacks – Community United

- Key purpose of building is to provide enhanced visitor services, plus expanded gift shop – violates the purpose of the Landmark protection.
- Space will be used for gala events.

Steven Schutz

- Speakers in favor of project come from outside the neighborhood.
- Crisis of science – don't understand as reason for expansion into the Park.
- Make the west façade just an exit.
- Should put a limit on the entrants.

Howard Yurow

- Olmstead vs. United States – right to be left alone.
- Once a landmark is designated – should be left alone.

Gary Mayer – resident

- Draft scope for EIS – architectural approach must be responsive to the Museum's needs and the historic character of the neighborhood.
- Other buildings in the campus not similar.

Committee/Board Discussion.

Shelly:

- Applaud accessibility.
- Q: Will entrance doors be accessible – self-activating.
- A: Yes.

Ethel:

- Questions were raised tonight and at previous hearings/presentation – relating to external circulation for those entering the Museum.
- Circulation and congestion issues must be addressed – to be reviewed by the Board.
- A: Jay – will be considered in the EIS process.

Jay:

- Two resolutions – one each for Park and building.

Park:

Meisha:

- Concerned about encroachment.
- Landscape proposal – not enough evidence of conversation with existing landscape holistically.
- Loss of the trees – an issue, but applaud efforts to plant new trees – encourage planting even more new trees.
- Touchstone issue of trees.

Susan:

- Applaud the decision to pull back the footprint.
- Striking concern for the park – small, intimate park. Need to maintain that feel.
- Scale of the building is large for its context.

Sarena:

- Museum has accounted for the public's views.
- Demolition of park space is minimal.
- Building's benefits outweigh the intrusion.

Ken:

- Original master plan called for a structure at this part of the site – inevitable that Museum would fill the cavity.
- Could have been a lot worse.
- Under original plan park would barely exist at all.
- Concern – growth boundary – losing 7 trees and ¼ acre, how do we know this is where it will end?
- Q: was a growth boundary considered for further incursion into TR Park?
- A: Futter – It would be irresponsible to try to give an answer that would be binding forever, but Museum has no other plans to expand further into TR Park at this time.
- A: Done efforts to protect CPW and West 77<sup>th</sup> Facades.

MND:

- Need to replace the intimacy of the existing area of TR Park that has the feel of an intimate Town Square.
- Cul de sacs to separate circulation from respite/quiet reflection areas is the right idea, but not there yet.

- Continue to work with the Park Working Group.

Peter:

- Existing straight path is not that innovative. New design is an improvement.
- Curvilinear path proposed to run very close to the Museum façade. Want to feel as though in a park, not a few feet from a building.
- New entrance is much more dynamic.
- Sorry about loss of parkland.

Miki:

- Really appreciate that the landscape designers worked with the community.
- Recalls the Rose Center – originally criticized and now valued.
- Loss of ¼ acre is enough that its loss would be felt.
- Applaud hard work and listening.

Louisa:

- Museum relationship is very personal to most New Yorkers.
- Concerned about the Park because it is so small – the small size and quiet character are why it is special as a park.
- Museum entrance will change the character – wonderful activities accompany a Museum's major entrance.
- Will overwhelm the experience of the Park.
- Can the landscape more definitively separate the Park experience from the Museum entrance – concern that Museum visitors will take over the Park.

Gabby:

- Redesign is an improvement.
- Enhanced design – separating entrance from quiet reflection and children's areas.
- Painterly quality being created that is missing now.
- Appropriate to place a building in the Park – not ramming the building façade to the streetwall of this thoroughfare.
- Support.

Jay:

- Proposed Park design is vast improvement based on the renderings.
- Need to follow through to ensure that the design is fully achieved.
- Loss of ¼ acre – would prefer to see building built without loss of park space, but on balance is appropriate.
- Controlling the populations using the park – separating the Museum visitors from Park users through planting or fencing – is important and should be part of the resolution.
- Takes Museum at face value that there are no current plans for further incursions into the Park.

Peter:

- Use roof of Gilder Center as a rooftop Park?
- A: Roof proposed to be green/planted roof.

Mel:

- Chaired a task force on design of TR Park several years ago. Stakeholders from throughout the community participated.
- Broad consensus as to what the park should have.
- Agreed should have a better connection to Columbus Avenue.
- Needed to be educational – connection to the Museum.
- Needed to be truly green.
- Task Force dissolved.
- Sometimes need to say yes – Museum scaled back, made significant concessions.
- Fierce advocate for Parks, along with Klari and Olive.

Resolution to approve proposed design with a recommendation that the Museum strongly consider separating flow in/out of Museum from dedicated Park users.

VOTE: 10-0-0-0; non-committee Board – 8-0-0-0.

Building Design.

Peter:

- Enthusiastic about the design.
- Renderings should be changed to eliminate the grey cast that is not intended.
- Detailing needs to be revised in plans – looks too much like a concrete building.
- Early schematic stage.
- Complement on the design.

Miki:

- Old fashioned Preservationist – modern buildings usually leave one cold.
- Building is stunning.
- Building needs to work with the old – not trying to recreate history.
- Façade speaks to the community, to the undulating nature of the structure.
- Impressed with the open spaces upon entering the Museum.
- Size is appropriate; height is appropriate.

Louisa:

- Destination building – something people will make special trips to see.
- Thought this would be the main entrance.
- Concern about the volume and its relationship to intruding upon the Park.
- Design grows on you.

Meisha:

- Applaud creative and courageous vision in trying to imagine and refashion what can be done in this portion of the site.
- Some aspects of Preservation appropriateness argument that are hard to accept.
- Agree the demolition of the buildings to be lost are not part of the defining fabric and would not compromise the identity of the Museum as a landmark.
- Applaud the sincerity of effort.
- Rectilinear plan/curvilinear form argument not as persuasive – Museum is overwhelmingly rectilinear with accents of curvilinear forms.

- Curvilinear forms are not represented elsewhere on the campus.
- Design not fully baked yet – how the building meets the building to the south is particularly abrupt. Attempt to be sinuous does not succeed.
- Appreciates the effort not to extend height beyond the roof line.

Ken:

- Design exciting and interesting.
- Concern about carbon footprint – should be a model for the world on energy conservation.
- Would like to include a plank in resolution to call on Museum to limit use of fossil fuels.

MND

- Modern has its place, especially in Museum design – Rose Center, Roche & Dinkeloo, etc.
- Concern for volume of the Atrium and its relationship to the intrusion on the Park.
- Concern for reveal the undulating and multiple setbacks in plan will create an inconsistent shadow line that will be distracting, not pleasing.
- Agree on demolition – buildings to be sacrificed are non-contributing.

Shelly:

- Alignment on color of stone, height.
- Facilitating connection and flow is important and desirable.
- Plan to be fully accessible – very important.
- Landmark status does not mean that the building must be left alone, but rather must be taken seriously whenever changes are proposed.
- Criteria of appropriateness satisfied.
- Support approval.
- Volume – sense of awe is important part of discovery and exploration of science and learning.

Dan:

- Took modern design and incorporated with landmark elements.
- Taking as little as necessary to achieve goals.
- Improving the park – we would never get the funding to improve the park to that extent.
- Volume of the Atrium will inspire.

Christian/Jerry:

- Reduction of footprint – believes the Museum has gone as far as it could.
- Curved design helps reduce the intrusion into the park.
- Believes the Atrium will be spectacular.
- Museums should be destination spaces.
- Atrium will make this building a destination.

Mel:

- Museum should be a destination space.
- Can sustain our neighborhood without supertowers by creating such spaces.

Roberta:

- Appreciate that Museum has changed the design.

- Hopes for continued collaboration with the community.

Jay:

- Example of Peter Samton's design for Columbia Grammar. Learned to appreciate interplay of historic and modern through exhibit at NYU and influence of Lenore Norman, Meisha, Gabby and other colleagues.
- LPC expresses its desire to have the historic and modern be distinct.
- Proposed design is appropriate.

Gabby:

- Exciting design inside and out.
- Transitions from rectilinear of adjacent building to curves has details to be worked out, but are quite effective.
- Beautiful evolution – respectful while distinct.
- Color was initially a concern, but seeing the materials reassured.
- Plaster with lines will make it scaled appropriately.
- Atrium is a modern interpretation of the TR volume. Interesting space will make the Museum more appealing and inviting to visitors

Resolution to approve the design as proposed, with recommendation to maximize the use of alternative fuels to try to achieve a zero carbon footprint.

VOTE: 9-1-0-0; non-committee 7-1-0-0.

Adjourn: 10:15 pm