



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 611/16

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting  
City Hall  
600 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room  
Wednesday, October 19, 2016 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker  
Kathleen Durham  
Robert Ketcherside  
Kristen Johnson  
Aaron Luoma, Chair  
Jeffrey Murdock  
Julianne Patterson  
Matthew Sneddon

Staff

Sarah Sodt  
Erin Doherty  
Rebecca Frestedt  
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Jordon Kiel, Vice Chair  
Emily Vyhnanek

Chair Aaron Luoma called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

**101916.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

September 7, 2016

MM/SC/DB/KJ

7:0:1 Minutes approved. Mr. Ketcherside abstained.

**101916.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

101916.21 Columbia City Landmark District  
3810 S. Edmunds St.

## Proposed signage

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed tenant signage consisting of:

- One 2-sided blade sign (dimensions: 13”h x 29”w);
- Decorative panel to be installed on the wall adjacent to the entrance (dimensions: 72”h x 24”w); and,
- Vinyl lettering applied above the entrance (letters 10”h x 58”w).

Exhibits included photographs, plans and materials. She reported that the building was constructed in 1954. It is a non-contributing building located outside of the Columbia City National Register District. In February 2016 the Landmarks Preservation Board approved a Certificate of Approval for paint colors and awning fabric replacement. On October 4, 2016 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. The Committee recommended approval, as proposed.

Ms. Frestedt presented on behalf of the applicant, who was unable to attend the meeting; She explained the two-sided blade featuring the business name, Maleda Convenience Store, will attach to stanchion and a decorative panel will be attached to the wall to the right of the entrance. She said the sign will be Dibond material with vinyl decal. There will be lettering added above the entrance with the business name. The decorative panel will tell the history of coffee and the Ethiopian coffee ceremony.

Mr. Luoma said the panel is similar to a mural and asked if there is anything else like this in the district.

Ms. Frestedt said the closest thing is a large multi-panel mural on the south end of the district. She said the Columbia City Review Committee considered the panel to be art rather than a sign.

Mr. Murdock noted the sign attachment to the stanchion.

Ms. Frestedt said it is the same type of installation as the Columbia City Live Aboves across the street.

Mr. Ketcherside noted the creative use of the wall at entrance.

Mr. Luoma agreed and said there are no negative impacts.

Mr. Sneddon noted it is a non-contributing building.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signs located at 3810 S. Edmunds St., 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 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 & 10**

MM/SC/RK/JM8:0:0 Motion carried.

101916.22 Columbia City Landmark District  
4822 Rainier Ave. S.  
Proposed signage

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed tenant signage consisting of a single vinyl decal sign to be installed within the storefront window (dimensions: 2.5’ h x 3’w). Exhibits included photographs, plans and materials. The Rainier Valley State Bank building was constructed in 1922. It is a contributing building located inside of the Columbia City National Register District. On October 4, 2016 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. The Committee recommended approval, as proposed.

Applicant Comment:

Julie Andres, Alma, explained the proposed temporary use of the space. She said she important art from around the world. She said a sticker to identify the business will be placed on a scratchy spot on the wall. She said that both black vinyls will match. She said there is no lighting.

Ms. Barker asked if she would have signage for hours.

Ms. Andres said that she may use something handwritten to hand in the doorway or perhaps a small sandwich board. She said there are other signs like this in the district and what she does will provide continuity with the rest in the area.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Murdock said it is reversible and in character of the district.

Ms. Barker supported the application.

Mr. Luoma said it is simple and he had no issue with it.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for a sign located at 4822 Rainier Ave. S., as proposed. This action is based on the following:

The proposed sign meets 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 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.

- c. **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.

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

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

101916.23

Columbia City Landmark District

3835 S. Edmunds St.

Proposed garage demolition, fence removal and landscaping

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed retroactive request for approval for garage demolition and construction of a chicken coup, and proposed fence and pavement removal and the addition of landscaping in the back yard. Exhibits included photographs and plans. The one-story home was constructed in 1905. It is located outside of the Columbia City National Register District and within the local district. The period of significance for the National Register District is 1891-1937. Based on property tax records, it appears that the garage was constructed between 1921 and 1938. She reported that on October 4, 2016 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. The Committee supported the demolition of the garage and fence removal and did not voice objection to the chicken coup. The committee conditioned a recommendation for approval, on the addition of landscaping (provided that its mature height does not exceed 3') and/or paving to add a finished appearance to the back yard.

Brett Weimann said he mistakenly thought he could tear the building down. He said he tried to preserve it but it was in bad condition – the bottom was rotted out, the doors were rusted and fallen in, and the asphalt shingles had given way the roof rotted, and the entire structure was leaning. He said he may replace it in the future. He said they will plant lavender and rosemary on perimeter to create a barrier. He said he didn't know he had to get permission for the chicken coop. He said it is a cedar structure with TNG recovered from a nearby project; the roof is white corrugated material. He said the fence was installed before they moved in and was not reviewed; they want to remove it to allow visibility from property to property.

Ms. Frestedt said they want to remove the paved walkway and maintain gravel parking place with brick at edge to contain gravel.

Ms. Barker asked if the parking pad will remain.

Mr. Wiemann said it will.

Responding to questions Ms. Frestedt provided clarification of district boundary relative to this property. She noted that the alleyway is somewhat different from this portion where it shifts to a more residential look. She said the zoning also changes here.

Mr. Luoma asked if there is a historic garage in back of the white house to the east.

Ms. Frestedt said there is.

Mr. Sneddon said the house was built in 1905 and the garage was an addition in the 1930s.

Mr. Murdock asked about the window on the chicken coop.

Mr. Weimann said the window faces the alley; people like to look in and see the chickens.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker said the building was in sad shape – it has stood a long time.

Mr. Luoma said he was not too concerned. He said that if they decide to re-build the garage in the future it will be an opportunity to discuss the design. He said it was in poor condition and would be a big effort to restore. He said the chicken coop doesn't detract – it is obviously new. He said the rosemary and lavender hedge work until they decide on a future garage.

Ms. Barker suggested a garage / coop scenario.

Mr. Sneddon said it restores the view from original period.

Mr. Murdock said the garage is past rehabilitation.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for garage demolition, site alterations and landscaping located at 3835 S. Edmunds St., as proposed. Approved plantings shall not exceed 3' in height. This action is based on the following:

The proposed work meets the following sections of the District ordinance, the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards:

**Guidelines/General**

- 2. The District should be pedestrian-oriented on the street level.
- 5. The inventory of contributing buildings, spaces, historic uses, historic views and present uses should be respected and maintained.

**Guidelines/Specific**

**7. Street Use.** Any work that affects a street, alley, sidewalk, or other public right-of-way, shall be reviewed by the Review Committee and Board. Emphasis shall be placed on creating and maintaining pedestrian-oriented public spaces and rights-of-way. Street trees and other plant materials that add human enjoyment to the District shall be encouraged. Decorative treatments within the sidewalk, including special paving patterns and building entryway tiling shall be preserved. The use of alleys for services and public-oriented activities shall be encouraged.

**Secretary of the Interior's Standards**

2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

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

101916.23

National Building  
1018 Western Avenue  
Proposed business signage

The applicant explained the stainless-steel back fits in and is flush with the mullions. He said the painted channel letters protrude 2-3” and are pin mounted to the back; the light element is within. He said they will remove the existing cabinet which protrudes out 5-6”.

Mr. Murdock asked about the blocking.

The applicant said that blocking is not existing; when they remove the existing cabinet, they will determine the best way to do this. He said they will drill into the inner portions of mullions unless there is something behind the cabinet.

Mr. Murdock asked if the storefront was historic.

Ms. Sodt said she thought it had been altered.

The applicant said that all signage on the building is within same band.

Ms. Sodt said that this building is part of the First Avenue Group and most have that kind of signage band.

Mr. Murdock asked if they will have vinyl on windows.

The applicant said there will be.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Luoma said ARC reviewed this and had no major concerns.

Ms. Barker said she had wanted to see it in context. She suggested administrative review on attachment.

Mr. Luoma agreed.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for signage at the National Building, 1018 Western Avenue, as per the attached submittal pending Staff review of method of blocking following removal of existing sign cabinet.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed signage does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 111058 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/RK/DB 8:0:0 Motion carried.

101916.24

Maritime Building  
911 Western Avenue  
Proposed rehabilitation and addition

Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill Leary, introduced the project and said that with use of the view corridor they will end up with a better project. He said there had been tension with the Design Review board regarding the windows; he noted that they sent a letter to the DRB.

Andy Wattula said that it has been great working with the board.

Wyatt O'Dea, NBBJ, walked the board through the drawings (PowerPoint in DON file). He noted on the west elevation the clear glass and deck and top floor amenity. He said the building address will change as the main entry will flip to the Alaskan Way side. He said they propose to replace all wood sash windows to get them proportionally correct. He said that there will be 15' set backs off Western; 4' on the west, and 7'4" on the north and south sides. He said there will be new trees around the building and existing on Madison will be maintained. He said that new plantings on Alaskan will be done as part of the Waterfront project.

He said they will remove unnecessary debris from the building. He said that they will retain the north, east and south retail storefronts as they are. He said they will remove the 1970s tile from the east side. He went over proposed materials. He said that they have a 15' allowed on the west façade and will extend the dock out to the property line for a raised dining dock. He said the materials will be raw – concrete dock, exposed metal plate, galvanized grating rail. He noted the wire mesh railing and entry steel plate canopy that will extend into the interior. He said they propose repetition of steel trim on major bays and full steel to ground at ramp.

He said that they plan to keep the signage raw and gritty to maintain the historic character of the project; they are using historic typologies. He said they will bring back to life the corner Maritime signage and signage will go on three sides of the building and the west façade. He said the Maritime Building sign will be replaced with steel cut lettering with gentle backlight and pin mounted steel plate signage; letters are 9 – 12" tall. He said the building address will be on glass in vinyl. He said they provided a window survey.

Ms. Barker asked if there will be material below the trees that are to be planted.

Mr. O'Dea said there will be a continuous strip of low-grown plantings below the trees. He said the whole sidewalk is coming out and they will level the area.



Ms. Patterson asked if just the roll top at the store front level on the west elevation is coming out.

Mr. O’Dea said that on the west elevation they will remove all storefronts – they are deteriorating. He said there is detail in the packet on new storefronts and noted that is where the new steel surrounds are.

Mr. Luoma asked about the reveal bands.

Mr. O’Dea said it is a standing seam that pops out about 1” so we will really see those lines; it will add some texture.

Mr. Ketcherside expressed concern about what is under the Western sidewalk on the east side of the building.

Mr. O’Dea said they will know what is underneath when they remove it.

Ms. Barker asked if there are areaways beneath.

Mr. McCullough said there are voids.

Mr. Wattula said the street has settled around the building.

Mr. Sneddon asked about new window materials.

Mr. O’Dea said the propose aluminum frame windows; the frame dimension will be as close as possible to existing; muntins will not be true divided light.

Mr. Sneddon asked if they had explored wood windows.

Mr. O’Dea said they are extremely expensive and they couldn’t get the dimensions as close as they can with aluminum. He said the wood frame would have required a whole new structure.

Ms. Sodt asked if the windows proposed are the same as used at Union Stables.

Mr. O’Dea said aluminum clad wood are used there; he noted the window openings are smaller there.

Mr. Luoma asked about sequencing with the Viaduct project and dock construction.

Mr. Wattula said if they find they need to hold off they will otherwise they will move forward.

Ms. Sodt said that some of the Viaduct is to remain as public art and suggested applicants talk to the Office of the Waterfront.

Mr. Luoma said ARC has reviewed this project multiple times.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Murdock asked about the corner blade sign banner.

Mr. O'Dea said they are not proposing a banner.

Ms. Sodt said that building sign is proposed on top and on the corner but that is all at this point.

Mr. Wattula said they will come back with a retail signage package.

Ms. Barker said the signage is a lot calmer than the historic signage.

Mr. Murdock said that it has been a productive process and it is a great building.

Mr. Luoma said that it has been a great collaborative process and noted that the dock will be great.

Ms. Barker said it is nice. She noted that the Maritime Building is a known quantity and the signage will provide continuity for people when the viaduct comes down.

Mr. Sneddon said he was sorry that the windows won't be wood but he would be more concerned if they were 100% original. He said there is value in consistency.

Ms. Johnson said there is not much ornamentation on the building and the window pattern is important.

Ms. Barker said the nomination / designation story is fascinating. She said it would be great to get John Deer as a tenant.

Mr. Luoma said the addition is a success and is a complement to the existing building.

Ms. Patterson said it is a successful addition to the historic building and the process has been an easy one.

Mr. Murdock said it is a great precedent.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations, at the Maritime Building, 911 Western Avenue, as per the attached plans.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes 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 are compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.

2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

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

101916.25 McGilvra Elementary School  
1617 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue East  
Proposed cafeteria building

Amy Vanderhorst, Integrus Architecture, provided history and an overview of the site and school. She walked through the existing building and noted that the cafeteria will be turned back into a classroom, when the new cafeteria building is built. She said there will be new detention ponds and they will protect existing trees. She said the new cafeteria building will have two main rooms – a cafeteria and a kitchen – with toilets, vestibule, and a mechanical mezzanine above the kitchen that will be enclosed. She showed massing studies of the new building from different views.

She said the proposed materials are masonry brick down low and metal panels siding above. She said the metal panels will be a warmer color with thin metal profile. She said the white Hardie Panel will be used in recesses; if funds allow they will use Swiss Pearl in lieu of the Hardie product. She said the entry will be covered to create an area for use during rain.

Mr. Luoma asked if there will be lights in cove underneath ceiling.

Ms. Vanderhorst said there will be.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Barker said it is all good.

Ms. Johnson noted the two roll up doors and louvers that had changed and said she supported the application.

Mr. Luoma said the new building is removed from the historic buildings. He said it is a successful balance; the new is differentiated and complementary.

Mr. Murdock said there is a nice edge condition across from the historic building. He said it is an improvement to the site as a whole. He said it is a nice counterpoint.

Ms. Barker said she hopes the Swiss Pearl will be used.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the new cafeteria building at the McGilvra Elementary School, 1617 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue East, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed cafeteria building does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 124777 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/RK/JM 8:0:0 Motion carried.

### **101916.3 BRIEFINGS**

101916.31 Seattle Times Block  
1120 John Street  
Briefing on proposed development

Mr. Luoma explained that board frustrations about the building and its circumstances are outside the scope of this briefing. Board members were asked to provide good feedback and comments and to find means and ways to express frustration regarding the demolition outside of this meeting.

Ms. Sodt explained the Certificate of Approval process is separate from Controls and Incentives. She asked board members to focus on the briefing.

Jessica Clawson said that asbestos and other hazardous material abatement is done and interior demolition has started; brace frames will be going up shortly. They expect to be done with this part by spring.

Chris Dikeakos presented via PowerPoint (full report in DON file; following are board questions and comments). He said they are looking at historic preservation and increasing density. He explained they are looking at placement of the towers and provided five options they have explored with Option 5 as their preferred. He said in Option 5 they retain the park, and the Seattle Times office and the printing plant building façades. He provided a birds' eye view of the site with the proximity of the site and future development around.

Mr. Murdock asked which windows are historic and how they are dealing with them.

Mr. Dikeakos said that with the existing Seattle Times Office Building most are original and will be maintained as part of façade rehabilitation.

Mr. Murdock asked how they will be removed and protected.

Mr. Dikeakos said that they will have to be; they will be cleaned and replaced back again. He wasn't sure if any on the production facade are original. He said they look like the original windows so if replaced they match.

Ms. Sodt said that she believes the printing plant building windows have been replaced; she noted the owner drilled through them when they covered the windows with plywood. She said she believes that they are metal.

Mr. Dikeakos said the Office Building windows are original.

Mr. Murdock noted Option 1 and asked why they didn't show the option pushed both buildings all the way to the property line on the north side onto Thomas Street.

Mr. Dikeakos said that zoning does not allow two towers on the same façade and that each block face can take a single tower; that is why they are on opposite locations. He said that is why there are really just two options.

Ms. Clawson said the situation with the block face is not departable.

Mr. Murdock asked why they are shown as square blocks.

Mr. Dikeakos said it is just for massing and that they could be narrower and longer but the it could be too tight; they are trying to retain 80 – 100' separation between the two buildings. The diagonal in this location is above 90'.

Ms. Barker asked about zoning and allowable height.

Mr. Dikeakos said they are designing to allowable height, not below. He said that there are no departures.

Dave Embers said that the heights that are shown here are assuming that a text amendment associated with retaining that park goes through and also assuming that the HALA legislation goes through.

Ms. Barker asked if the proforma is based on need of four towers – you can't do this project with three because the site to the south of this is part of this.

Mr. Dikeakos said yes.

Ms. Barker asked if it would pencil at three towers.

Robert Duke said it would not pencil with three. He said the capacity of the site was identified in two pieces not as a whole. Each city block was identified as its own individual component. Although they came together they are two individual parcels and addressed individually. He said they are owned independently and a MUP has been issued for the south site.

Ms. Barker said they were sold as dual sites with potential for two towers per.

Applicant said that is correct.

Ms. Barker questioned that it can't pencil out with just one tower on the site with either a fatter tower that this the height they need.

Mr. Dikeakos said maximum floor plate in the zone of 12,000 square feet.

Mr. Luoma asked if the floor plate is maximized with long rectangular single building.

Mr. Dikeakos said there is nothing that dictates what shape the 12,000 square feet needs to be.

Someone mentioned it is 10,500 square feet.

Mr. Dikeakos concurred it is 10,500 square feet.

Ms. Clawson explained proposed improvements at John Street that include an open to the public at all times areas. She said that Terry Street is a festival street.

Mr. Embers said they are working to get John Street designated a festival street as well.

Mr. Luoma said there is a depiction of two 400' towers at the corner that appear very close together; he asked how that was permitted.

Ms. Clawson noted that John Street was vacated and ends here and noted that one of the towers is not technically on John Street. She said that one is a development by a company called H5 and the other is a company called Mac Urban previously Harbor Urban. She said they had to get a departure for width for tower spacing; she said she thought it was down to 25' at the lower level and 30 – 40' at the top. She said they are very close together, not a great urban situation. She said that one tower fronts on Terry and you couldn't have another block or tower on this block.

Mr. Luoma asked what the set back from the right of way is required to consider that it is not facing or fronting in terms of having multiple towers perceived as being on one street.

Ms. Clawson said that they don't have to be far from John Street from a setback standpoint. She said the upper setbacks from John St. is 45' because it is a view corridor; it has an incredible view to the Space Needle and so does Thomas Street. She said that in the zoning code the view corridors are set. Because we don't front on John or the Mac Urban Tower we are in what used to be John Street previously. She said they tried to shift back to respect the view corridor.

Mr. Luoma asked how close to one of the propose towers could be to Thomas or Boren and not consider fronting it.

Ms. Clawson said whatever the front lot line is your block face. If have a tower fronting Boren then know you can't have a tower there. She said she wasn't sure how that would be determined but in terms of block face it is strict and can't be changed. She said she could get that answer.

Mr. Luoma said it would be interesting to know – it may help justify one option or another.

Ms. Clawson said she would get the answer for him.

Ms. Barker asked the distances between the two corners of the towers.

Ms. Clawson said for their planning purposes it is 80 – 100'; she said that is their base. She said the code is just 60'.

Responding to questions Mr. Dikeakos said 80' is depicted in drawings.

Ms. Patterson asked if the towers could be moved so that the westernmost tower is at the corner of Thomas and Boren and the other one that abuts the office – there is at least a gap there.

Mr. Dikeakos said in the last iteration they have 15' separation between that tower right behind the office building and that becomes a public walkway.

Ms. Patterson asked if they could move the towers up and keep the same diagonal distance.

Mr. Dikeakos said he thought the northern tower is already at its maximum setback line.

Ms. Clawson said there is a 45' setback on Thomas.

Mr. Dikeakos said it is pulled as far as it could be.

Ms. Sodt asked for clarification on Mr. Luoma's question.

Ms. Clawson said at what point this becomes a block face on Boren versus a tower facing Fairview which is okay. She said it has to face on Fairview so how far can you shift it west before it becomes into the Boren territory.

Ms. Sodt said that is a good question to get answered.

Ms. Barker and Mr. Ketcherside suggested looking at how far centrally the towers can be moved and still keep the view corridors.

Mr. Sneddon asked if there would be any relief if the massing for the north tower had a wider pedestal and then it staggered back to respect view corridors. He asked if the view corridor is from the base or is there a height limit.

Ms. Clawson said it is up to where the podium starts.

Ms. Barker asked if there is a defined height on the podium.

Mr. Dikeakos said there is – a maximum height for the podium and then the tower has to step back that 45'.

Ms. Clawson said she will look up code.

Ms. Barker asked the maximum height for the podium

Mr. Dikeakos said 65' on that side.

Public Comment:

John Pearson, Mirabella resident, said he was in favor of Option 1. He said they are not lackeys for the developer. He said they are a small building surrounded by

towers. He said the zoning is what it is and they want to make it as best they can. He said his preference retains the Seattle Times employee park and will provide an appropriate and nice setting for the historic building. He said that Option 2 creates too much density; putting all towers in one corner is inappropriate.

Louise Miller, Mirabella resident, noted the beauty of the Art Deco building that doesn't look like that anymore. She said people have been occupying the building and there have been fires and graffiti. She did not want to lose their view corridor to the Space Needle. She said a grocery store is needed in the building and that this is the only developer who is willing to do that. She suggested putting a grocery store below street level. She said John Street should be a green street.

Ms. Sodt noted that the board does not have purview over use.

Brooke Best, Historic Seattle, said that to meet Secretary of Interior Standards #9 a lot of work needs to be done. She said to try to squeeze two high rise buildings around historic buildings is a challenge. She said she prefers the towers be moved away. She said the massing and scale need a lot of finessing to respect the historic character of the site.

Mr. Luoma explained that the board does not have purview over use, just the exterior of the building. He said comments should focus on massing on the proposed towers.

Ms. Barker said she was excited about Option 2. She said that from an urban design perspective they have taken open space and given it breathing room and given the worker park the park presence and standing and the ability to be seen and to see other areas. She said it creates with the four towers a crescent and a balance going with the two blocks. She said there is a crescent of strength and intensity that supports the green space in front and gives residents to the east more space to look at. She supported Option 2 from strictly a massing perspective. She supported any movement of the southwest tower further north. She noted the adjacency of towers in Vancouver BC and how that adds to vibrancy of standing on a balcony. She supports the view corridor having the southwest tower moved as far north as possible. She said she doesn't have comments right now on windows or anything else.

Mr. Murdock said he want the options where they are using minimum diagonal spacing. He said there is a lot of opportunity to come off the printing plant side rather than being quite so close to the façade on the east elevation. He preferred Option 2, has further separation between towers and they could bring the other tower back so it is off the corner and off the printing press building. He said that Option 1, the west side of the office building will be another exposure of that building that they don't have now so your investigations and study will be important for the board to understand how to tie the historic façade on the south side around the corner. He wants to see more variations and shape of tower to come off the historic buildings more and maybe have a little more interesting open space and the way they are interacting on the large site. He said there is an opportunity to do more; it would be good for the board to see a longer building if that is possible rather than two square towers that are just shuffling around.

Mr. Sneddon applauded the team on the separation of the office building and trying to preserve it as a whole. He said where it seems like the SOI standards for massing



and scale that seems to be the biggest hang ups for some of the projects in the downtown area. He said it is easier to handle that question when the buildings are separate from towers. He said the board has gone through several projects where somebody tries to just stick a tower on top of a historic building. He said the spirit of the SOI is to keep the scale and massing of historic building and there are cities across the world where you have historic buildings next to giant towers. He said it is a little bit easier prospect if you are dealing with scale and mass if you are able to get some separation. He said he realizes they have certain restrictions in terms of setbacks and view corridors. He said that mass and scale are important. He said they have done well with the office building; he said it is a bit different project than seen elsewhere.

Ms. Patterson said speaking strictly on the tower placement she prefers Option 2. She echoed Mr. Murdock and said to see if the towers could be closer together or even to bump north, south or see a few other options. She said from a scale standpoint they are way off. She said she appreciated that there is no tower on top of the office building. She said the addition and the tower on printing plant is way out of scale of the historic facade and they need to come down a bit. She said it will be interesting to see if they can get the height elsewhere on the project but the podium and tower on the printing plant is just too large.

Ms. Durham said the scale overall is way too big and is disrespectful of buildings and their character. She said she can't decide between Options 1 and 2 – but they both dominate these buildings. She said she appreciated any effort to remove the towers or push away from historic buildings. She said there are too many towers sitting on top of historic buildings.

Mr. Ketcherside agreed with Mr. Sneddon and having the office building separated is an important first step. He said the aerial perspectives on pages 19 and 22 properly capture the important corner of this block at John and Fairview; it is where the landmark is. He said he wondered about the back corner whether that needed to be captured; it is a dead end street so it is not the focal point of the block. He said he prefers Option 2 because it emphasizes that corner. He said the number of towers on John Street is scary. He said he lived in the area when the Mirabella was built – it was the behemoth at the time and now it calls itself the small building in the neighborhood. He said at the next step street level views are super important to understand how the proposals interplay with the landmark building / façade and how they feel at a human scale. He said if possible to take Option 2 and push the southwest tower north; every foot along John Street probably would have a positive impact. He said there have been massive projects with nearby landmarks that we've come to compromises we felt okay with; he said the Troy block is looked unfavorably by a lot of people because of the overall massing of the new structure – there are a lot of other circumstances that come to play with the site. He said when they get to more design – finish not to forget that this was the Seattle Times site – to incorporate whatever elements of Seattle Times and ideas of news. He noted the interesting dynamic of the area now being a tech hub and center of Seattle's information economy. He said the Seattle Times used to provide information to people; it used to have phone lines that were open that anyone could dial into and ask whatever question you had and they would provide answer. He said there is someone about the sharing of information that the Seattle Times has done over its entire life in Seattle and then – maybe no Amazon directly but Amazon provides backend services

that are being used by all kinds of business. He said that clocks are his thing and the Seattle Times Square building – the previous home of Seattle Times – used to have a time ball on top of it. He said it would drop at noon every day and tell people the time. He said there is a tiny homely clock on the current building. He suggested incorporating something about time, and there are a number of historic clocks around the region that need to be saved.

*Mmes. Durham and Barker left at 6:00 pm.*

Ms. Johnson noted pages 19 – 22 that the park and the building across the street will feel like the heart of the place. She said that she wants to push everything away from that space. She preferred Option 2 and similarly said to push the tower adjacent to the building toward Thomas. She said she needs to see from a street perspective. She said the scale compared to the historic building is out of whack but compared to what is happening in the rest of the city it does not. She said to keep circulation around at least part of the office building is nice.

Mr. Luoma said it will be helpful to have a plan diagram that overlays zoning, view corridors, setbacks, front block; that will help in understanding how they are constrained in placement. He said to be more creative than squares – explore other floor plates besides squares and what they are allowed to do within constraints. He said different shapes will lend themselves to better opportunities than just squares. He said to explore Option 2 further; have fun and have them completely off the landmarks. He said that doesn't seem possible to date except for maybe one tower. He said the remaining tower that may have to intersect with one of the landmarks particularly the printing press – what can you do at the corner of Thomas and Fairview so that it is not just a square that drops in on top. He said to see how they can angle that, change its shape so that you see more of the return of the historic printing press so you understand the scale of what that building was better than just have a giant pencil sticking up from the ground. He said the relationship to other towers that are proposed, even what they are doing on the southern parcel, it is really difficult to grab on to because the board has no purview over other towers and whether they are built or not; the applicants don't either for projects that are not theirs. He said the board can't respond to 'what ifs'. He said the board can only respond to this site and what happens here with these two historic buildings. He said it would be unfortunate to have towers really close together but if we are all racing together hopefully there can be respect and compromise among parties to have towers placed in better spots.

Mr. Murdock said to not lose track of scale of the pedestal as well – an eight story building that is like a city block in size; he said we are focused at the towers but really to look at the scale of the pedestal and to look at how it modulates with the landmark is important. He said to look at pedestrian experiences is important than just the aerial view with all the towers in the city. He said understanding what parts of the landmark we are actually going to see from the street and how it is relating the new buildings. He said an eight story building just behind a four story building seems pretty huge. He said that kind of focus as well as the south side is another really large building which is essentially ringing the entire block. He said to look at the south side. He said while we are focusing on the towers is it also important to see the scale further down the elevation.

Ms. Luoma said related to that in terms of massing and scale the substantive nature of the printing press and even somewhat of the Times building as an anchor. He said we have seen additions of a few stories – one, or two or three – above these types of large concrete buildings like this that have been successful. He said it is feasible to do and have respect for the buildings below because there is a proportion that doesn't seem to be skewed but then the tower coming up from it – is what really throws them off.

David Evans (Onni) said we came here and want to continue this process in the spirit of cooperation and aesthetic compromise. He said there is certainly a lot of water under the bridge some to the negative. He said that there are a lot of positive merits that have been made up until about a year ago working with your ARC and yourselves. He said we want to continue with that as best we can and we are looking at great opportunities with local artists of saving the actual printing presses within the plant building right now as part of this demolition goes on so they can become part of a public art component within the park and some of the other spaces that we will continue to work through. He said the dynamic from our perspective and you have yours which I respect just so you understand ours is that we have mass to work within but because of the way the zoning which we must follow as will you we don't have the ability to push stuff one place and put it somewhere else. He said we are talking about density and mass so we are bound by these guidelines that above us all. He said such that we just need to try to take your commentary which we are respecting preservation of the historic nature of these buildings and find a way that we can move forward without just taking away. Every time we have taken a negative away it with reference to density or mass it has an effect until such time and because of city rules and what have you we can't just put it somewhere else. He said if we just said 'ok we'll just put it on the top because it will be far away from everything and we can respect it in that way so I don't always want to feel like you guys say things and then we try to take that and give you a third or half or 20% of what you want but in perspective we are just trying to take the commentary that we are hearing and still make it work from our perspective and try to respect what you are saying. He said I don't it to be like we are in this 'push / pull' game which kind of we are. He said we are listening to what you are saying and we are trying to take it to heart and trying to bring it back.

Ms. Clawson said that Mr. Luoma's comment of telling the logic of what we are doing from a zoning perspective, this is what we can and can't do – that will be really helpful.

Mr. Luoma added and what of those things are departable.

#### **101916.4                    CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

101916.41                    Seattle Times Building - 1947 Office Building Addition  
1120 John Street

Jessica Clawson explained the request for a three-four month extension and noted they could provide monthly updates.

Ms. Patterson suggested granting an extension to the first meeting in December.

Mr. Luoma said if there are updates about parameters to bring those to the board.

Mr. Murdock was okay with granting extension.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Seattle Times Building – 1947 Office Building Addition, 1120 John Street, until the first meeting in December 2016

MM/SC/RK/JM 6:0:0 Motion carried.

101916.42 Seattle Times Building - Printing Plant  
1120 John Street

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Seattle Times Building – Printing Plant, 1120 John Street, until the first meeting in December 2016.

MM/SC/RK/JM 6:0:0 Motion carried.

101916.43 White Motor Co. Building  
1021 E. Pine Street

Ms. Clawson explained the request for an extension to the second meeting in February 2017 and noted they are planning to come back to ARC before they go to the Design Review Board.

Ms. Sodt said that the board has not seen design yet.

Mr. Luoma said there is some progress to be made.

Ms. Sodt said they have come back consistently.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the White Motor Co. Building, 1021 E. Pine Street, until the second meeting in February 2017.

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

101916.44 Kelly-Springfield Motor Truck Co. Building  
1525 11th Avenue

Ms. Clawson explained the request for an extension to the second meeting in February 2017 and noted they are planning to come back to ARC before they go to the Design Review Board.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Kelly-Springfield Motor Truck Co. Building, 1524 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue, until the second meeting in February 2017.

MM/SC/RK/JM 6:0:0 Motion carried.

101916.45 Maritime Building  
911 Western Avenue

Ms. Clawson explained the request for an extension to the second meeting in February 2017 and noted they are planning to come back to ARC before they go to the Design Review Board.

Ms. Sodt said that they would have a signed agreement soon.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Maritime Building, 911 Western Avenue, until the second meeting in February 2017.

MM/SC/RK/JM 6:0:0 Motion carried.

**101916.5 APPOINTMENTS**

101916.51 Sand Point Naval Air Station Landmark District  
Appointment of five new members for the Application Review Committee

Ms. Doherty explained that Sand Point Naval Air Station Landmark District is getting its own architectural review committee that would operate similar to Columbia City Review Committee. She explained that term limits are staggered so all terms aren't up on the same year.

Mr. Luoma said it is a good group and the district is in good hands.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the appointment of Stephen Lee to the Sand Point Application Review Committee for a 2-year term ending October 19, 2018.

MM/SC/KJ/RK 6:0:0 Motion carried.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the appointment of Christine Howard to the Sand Point Application Review Committee for a 1-year term ending October 19, 2017.

MM/SC/KJ/RK 6:0:0 Motion carried.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the appointment of Mitch Cameron to the Sand Point Application Review Committee for a 2-year term ending October 19, 2018.

MM/SC/KJ/RK 6:0:0 Motion carried.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the appointment of Tom Ansart to the Sand Point Application Review Committee for a 1-year term ending October 19, 2017.

MM/SC/KJ/JM 6:0:0 Motion carried.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the appointment of Brooke Best to the Sand Point Application Review Committee for a 2-year term ending October 19, 2018.

MM/SC/KJ/RK 6:0:0 Motion carried.

**101916.6 STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator