



The City of Seattle

# Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 109/18

## MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

600 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue

L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room

Wednesday, February 21, 2018 - 3:30 p.m.

### Board Members Present

Deb Barker

Russell Coney

Jordon Kiel

Kristen Johnson

Nicole McKernan

Julianne Patterson

Steven Treffers

### Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Melinda Bloom

Rebecca Frestedt

### Absent

Kathleen Durham

Garrett Hodgins

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

### **022118.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

December 6, 2017

MM/SC/DB/JP 5:0:0 Minutes approved

December 20, 2017

MM/SC/DB/JP 4:0:1 Minutes approved. Mr. Coney abstained.

### **022118.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

*Ms. Johnson arrived at 3:40 pm.*

022118.21

Columbia City Landmark District

5020 Rainier Ave. S.

Proposed signs

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed installation of the following: a two-sided blade sign to be installed within the existing frame; two (2) aluminum di-bond wall signs to be hung on the west and south facades, respectively. Dimensions: 68”w x 28”h; photos and the menu installed within the storefront window. Exhibits reviewed included plans, photographs and samples. This single-story commercial building is located outside of the Columbia City National Register District. A second tenant, Paris Bakery (wholesale), operates within the building, but does not have street frontage. On February 6, 2018 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. Committee members recommended approval of the proposal.

Applicant Comment:

Nat Pomyukhol, Bui 9 Thai business owner, had nothing further to add.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Coney said it is an existing sign frame and just the surface is being switched to a different surface. He said there are no conflicts.

Mr. Kiel said it is non-historic material.

Ms. Patterson asked if it is a contributing building.

Ms. Frestedt said it is within the local historic district but there has been no formal determination about its status.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signs at 5020 Rainier Ave. S., as proposed

This action is based on the following:

The proposed signs meet the following sections of the District ordinance, the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards:

**Guidelines/Specific**

**11. Signs.**

All signs on or hanging from buildings or windows, or applied to windows, are subject to review and approval by the Review Committee and Board. Sign applications will be evaluated according to the overall impact, size, shape, texture, lettering style, method of attachment, color, and lighting in relation to the use of the building, the building and street where the sign will be located, and the other signs

and other buildings in the District. The primary reference will be to the average pedestrian's eye-level view, although views into or down the street from adjacent buildings will be an integral feature of any review.

The regulations in Seattle Municipal Code Chapter 23.55 (Signs) and the following guidelines shall apply to signs in the District. The provisions of these guidelines apply to at least the following: (1) any sign located out-of-doors; (2) indoor signs located within three feet of a window and visible from the street, sidewalk or other public place; and (3) "place of business" identification signs.

The intent of sign regulations is to ensure that signs relate physically and visually to their location; that signs reflect the character and unique nature of the business; that signs do not hide, damage, or obstruct the architectural elements of the building; that signs be oriented toward and promote a pedestrian environment; and that the products or services offered be the focus, rather than the signs.

**a. Window Signs and Hanging Signs.**

Generally, painted or vinyl letters in storefront windows and single-faced, flat surfaced painted wood signs are preferred. Extruded aluminum or plastics are discouraged and may not be allowed. Window signs shall not cover a large portion of the window so as to be out of scale with the window, storefront, or facade.

**b. Blade Signs.** Blade signs (double-faced projecting signs hanging perpendicular to the building), that are consistent in design with District goals are encouraged. Blade signs shall be installed in a manner that is in keeping with other approved blade signs in the District. They shall not hide, damage, or obscure the architectural elements of the building. The size should be appropriately scaled for the building.

**Secretary of the Interior's Standards #9 and 10**

MM/SC/RC/JP 6:0:0 Motion carried.

022118.23

Columbia City Landmark District  
Columbia Branch Library  
4721 Rainier Ave. S.

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed repairs and site alterations, including the following: installation of a steel brace around the chimney; replacement of three non-original doors; improvements to the ADA ramp to meet current requirements; installation of an illuminated handrail along the ADA ramp; installation of a steel awning over the entrance on the north façade (of the addition); replacement of the bike rack with a new design to be installed over porous concrete paving, and demolition of the non-historic masonry book drop to be replaced by a second metal book drop to match existing. Exhibits included plans, photographs and samples. She reported that the Columbia Branch Library was constructed in 1915. The Colonial-Georgian Revival Building is a contributing building within the Columbia City National Register District. The modern rear addition was added in 2003-04. The rehabilitation involves a series of in-kind repairs and maintenance that are being reviewed administratively, including, but not limited to roofing and window repairs, stair replacement and masonry restoration.

On February 6, 2018 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. The Committee asked clarifying questions about the design and finish for the new canopy proposed for the rear exit. The Committee supported the proposed canopy design on the basis that it is on the new addition and the colors match the overall palette on the addition. The Committee voiced support for an additional bike rack. Following Committee deliberations, the Committee recommended approval of the application, as proposed.

Applicant Comment:

Joe Hudec, SHKS Architects, went through the plans and explained the proposed changes. He proposed replacing three doors that have weathered, rotted and cracked; they are non-original and non-public doors. He said one is on the 2004 addition; one at the north entry, and one at the lower level underneath the stairs. They propose aluminum clad to match existing design and size; it is more durable and protects the interior. He said doors will be painted dark bronze. He proposed to rebuild the ADA ramp to meet ADA standards. The rails will be replaced; the new rails will be illuminated and painted black to match others. He said the awning at the north entry of the 2004 addition will be a simple steel plate awning which they will paint silver/gray to match aluminum fascia and window frames.

Mr. Hudec explained that a seismic brace would be installed on the chimney; they will install a steel plate collar and four steel tie backs. He said the metal brace will be painted dark gray to match roof hues. He said the proposed bike racks will be painted black to match rails and guard rails; it will replace existing rack and a 3<sup>rd</sup> rack will be added. He said the existing concrete around the bike racks will be repaved with a porous concrete. He said they will clean up the concrete perimeter and supported the suggestion to install a French drain to help keep run off away from the foundation. He said there are currently two book drops: one is stand alone; the other is masonry and concrete built in the 1980s. He said they will demolish the masonry one and relocate the stand alone to the masonry location. They will add one more of the Kingsley series at the same location. He said they will match. It is a better location for drop offs. It will have logo on it to indicate it is library book return.

Ms. Frestedt said CCRC discussed the amount of text on the drop box and recommended to not put text on all sides and to keep it minimal.

Mr. Hudec said they will keep it minimal, just on one side rather than all four.

Ms. McKernan asked why the guard rails are being removed.

Mr. Hudec said it is in-kind maintenance; the connections are failing. He said they will remove it and then reinstall. He said the handrails will be new.

Mr. Kiel asked about how penetrations will be weatherized.

Mr. Hudec said they will be a sleeve.

Ms. Johnson asked if they considered removing the chimney.

Mr. Hudec said they did but this is the preferred route per the Library.

Ms. Patterson asked about new awning scope.

Mr. Hudec said it will drain into concrete area, not toward building. He said they could slope it right to drip into green area.

Mr. Coney asked if the permeable paving will be strong enough to hold the racks.

Mr. Hudec said yes, that it will drain out away from the building.

Mr. Coney was concerned with penetration into slate roof.

Mr. Hudec said they slimmed the braces down to reduce the surface contact.

Mr. Coney asked if they will reflash the chimney.

Mr. Hudec said they will and they will do cleaning as well.

Mr. Coney asked about security.

Mr. Hudec said the doors are locked at all times. He said they continued the glass for egress and for visibility inside.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker and Mr. Kiel said it is reasonable.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for exterior and site alterations at 4721 Rainier Ave. S., as proposed

This action is based on the following:

The proposed exterior and site alterations meet the following sections of the District ordinance, the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards:

**Guidelines/General**

**8.** Emphasis should be given to maintaining the character of, and enhancing compatibility with, contributing buildings.

**Guidelines/Specific**

**2. Building Materials and Fixtures.**

Integrity of structure, form and decoration should be respected. Building facades should be brick, wood, or other materials that are in keeping with the historic character of the District. Exterior light fixtures shall be in keeping with the historic character of the District.

**10. Awnings/Canopies/Marquees.** Marquees, awnings and canopies will be encouraged at street level. Shiny, high-gloss materials are not appropriate. Distinctive

architectural features shall not be covered, nor shall installation damage the structure. Awnings may be installed on upper levels, where appropriate.

**Secretary of the Interior's Standards #2, #3, #5, #6, #9 and #10**

MM/SC/JP/DB 6:0:0 Motion carried.

022118.22

Columbia City Landmark District

4915 Rainier Ave. S.

Proposed storefront remodel and exterior paint colors

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed storefront remodel, including installation of a new storefront system, proposed operable windows, new exterior cladding, new tiles and paint colors, below the canopy. Exhibits included plans, photographs and samples. This two-story commercial building was constructed in 2014. It is a non-contributing building within the Columbia City National Register District.

She reported that on January 2, 2018, the applicant presented the proposal to the CCRC. The CCRC supported the proposed addition of the double hung operable window option, noting that although this type of window is typically seen in residential buildings, the scale of the proposed window is more commercial in nature and acceptable for this location. Members recommended changes to the orientation and dimensions of the cladding. Members also discussed the finish and configuration of the tiles. On February 6, 2018 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. The applicants presented tile and color finish options, based on Committee feedback from the January briefing. Following Committee deliberations, the Committee stated support for the applicant's preferred alternatives. Committee members recommended approval of the application, as proposed.

Applicant Comment:

Henry Walters, Atelier Drome, explained the intent to improve the look of and transparency into the storefront. He provided rendering of existing conditions consisting of cement board siding, fixed windows with reflective coating, prism-esque concrete block water table. He provided an exhibit which presents storefront examples and precedent in the neighborhood. He went over proposed rendering and said they will clad concrete block with patterned tile at the bottoms of the windows and a supporting tile on the sides. He said they will remove the dark framed fixed windows, pop out from the face of building 5". He said there will be a 5 1/2" wide steel plate, single hung windows, the middle mullion will be 7' off the ground so when open, no mullion will block views. He said they will use a Marvin window, vertical grain Douglas fir. He said they will take out the cement board siding and will introduce a stained product in Hemlock. He said the 1' x 8' cladding will be oriented horizontally. He said the existing steel and glass canopy will remain. He said the blue with be replaced with gray-green. He said that lighting, outdoor seating, and signage will be presented in a future submittal.

Linda Morton, Bar Tapeo restaurant owner, said the gray-green color pulls from the tile.

Mr. Walters said the pendant light fixture and bar top will be added along window.

Ms. McKernan asked about installation of weathered wood.

Mr. Walters said it has a rabbeted joint, 1/16" reveal, tight fixed; he said it is like ship lap.

Mr. Kiel asked about the window protrusion.

Ms. Frestedt said there was not much comment by the Committee, they noted it was a bit of departure from the original design of the building, but they did not voice opposition.

Ms. Morton said it will look less suburban.

Mr. Coney said it is compatible with surroundings. He noted the tile.

Ms. Frestedt said the Committee noted there was such a variety of tiles in Columbia City; the Committee supported the tile and thought it was appropriate. She said they studied the alignment of white tiles as opposed to pattern.

Mr. Coney said it provides more interest.

Ms. Barker said the alley side wraps around.

Mr. Walters said the obvious stopping point is the vertical green wall.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Deliberation:

Mr. Kiel said it is an improvement.

Ms. Barker said they are adding great components and it is good to get rid of the baby-blue.

Ms. Johnston said the tile will help it to fit in better.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations and paint colors at 4915 Rainier Ave. S., as proposed.

This action is based on the following:

The proposed exterior alterations and paint colors meet the following sections of the District ordinance, the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards:

**Guidelines/General**

**6.** New construction should be compatible with existing development in terms of scale, materials, and setback.

8. Emphasis should be given to maintaining the character of, and enhancing compatibility with, contributing buildings.

**Guidelines/Specific**

**2. Building Materials and Fixtures.**

Integrity of structure, form and decoration should be respected. Building facades should be brick, wood, or other materials that are in keeping with the historic character of the District. Exterior light fixtures shall be in keeping with the historic character of the District.

**3. Building Surface Treatments.**

Approved surface treatments shall be consistent with the historic qualities of the District. No paint shall be applied to unpainted masonry surfaces. Painted surfaces shall be:

- a. Repainted with the original historic color(s) of the building, provided that the business or property owner obtains a professional color analysis; or
- b. Repainted with subdued colors that are appropriate and consistent with the building and other buildings in the District. Local paint stores have an "historic colors" palette that may be useful as a guide. The Board Coordinator also has a palette of historic colors that may be used as reference.

**4. Storefront.**

Building facades should have a greater proportion of window and door openings than wall spaces on pedestrian levels. Any exterior façade alteration shall respect the original architectural integrity of the storefront. Recessed entryways and/or alcoves shall be maintained for existing street-level storefronts. Original fenestration shall be preserved (i.e. windows, transom areas, and door design). Storefront materials should be brick, wood, concrete, and tile, or a combination thereof.

**5. Transparency.**

To provide street-level interest that enhances the pedestrian environment, street level uses shall have highly visible linkages with the street. Windows at street-level shall permit visibility into the business, and visibility shall not be significantly obscured by security bars or gates, frosting, etching, painting, extensive signage, window darkening film or mirrored film, window treatments, or other means. The intent is to encourage pedestrians to focus on the products or services offered, rather than the signage.

**Secretary of the Interior’s Standards #9 and 10**

MM/SC/DB/JP            6:0:0    Motion carried.

022118.24

Shafer Building  
515 Pine Street  
Proposed storefront alterations

Applicant Comment:

Glenn Trunley explained the renovation to Starbucks’ storefront. He said they will demo the non-historic storefront, leaving the pillars intact and untouched. He said



the tile, grout, were selected to be compatible with building and existing adjacent storefront. He said their current storefront is run-down.

Ms. Doherty said she understands that Starbucks (the previous tenant) proposed a different storefront that was approved by the Board, but then they installed this instead; this project will correct that.

Mr. Kiel said they are looking to be more compatible with the building and other storefronts.

Mr. Trunley said that it will change the entrance and will be neater.

Ms. McKernan asked about the size of the tile.

Mr. Trunley said it is 1" x 2" and will be cut to fit.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed storefront alterations at Shafer Building, 515 Pine Street, 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. 113430 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/RC/KJ            6:0:0    Motion carried.

022118.25    former Hay School / Queen Anne Elementary  
2100 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue North  
Proposed addition to brick building and site improvements

Mr. Kiel recused himself.

David Dahl, Mahlum Architects, provided context of the 1905 wood building and 1921 brick building. He noted site retaining walls were added in 1950's and portables were added in 1960s. He explained the need to add eight classrooms and gym, central gathering space and connection between two buildings, and improved access to the school. He went over drawings, indicating the location of the proposed gym and the administrative suite in the center of the campus. He said the development will push vehicle access to the perimeter.

*Mr. Treffers arrived at 4:40 pm.*

Mr. Dahl said they will regrade to create accessible routes from all sides; they will demolish part of the 1950's retaining wall and chain link fence. He said that one street tree will be removed on the west side, and noted that Bigelow Avenue on the east side is protected as part of Queen Anne Boulevard. He said the planting palette will include low maintenance ground cover with seasonal color, a storm water retention rain garden. He said the new construction will be compatible with the brick building; they will match window proportion and rhythm, height, and they will add more windows on new construction. He said the gym volume will be clad in horizontal lap siding material to related to the 1905 school volume. He said the west elevation will use the same brick palette as the east. He said numerous openings will be made in the 4<sup>th</sup> Ave N. fence line; it will be nicer than chain link. He said construction will be phased.

Ms. Barker asked how the covered play area fencing will be done in advance.

David Mount, Mahlum Architects, explained phasing and said the lower part of the fence is 7'; in Phase II it would go up to 11'9".

Ms. Barker asked how the seams and openings will work.

Mr. Mount said there will be panels and joints and there will be gates at the openings. He said it will go back to chain link beyond the play area.

Vince Gonzales, Seattle Public Schools, said it will prevent balls, etc., from going over the fence.

Ms. McKernan asked if there had been ARC discussion about the gym cladding.

Ms. Barker didn't recall.

Ms. Johnson said it relates to the wood school and is set back.

Mr. Coney noted that Bigelow is part of Queen Anne Boulevard and asked for further elaboration on what is happening there.

Mr. Gonzales said only bussing lanes will be on that side; cars will be on the 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue side. They are not making any physical changes on Bigelow Avenue.

Ms. Doherty said that Seattle Parks and Recreation owns the Boulevard and oversees protection of the street trees.

Mr. Gonzales said that they will work with Parks Department's arborist for tree-related maintenance issues.

Mr. Coney asked if they are expanding the existing cafeteria.

Mr. Mount said yet.

Mr. Coney asked about new parking.

Mr. Mount said the whole upper portion is paved; the portables are on paving.

Mr. Treffers asked what has changed since the ARC meeting.

Ms. Barker said more information has been provided on west facing gate area at the covered play / entry.

Ms. Doherty said the interior play court walls have been changed to brick.

Ms. Barker said that seemed reasonable; she noted that the bio retention is new.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Patterson asked about the joint where new addition meets existing.

Mr. Mount said it is dark brick and panel at loading dock; above that, fiber cement lap siding.

Ms. Patterson asked if they will demo the south wall.

Mr. Mount said they are re-using original columns and beams; infill wall panels were added in 2011.

Ms. Barker asked signage about to indicate changes to bus and vehicle use.

Mr. Gonzales said there is signage now; they are narrowing parking restrictions to accommodate residents.

Ms. Patterson said she likes what is proposed; it is compatible with the landmark and maintains a compatible scale.

Ms. Johnson said it is a nice riff on the existing historic building.

Ms. Barker said the design has come a long way; they further developed many of the components.

Ms. Patterson said the existing materials go a long way.

Mr. Treffers said it is a model project for compatibility of a modern addition with a historic building; he was impressed by the proposal.

Ms. Johnson said programmatically it is more usable.

Ms. McKernan said the bio retention and landscape are a good step. She said the top edge of the gym is a bit jarring.

Ms. Patterson said as long as the trees are preserved the gym will fade into the sky.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed building addition and site improvements at the (former) Hay School, 2100 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue North, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed addition and site improvements do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Report on Designation, 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/KJ/JP                      6:0:1    Motion carried. Mr. Kiel recused himself.

**022118.3                      CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

022118.31                      Ainsworth & Dunn Warehouse  
2815 Elliott Avenue

Ms. Doherty went over details of the signed agreement.

Jessica Clawson, McCullough Hill Leary, said the Certificate of Approval has already been approved but they will come back if there are minor alterations.

Ms. Doherty said that anything major will come to the board.

Mr. Coney asked about heavy timber beams.

Ms. Doherty noted for example one of the waterfront piers, when a whole truss was proposed for removal it came to the board for approval.

Action: I move to approve Controls and Incentives for the Ainsworth & Dunn Warehouse, 2815 Elliott Avenue.

MM/SC/DB/JP                      7:0:0    Motion carried.

022118.32                      Seattle Times Office Building Addition  
1120 John Street  
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty said an ARC packet has been received. They have asked for four months; they are still working through the process. They have been responsive to ARC comments.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Seattle Times Office Building Addition, 1120 John Street, for four months.

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

022118.33                      Seattle Times Printing Plant  
1120 John Street

Request for extension

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Seattle Times Printing Plant, 1120 John Street, for four months.

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

022118.34 Kelly-Springfield Motor Truck Co Building  
1525 11th Avenue  
Request for extension

Jessica Clawson explained that construction is underway; she noted there are some interior controls. She requested a four-month extension for this building and the White Motor Company to keep everything on the same schedule.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Kelly-Springfield Motor Truck Co Building, 1525 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue, for four months.

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

022118.35 White Motor Company Building  
1021 E. Pine Street  
Request for extension

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the White Motor Company Building, 1021 E. Pine Street for four months.

MM/SC/DB/JP 7:0:0 Motion carried.

022118.36 Firestone Auto Supply & Service Store  
400 Westlake Avenue  
Request for extension

Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill Leary, explained the request for four-month extension. He said they have met with ARC and are getting ready for Design Review next month.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Firestone Auto Supply & Service Store, 400 Westlake Avenue, for four months.

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

022118.37 Federal Reserve Bank Building  
1015 Second Avenue  
Request for extension

Jack McCullough said they lost the planner at SDCI; he said they will have the final application to Ms. Sodr within a month. He said the MUP will be in six weeks or so.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Federal Reserve Bank Building, 1015 Second Avenue, for four months.

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

022118.38 Franklin Apartments  
2302 4th Ave  
Request for extension

Jack McCullough explained the MUP will be done in late summer; the owners are committed to develop. He said there is not a lot of change.

Ms. Barker asked the status of security of the building.

Mr. McCullough said the ground floor is sealed.

Ms. Patterson said there is activity in the upper floors whenever she walks by.

Ms. Barker said she didn't want it to turn into a problem.

Mr. McCullough said he would check on the security issue and contact Ms. Sodt.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Franklin Apartments, 2302 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, for four months.

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

022118.39 Mama's Mexican Kitchen Building  
2234 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue  
Request for extension

Jack McCullough explained the challenge of working with a small lot. He said they want to see what happens to the Wayne site because it may provide some assemblage.

Ms. Barker asked if it is occupied.

Mr. McCullough said the restaurant is, but he isn't sure about the rear portion.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Mama's Mexican Kitchen Building, 2234 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, for four months.

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

022118.310 Lloyd Building  
901 Stewart Street  
Request for extension

Jack McCullough said negotiation is going on and they are looking at development of the block; it is a small site and would be better as part of a large project. He asked for a four-month extension.

Ms. Barker asked if the ground floor is occupied.

Mr. McCullough said the restaurant is gone but the tower is still occupied.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Lloyd Building, 901 Stewart Street, for four months.

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

02218.311 White Garage  
1915 Third Avenue  
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained that the owners did a recent briefing and asked for four-month extension to explore alternative options per the board members' feedback.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the White Garage, 1915 Third Avenue, for four months.

MM/SC/JP/DB 7:0:0 Motion carried.

**022118.4 DESIGNATION**

022118.41 820 John Street

Jack McCullough said at nomination there were questions; David Peterson has provided supplemental materials. He said Mr. Peterson discovered this is not a curtain wall building. He said they are convinced it does not qualify as a landmark.

David Peterson. David Peterson Historic Resource Consulting, prepared and presented the report and supplemental materials (in DON file). He provided an overview of the previous nomination presentation. He provided context of the site and its history as it relates to the regrade and the first park in Seattle - Denny Park. He said there was slow development of the area in the 1950s; there was slow fill in with low-scale modern. He said this building was an addition to the adjacent building. He said it is not a curtain wall building; the vertical mullions actually support the weight. Examples of local curtain wall buildings include the Logan and Norton buildings.

He said there have been alterations to the building including replacement panel, doors have been replaced in kind, glazing replaced with vent, removal of man-door. He said the window tinting was applied in 1995 by tenants at the time. He said the building was included on previous historic reviews: in 1975 by Steinbrueck and Nyberg, who described the building as 'not significant to eh City or community'; in 2014 Krafft and Meissner identified the building as Modern Commercial Style, not curtain wall; and the building is not included on the 2011 South Lake Union EIS. Responding to board questions at the nomination meeting, he noted some extant 1950s-70s low scale

buildings with extensive glazing: Parks Department Headquarters, which he said should be a landmark; British Motor Car building, 127 Mercer, 901 Lenora, 301 Broadway, among others. He said this building is not significant and lacks the significant character and interest.

Mr. McCullough said there is less there than was originally thought; he agreed with Staff's recommendation not to designate.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Nick Carter sent a letter (in DON file) and said his firm has been a tenant in the building since 2004. He said it is steel frame, steel columns clad in aluminum, and not a curtain wall building. He said the building doesn't meet any of the standards. It is on a corner lot but does not have significant character or value. He said there is no reason to landmark it.

Michael Shreve, PB Architects, said the building does not meet the criteria and the base of the structure doesn't relate to the public realm.

#### Board Deliberation

Mr. Treffers supported designation. He appreciated the public comment and additional information provided by Mr. Peterson. He said in the post WWII development of South Lake Union, a shift occurred. He said you see that with Mid-century-designed buildings. He said there was a significant pattern of events in the City and this building is associated with that trend. He noted the value of rarity and said that 20 out of 35 of these buildings in the district have been demolished or are slated for demolition. He said of the remaining, 15 have been altered or are not great examples. He said these buildings illustrate a significant pattern of development in the City and there are very few of these left. He said the building has integrity – there are no substantial alterations. It has a higher level of design than others. He said the building embodies Modern Style architecture and has a higher level of design intent than others he has seen. He believes it has significance and integrity.

Ms. Johnson appreciated the supplemental information. She did not support designation. She said it is a nice building but is not the most distinctive in the City. She noted there has been lots of change in South Lake Union.

Ms. Patterson did not support designation. She said understands rarity of resource. She said she struggled with changed in the neighborhood and that it has lost its identity. She said she never considered South Lake Union a wealth of Modern or Post-War buildings, with the exception of the Seattle Parks Building. She said she struggled with the interest and value of this building. She said there was no public comment in support of designation.

Mr. Coney did not support designation. He said it was a speculative building and is not of great quality as the others shown in Mr. Peterson's report. He said there are better extant examples in the area around Seattle Center.



Ms. Barker said she supported nomination but that seeing other examples clarified things for her, and she would not support designation. She said it is invisible on a corner lot. She said it may have integrity, but it is not a particularly good design.

Ms. McKernan echoed Mr. Treffers' comments. She said it is unaltered; its grid is aesthetically pleasing. However, she said it doesn't rise to the standards; there are better examples that have been mentioned.

Mr. Kiel did not support designation and called the building 'unremarkable'.

Action: I move that the Board not approve the designation of the 820 John Street as a Seattle Landmark, as it does not meet the standards for designation, as required by SMC 25.12.350.

MM/SC/NM/KJ            6:1:0    Motion carried. Mr. Treffers opposed.

## **022118.5            BRIEFING**

022118.51            Century 21 Coliseum (Key Arena) / Bressi Garage  
305 Harrison Street / 226-232 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue North  
Briefing on proposed addition, alterations, and rehabilitation

Presentation in DON file. Following is an overview with board and public questions and comments.

Geoff Cheong, Populous, provided overview and context of the site.

Jill Crary, Seattle Center, said they will relocate the skatepark; it will remain in uptown/downtown area, close to transit. She said they are working with Parks and looking for potential sites.

Ms. Doherty asked Mr. Cheong to explain what the south parcel is.

Mr. Cheong said that it is in the block south of Thomas, south of the Bressi Garage. They have no development plans for that.

Rico Quirindongo said they are going back to Seattle Design Commission on March 15, 2018. He explained the design goals: be world-class; show stamina by providing successful and sustainable operation without relying on City funds; invite neighbors in through design and operations, level up; play a role in maintain and increasing vibrancy and relevancy of the Seattle Center; level up to further the City's Race and Social Justice Initiative through design, construction and operations; and, keep it moving to mitigate impacts of traffic from construction and events.

Develop a building scope that meets a minimum LEEDv4 - NC certification threshold:

- Design a new arena with solutions that deliver inviting spaces, optimize site adaptation, and conserve water and energy resources.
- Achieve both OVG's and Seattle Center's sustainability program goals.

- An innovative yet historical design that leaves a positive environmental legacy for the local community and surrounding neighbors.
- Continued integration of solutions with strategies and approaches regarding site, water, energy, materials and Indoor Environmental Quality and innovation.
- Serve as a pioneer in testing the new higher green building standard, becoming the first arena, stadium, or large-scale event venue to achieve LEEDv4 certification

Mr. Cheong said the expanded arena footprint will be below grade.

West elevation: went over elements original to 1962 structure. Propose to re-establish simple approach to ground plane, fully transparent; service doors infilled with curtain wall panels.

East elevation: went over element original to 1962 structure.

South elevation: went over elements original to 1962 structure. Proposed removal of elements and addition of atrium mass / element.

North elevation: went over elements original to 1962 structure. Proposed largely transparent façade.

Gareth Loveridge, Swift Company, went over historic 1962 site plan and 1965 post-fair renovation plan.

Mr. Cheong went over elements maintained during 1990's renovation. He noted the original glass was maintained. He said the tripods, buttresses, b-columns remain. He said a roof element was removed. He said the building maintained its historic mullion and muntin system. Re-glazing is proposed; it will maintain the frame but will have better consistency.

Mr. Loveridge went over arrival direction study; they are waiting to hear about location of the light rail station. He said the space to south of the arena will be new public space. 2<sup>nd</sup> and Thomas delivery site will be maintained. Thomas is a green street; Republican is a festival street. He said that except for one, legacy trees will be maintained. Internal trees will be removed. He identified on the rendering curbs that will be modified or closed. He said user diagrams demonstrate use of the site during daily, arena event, and festival uses.

Mr. Cheong said truck and vehicle access will be subterranean and will tunnel below the Bressi Garage. Bressi will be shored up during this work. He said they have made assumptions on the location of the footings.

Mr. Loveridge said there will be four points of egress, as indicated on page 32. He noted datum change, the new base elevation of 124'. The preferred site concept as shown on page 33, indicates new entrance at center part of the plaza. It consolidates objects, egress, intakes, ticket office; keeps perimeter elevation clear; moves cover over driveway entrance, one ADA ramp; keeps flat plane around building. He noted benefits of preferred plan:

- NW access ramp geometry from upper terrace at KEXP reduces impacts plaza and creates accessible route.

- Thomas Street Garage entry is minimized and is screened by the SE open space.
- South Plaza Atrium entrance.
- SE terrace corner is open and allows gathering at top of intersection with overlook.
- SE open space is porous and provides multiple access routes and spaces to use.
- SE egress and building is tucked under view deck to provide additional views into SE entry plaza.
- New structures and tree canopies frame / bracket South Plaza.
- SE and SW entries slip behind and under the existing roof line.

He went over site design views and noted potential programming possibilities: outdoor yoga, small scale performance, festival overflow, outdoor classroom, pick-up basketball hoops, farmer's market, pick-up ball hockey.

Mr. Quirindongo noted the lack of clarity of organization of elements. He said they will go back to define the exact borders that wrap the sound end. The footprint will become the organizing element and they will introduce an organized tree grid. They will not replicate the 1962 elements but will use them as an organizing principle. He said there will be program-driven but historic references as well.

Mr. Cheong said there several iterations of the atrium addition before arriving at the preferred concept. He said they reduced the length of the atrium and added south entry to reduce the scale of the other lobby. They exposed the corners of original roof structure; the slope percentages are symmetrical; there is 35-50% transparency over entries (page 52). He said a glass collar connects the atrium to the historic structure. He said they have used a light touch and there will be a 20'-10" alcove or reveal in between. He said they have eliminated some elements, and combined others (ticket office and egress stair). He said a view platform on the north courtyard will allow view inside. He said they will continue to study how to minimize height so that the historic structure stands out. He said the new construction will be respectful of the historic structure. He said the main concourse is below grade. On interior he said sport configuration allows patrons to perceive the roof volume through the grid. Acoustic curtains will be deployed for concerts.

Ms. Barker asked if there are legacy trees in the right of way or on the campus.

Mr. Loveridge said both; the trees on west and south are all in the right of way.

Ms. Barker asked about the queuing diagram.

Mr. Loveridge said it is just an overlay on diagram – a digital flaw.

Ms. Barker asked where the concessions are.

Mr. Cheong said to the left; they aren't shown yet.

Mr. Treffers asked if they are pursuing National Register tax credits.

Mr. Cheong said they are.

Ms. McKernan asked about the view of the atrium on page 58, is the diagonal element a change in plane?

Mr. Cheong said it is a subtle change in plane which allows internalizing two vestibules on the south. They are trying to keep the footprint of atrium to a minimum. They are folding the plane outward. He said the soffit is a metal panel.

Mr. Kiel asked if there is a truck and vehicle solution at Bressi Garage.

Mr. Cheong said they have studied extensively and there are operational challenges with twin tunneling.

Ms. Barker asked why the location for garage access is where it is.

Mr. Cheong said it is a sweet spot; Warren to the east becomes steeper. 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue is a high point and 150' of additional ramp would be needed. SDOT prefers no entry there; also, they are preserving the trees.

Mr. Quirindongo said SDOT directed them to move the entry off Warren.

Mr. Kiel asked if they'd considered a parking entry off 1<sup>st</sup> on the arena side.

Mr. Cheong said they studied it, but it is a pedestrian arrival point.

Mr. Loveridge said this location gives the smallest opening. 2/3 of people will be coming from the east – pedestrians, bus and monorail riders.

Mr. Coney asked about the window glass replacement.

Mr. Cheong said because of transformations over the years, there are discrepancies in what is there. He said new glazing will provide continuity with a new insulated glass unit to match original clarity and quality.

Mr. Coney said the windows are not going to match exactly with different angles.

Mr. Cheong said they will establish datum line to allow new elements below datum line. Everything above will match to historic material. He said the foundation wall extends beyond the curtain wall.

Public Comment:

John Savo, Seattle Design Commission, said the team has been responsive to their comments. He said they pulled in at the ends of the atrium to keep within the overall arena width. He noted they are tucking in beneath the roof. They are still concerned with garage entry on pedestrian street. He said they looked at eliminating or minimizing the driveway and noted concern with public realm. He said they can't combine the tunnel due to elevation differences. He said moving access to loading will change 1<sup>st</sup> Ave. He said what ultimately happens there is outside their project. He said to think about where the small pavilion buildings will go, what can be combined or

eliminated. They need to be transparent and of quality design. Overall he feels the team has been very responsive to date.

Neal Sofian, Pottery Northwest, said they hope to move back into the Bressi Garage. They are thinking about how they might better link to the renovated arena and be more oriented on the north side of the building. He said they are supportive of the project. He said they are looking at how they can tie arts capability to this.

#### Board Discussion:

Mr. Kiel said he likes the atrium addition – it is subservient, and the kinking of the glass is a modern expression. He noted they paid attention to the bracketing idea.

Ms. Patterson said it is a difficult building. She said the size, scale, tiny hyphen, and transparency are great; she said it is better than expected. She noted concern with all the objects popping up in the plaza but understands that the design team is working on it. She said the evolution is great, it is detailed and consideration for site impacts, entering, queuing. She loves that Bressi Garage will stay intact and have a tunnel below, but she did express concern for the garage entrance on the pedestrian street.

Ms. Johnson said ideally there would be no addition; too bad to lose the south curtain wall. But she said that given all the other things it is good with many positive moves; Bressi Garage will be saved, it is an interactive site, they are working toward making logical organization of objects. They are moving in a great direction.

Mr. Treffers said the team has been very responsive and the atrium is on the right track. He said looking from the south, angles follow roofline are successful. He said we are gaining that perspective back. He said they are providing something modern and giving back to historic character. He said the bracket / connector is successful. He said there are opportunities with the new glass to reference the original curtain wall in the rest of the building, maybe borrow from the proportions. He said to use shapes and forms from throughout the original site to inform the plaza organization. He said that optimally the garage entry would not be there on the south side of the block. He said to continue to explore ways to mitigate it; it is counter to the new connection path at the atrium's south entry.

Ms. Barker said the garage access on to a green street is not good design and should move as far east as possible. She said it is an insult to have it dump into a green street. She said they haven't tried hard enough to make it go away. She said putting a lid over it doesn't count. She doesn't want the garage entry there. She said there is a pinch point by the front door, and it is caused by the parking garage. She loves how they are putting viewing opportunities back into the building but need to show the reality – vendors, people in line at concession. She said the London Planes are not the best tree to use here, and to look outside the box. She said to look at coming in from 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue to access the underground parking and run route from there.

Mr. Kiel said he likes the soft idea of the trees at the south. He said to be relentless about the grid; edges on ground; it needs to be reinforced to be successful. He said to simplify the rest and consolidate objects. He would really like to see alternatives to the south garage entry. Could it be accessed from 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue North? He said he is not convinced that 2/3 of the people will come from the east.

Ms. McKernan suggested moving the parking entrance to the south east. She said a left turn onto Thomas creates a pinch point. She said to move the ticket office east and put transportation on the transportation side.

Mr. Coney likes the atrium addition. He likes the bracketed segregation from the original building and the respect shown to the historic building. He said the south elements are in flux. He said to build upon what Thiry did. He had concerns about proposed changes to the windows and said to respect the historic fabric and incorporate them as a style element. He appreciated the 'reality' slide. He said seeing the original building is good.

Ms. Barker said the buttress on south is obscured; she said it is seen on the inside.

Mr. Cheong said they are planning to put back the southeast corner as a concrete wall.

Ms. Johnson said it would probably be better to be glazing.

Mr. Cheong said they will check on historic tax credit requirements for this issue.

**022118.6 STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator