



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 724/16

### MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting  
City Hall  
600 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room  
Wednesday, December 7, 2016 - 3:30 p.m.

#### Board Members Present

Deb Barker  
Robert Ketcherside  
Jordon Kiel, Vice Chair  
Kristen Johnson  
Aaron Luoma, Chair  
Jeffrey Murdock  
Julianne Patterson  
Matthew Sneddon  
Emily Vyhnaneck

#### Staff

Sarah Sodt  
Erin Doherty  
Rebecca Frestedt  
Melinda Bloom

#### Absent

Kathleen Durham

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

#### **120716.1**

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

October 19, 2016, November 2, 2016, November 16, 2016  
Deferred.

*Mr. Kiel arrived at 3:32 pm.*

**120716.2 SPECIAL TAX VALUATION**

120716.21 Bon Marche/Macy's Building  
300 Pine Street

Ms. Sodt explained that the valuation represents exterior work, seismic retrofit, and changes to create upper floor lobbies; she noted that this is Phase 1. She said that submitted and eligible costs were \$ 35,204,019.00; there were not disallowed costs. Percentage value of rehabilitation was 945.4%. She said that work for designated portions of the property was performed in conformance with a Certificate of Approval issued by the Landmarks Preservation Board.

Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill Leary, talked about phasing of the project and the intent to bring the entire building to current design standards. He explained that they condo-ized the building.

Paul Brenneke noted they took out the roasting vent at the café space after hearing board comments. He went over work done thus far.

Mr. McCullough said that Macy's remains open during work.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board members determined they had enough information to make a decision.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: Bon Marche/Macy's Building, 300 Pine Street, that this action is based upon criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; that this property has been substantially improved in the 24-month period prior to application; and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Landmarks Preservation Board and the owner.

MM/SC/DB/RK            9:0:0   Motion carried.

120716.22 International Special Review District  
665 S. King St. – Louisa Hotel

Ms. Frestedt explained that submitted and eligible costs were \$1,054,338; there were no disallowed costs. She said that the percentage value of rehabilitation was 1054 %. She said that work performed received approval from the International Special Review District Board.

Tanya Woo said this is Phase 1 of two. She said this phase focused on stabilization and the next will focus on construction and preservation of the non-damaged side of the building.

Ms. Barker asked about bracing used.

Ms. Woo said that there is a shear wall behind the King Street façade, wall ties from wall to floor, and metal bracing holds up the alley wall.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Luoma thanked the owner for the work.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: Louisa Hotel, 665 S. King St. This action is based upon the criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; and based upon the recommendation of the International Special Review District Board which made the following findings at its meeting of November 22, 2016; and that the property is a contributing building located in the International Special Review District, and has not been altered in any way that adversely affects those features that identify its significance or contribution to the International Special Review District; and has substantially improved in the 24-month period prior to application, and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Local Review Board as required by Title 84 RCW, Chapter 449.

MM/SC/RK/JP 9:0:0 Motion carried.

### **120716.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

120716.31 Harvard-Belmont Landmark District  
1065 Summit Avenue East  
Proposed tree removal and replacement

Ms. Sodt explained the proposed removal of two pine trees and replacement with one Ginko biloba and one Calocedrus.

Mr. Luoma explained that the review committee met with the applicants and owner. He said that one tree is diseased and it has spread through root system to adjacent tree. He said the trees are within SDOT right of way; SDOT was part of the review process. He said that both proposed trees are acceptable species and size.

Public Comment:

Jerry Tone and Martha Wycoff, homeowners, said that Aaron had summarized the application well and had nothing further to add.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Ketcherside said they are good quality replacement trees.

Ms. Barker and Mr. Luoma concurred.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board issue a Certificate of Approval for removal of two Black Pine trees, one of which is a dead tree, and replant with one new Ginko biloba and one Calocedrus tree. Adjustment to the location of the street trees, number of street trees and substitution of the species of tree is allowed as approved by Board staff in consultation with the Board's Landscape Architect and the City Urban Forestry Office.

The proposed exterior alterations meet the following sections of the District ordinance and The Harvard Belmont District Guidelines:

District Ordinance

The proposed landscaping plans as presented Dec 7, 2016 do not adversely affect the special features or characteristics of the district as specified in SMC 25.22.

The other factors of SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable

The Harvard Belmont District Guidelines

3. Landscaping:

Guideline: Maintain existing landscaping, especially the mature trees.

Guideline: Maintain the alignment and spacing of street trees. Planting street trees where none now exist is encouraged. Existing street trees are important and pruning should be done only in a professional manner to maintain the trees health and to retain the natural form.

Guideline: Keep the space between sidewalk and street as a green planting space maintaining the same width wherever possible. Ground covers may be used in place of grass. Do not use crushed rock, concrete or similar materials as the major surface material.

Secretary's Standards for Rehabilitation

5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.

MM/SC/RK/JP 9:0:0 Motion carried.

120716.32

Georgetown Steam Plant

Northwest of King County / Boeing Air Field

Proposed banner sign

Rebecca Ossa, Seattle City Light (SCL), provided an historic overview of the Steam Plant and noted that the metal panel wall to receive the banner is a “sacrificial” wall that was constructed to allow for future expansion / generators or to blow out to protect building.

Julianna Ross, SCL, explained the proposed banner will identify the building from I-5.

Ms. Ossa said that they looked at options following the ARC meeting where the idea of painting it on was raised. She said they are in the middle of a huge rehabilitation – windows, roof, weatherization, concrete repairs to exterior – and said that painting the building is not a practical option now. She said they looked at the pipe rail and bracket system which would require more holes. She said the cable and eye hook system is the best option; she showed an example from another location. She said the banner is high up and the bolts will not be very visible. She said they will use existing holes and noted they will need to install at vertical studs.

Ms. Vyhnanek asked if the yellow font is intentional.

Ms. Ross said it is – they want visibility.

Mr. Luoma asked for clarification on timeline.

Ms. Ross said it is the 110<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the plant; the banner is warranted for one year but could last five.

Public Comment:

Gregory Bader asked if they looked at epoxy embedment for bolts.

Ms. Ossa said they did not.

Mr. Luoma said ARC reviewed and the applicants responded well to comments about bolts, penetrations and visibility.

Ms. Barker appreciated the close-up photos of holes etc. and impacts to the building. She said they are justified in why they are doing it and how.

Ms. Ossa said they will install bolts 24” on center per sign contractor.

Ms. Johnson said the black and white option would be nice but that she had no strong preference.

Mr. Luoma said it is temporary.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed banner sign on the Georgetown Steam Plant, northwest of King County / Boeing Air Field, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed sign does not adversely affect the features or characteristics as specified in Ordinance No. 111884, 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/DB/JM 9:0:0 Motion carried.

120716.33 Wallingford Center / Interlake School  
4416 Wallingford Avenue N. / 1815 North 45<sup>th</sup> Street  
Proposed exterior lighting

Brian Estes, GMR explained the lighting upgrade is to meet Washington State ATM lighting requirements and there will be as little impact as possible. He went over proposed fixtures.

Ms. Doherty said the original proposal added more poles to meet standard, and she asked for a solution that didn’t add more poles. She said the applicant was responsive to this suggestion, and also adjusted the lamping kelvin to be a warmer color.

Brian said they are adding a couple fixtures on ATM but no new poles.

Ms. Barker asked about the State law about ATM lighting.

Brian said 0' – 5' from ATM must be ten foot candles; 5' – 50' must be a minimum of two foot candles. He said they are meeting and exceeding the requirement.

Ms. Barker asked about the bright – dark contrast.

Brian said he does this across country and they don't control anything outside of their space. He said they have not done any studies beyond the area of the ATM.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Kiel said it is far away from the building, and it is for improved safety. It is not ideal but it avoids adding poles.

Ms. Barker said she was concerned that the back is lit up more than is warranted, but that it doesn't affect the landmark.

Mr. Luoma said there is minimal impact to the landmark.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed site lighting at the Wallingford Center, 4416 Wallingford Avenue North, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed lighting does not adversely affect the features or characteristics as specified in the Report on Designation (LPB 100/81), 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/JM/KJ 9:0:0 Motion carried.

120716.34 E.C. Hughes Elementary School  
7740 34<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW  
Proposed exterior and interior alterations

Mr. Kiel recused himself.

Paul Wight, Seattle Public Schools, introduced the project to give the building a facelift.

Rico Quirindongo, DLR thanked the ARC for guidance. Presentation was via PowerPoint (full report in DON file).

Ariel Mieling said the front facades of the 1929 and 1949 buildings are well-preserved. She went over controlled areas of the building and areas of focus for the project. She explained that the main entry corridor would be enclosed to create a vestibule to address safety and security concerns. She said they will replace non-original vinyl flooring with carpeted walk-off mat. She said that clay tile lobby walls will be taken down and they will salvage original doors. She said the general form will be the same but they will replace lighting, add suspended gypsum ceiling – existing cornice to remain; reuse salvaged doors, create a health clinic. She showed a Naramore proposal as inspiration for relites into administrative area. She said they will frame in with wood salvaged from other parts of the building. She said that new vestibule doors will be installed in archway between sets of consoles. She said they will cut the new wood frame around the cornice; this work will be removable.

Mr. Wight noted that the vestibule is needed for security.

Ms. Mieling explained that the meeting room will be the cafeteria. They will infill the door on the left side of the west wall to allow more usable wall space in the kitchen beyond. She said they will keep the coiling wood doors but the counters will need to be wrapped with metal to meet health code. She said they will wrap key areas in stainless steel. She said another grill will be added to the south wall. She went over exterior elements and said that windows installed in 1971 are aluminum frame and will be replaced with a Pella window (aluminum clad wood) with a simulated muntin. She said unnecessary conduit on the building exterior will be removed. She said an exterior service ramp will be added to the north elevation and they will preserve as much railing as possible and still bring it up to code. She said they will use vertical steel cable rail with square steel bar. She said they will add a guard rail extension to the original rail.

Mr. Quirindongo explained the details of how they will do this.

Ms. Mieling said they will use geo-foam to separate the building from poured in place concrete – it is reversible and will not harm the façade. She said the new ramp will be 6” from the building; 6” will be filled with expansion joint. She said there is no original exterior lighting on the building. She said they will replace those at every door and will add a few more fixtures. She said there will be a junction box at each light with 1/2” conduit going through the mortar joint. She said the fixtures will be wall-mounted and surface mounted under soffit; fixtures will blend in with surface at main entry.

Mr. Quirindongo said they will reuse existing opening in the terracotta.



Mr. Luoma said that ARC reviewed this.

Mr. Sneddon asked about details for glazing, framing in entrance corridor.

Ms. Mieling said they are in the Certificate of Approval packet and said they are taking from original wood details for the materials and frame.

Mr. Wight said that they are reusing wood from elsewhere in building.

Mr. Luoma said he was a bit concerned about no proposed muntins in vestibule area but said the rest matches closely.

Ms. Mieling said they wanted to make it clear that this was not part of the original building. She said when they remove the clay tiles they will remove ceiling tiles that are glued on.

Responding to questions Mr. Wight said they are not doing a dropped ceiling in the vestibule area to brighten it up.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Luoma said ARC reviewed the proposal and had no major concerns.

Mr. Murdock supported the application and said the applicants followed the spirit of discussion with ARC regarding the windows, ramp, railing and interior details.

Mr. Luoma said the biggest improvement is to the south side with the window replacement.

Mr. Murdock said the double corbel is unusual and this seemed like the best solution.

Ms. Barker said the north façade morphed to a nice addition; she appreciated the attention to composition of the façade.

Mr. Ketcherside noted the necessity of the changes to the entry and appreciated that they looked at the original design. He said the archway is still a transition point but now they have a hard door. He said it is good that it is removable.

Mr. Sneddon said he was troubled that one of the few protected spaces is being altered. He said to keep the door in the lunch room even if it is not used it is a marker of past design.

Ms. Vyhnanek liked how they drew on Naramore's historical design to administrative space. She said she would like to see muntins because it just seems too open without them.

Ms. Doherty asked applicants if they could keep the door and build a wall behind.

Mr. Quirindongo said yes.

Ms. Barker supported that.

Mr. Luoma said he supported that but felt that the significant feature was the volume.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed interior and exterior alterations at E.C. Hughes Elementary School, 7740 34<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed interior and exterior alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics as specified in the Report on Designation (LPB 433/15), 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/DB 7:1:1 Motion carried. Mr. Sneddon opposed; Mr. Kiel recused himself.

#### **120716.4 NOMINATION**

120716.41 Mama's Mexican Kitchen  
2234 2nd Avenue

Jack McCullough, McCullough, Hill, Leary, explained that nomination is part of the MUP process and they did not support nomination.

David Peterson, NK Architects, prepared and presented the nomination report (full report in DON file). He provided context of the neighborhood and site in

Belltown. He provided an overview of the history and early development of the neighborhood; he noted an early land claim by the Bell family. He said that Belltown was separated from the south part of the city by Denny Hill and he noted the area was regraded by 1906 which allowed easier travel between the two parts of the city. He said that in 1923 Henry Schuett bought and developed the property which was zoned as commercial. He said that George Stoddard designed the building; he was also married to one of the Schuett daughters.

Mr. Peterson said the 60' x 108' URM building has a post and beam interior, flat roof, three structural bays along the west elevation and six along the north. He said the west storefronts housed individual stores behind which was one large open space. He said that there have been various tenants over the years but noted the corner location has always been a restaurant. He said that Mama's Mexican one of the earliest Mexican restaurants in the city, occupied the corner space and at one point took over the entire front. He said that the smaller commercial businesses such as accounting or textile studio were typical of the way Belltown developed over time. He said that in 1930s Belltown developed and through the Depression and pre-wartime era there wasn't a lot of construction and it started to go downhill; then there was a decline in building stock into the 1960s. It was zoned a General Commercial area in which housing was discouraged in the 1960s. He said there was more development in the area in the late 1970s and 1980s; the area had been a supporting neighborhood for downtown and at this time the empty multi-use spaces were adapted into bars and clubs which revitalized the neighborhood. He said there was a wide variety of housing, entertainment, shops and retail.

He said that no permits were found for changes to the west three bays and he noted the center bay was completely redone. He said the transoms are intact as are the arrangement of the entries on the 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> bays. He said that the north wall is a demising wall and an additional demising wall is between the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> bays. He said that the back area is currently a gym that is only two bays wide now. He said the original doors were moved to the alley side and one bay is slightly altered. He noted the detail of the brick and the original wood sash windows on the alley side. He said interiors are exposed brick walls and he noted a painted skylight. He said the gym is exposed structure. He noted comparable buildings in Belltown – Two Bells, 401 Cedar, 425 Cedar and 2213 Fourth – and comparable garage type buildings – 401 Cedar and 2230 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue.

Mr. Peterson said that George Stoddard was a prolific architect and noted his work exhibited a variety of styles. He said he designed the Winthrop Hotel in Tacoma, Fox Garage, was part of Yesler Terrace team, Husky Stadium, among others. He said Stoddard was active in civic organizations.

He said the building did not meet any of the criteria for nomination – it was not significant to start with and is typical of the age, type and period. He said there

are integrity issues on bays, the owners were not significant, and it is not a great work of Stoddard's.

Mr. McCullough said it is an ordinary building and there should be a higher standard of integrity. He said it is not a great work of Stoddard's and it is not significant.

Mr. Luoma said there is no development to the east of the building – in the 1950s there was a parking lot and now it is a dog park. He wondered why the detail and fenestration are more than typical.

Mr. Peterson said he didn't know and noted across the street was a parking lot and gas station.

Mr. Luoma said the development to the east seems transparent and open.

Mr. Peterson said it has always been a parking lot.

Ms. Barker asked about the ceiling differences between gym and restaurant areas.

Mr. Peterson said it is covered on the inside with a drop ceiling in front; the trim is from an early period. He said the drawing set is not complete.

Ms. Barker said the west was dropped as well and noted there is tongue and groove where there isn't a dropped ceiling.

Ms. Patterson asked if the primary entrance would have ever been off the alley side.

Mr. Peterson said no. He said because of arch treatment the entry was centered on the primary street.

Ms. Johnson asked if this type building with stepped parapet is a Belltown type.

Mr. Peterson said they are all over the city – it is the most basic shop form.

Ms. Vyhnanek noted the community value of the building in Belltown and asked if they had done outreach.

Mr. Peterson said no and that the use of a building is not landmarked. He said that in looking at Criterion C the restaurant was the oldest Mexican restaurant in the city but there are no previous references of business or building.

Mr. McCullough said there is no double significance; they did outreach to community as part of MUP.

Mr. Murdock noted the auto-focused industries and also that the restaurant use was there a long time – at some point the use become part of the cultural heritage.

Mr. Peterson said this is not linked to an occupant – someone who put Seattle on the map.

Mr. McCullough noted B & O Espresso as an example of local significant use and the board said no.

Ms. Patterson said Mr. Peterson described the building as typical in form and of its time and asked if there are any others like this in Belltown.

Mr. Peterson said 320 Terry in South Lake Union – heavy timber commercial but it had architectural significance and integrity and neatly met the requirement. She asked what features are missing.

Mr. Peterson said flawless integrity.

Public Comment:

Tiffany Jorgensen said that Belltown is one of the city's oldest neighborhoods and this is one of downtown's most intact auto garage. She noted the wood sash bays and the wood beam throughout the interior. She said this is one of the most prominent streets in Belltown. She said it meets criteria C, D, E and F; C for auto-oriented business and Mama's Mexican. She said it has integrity and there are three sides visible. She said it meets F because it is on a prominent corner in Belltown. She said this is a main business hub. She said there are no garages landmarked. She said it is an iconic building and was a garage for 83 years.

Steve Hall, Friends of Historic Belltown, said it embodies the working building in Belltown; he said it meets F in that it is prominent and that criteria C and D work together. He said it was an auto garage which was a significant part of Belltown, He said there are a few left and none are landmarked. He said this is left. He said if it in the heart of Belltown. He said it has three exposures are visible and it is an easily identifiable building that is known.

Bec Brigade, Friends of Historic Belltown, said it was a significant work of Stoddard's - not all landmarks need to be mansions. She said they can represent the common man, the worker and the laborers who built Seattle. She said that until 2007 the building was still used as an auto garage. She said it is one of the best-preserved auto garages in Belltown and it meets criteria C, D, and F.

David Levinson said Belltown was the place for labor and the working man. He said that Belltown had lots of Maritime industry unions and everyone met at Mama's for lunch and dinner – he noted Pat Tobin, Charlie Black who helped found the Marine Engineers union. He said when he moved here is was a place

for the working class, for working people. He said that Mama's looks the same now as it did then. He said it has cultural significance for Belltown.

Brooke Best, Historic Seattle, supported nomination. She noted the architectural design and said it is an intact example of an auto garage in the neighborhood. She cited Criterion D and said that it does not have to be high style or most perfect; it just has to embody visual distinguishing characteristics as this building does. She cited Criterion C and noted its association with the auto industry and Belltown's social and cultural heritage. She said the building occupies a prominent location in Belltown's cultural hub and is easily identifiable. She said it sits next to the landmarked Wayne Apartments. She said the garage has a high level of integrity and contributes to the neighborhood identity. She said it represents early 20<sup>th</sup> century history of Belltown. She said it meets criteria C, D, and F.

Keith Kentop, Historic Seattle, said it meets Criterion C and noted its value in originality and materials. He said that the garage is a perfect location for art, fashion, design, small business. He said it is located at 2<sup>nd</sup> and Bell in the heart of Belltown.

Chris Code said he thought the building was already a landmark and said none of the others have the same original feel as this has. He said he feels like this is the center of the whole neighborhood. He said it would meet Criterion C.

Evan Clifthorne, Project Belltown, said his groups represents divers stakeholders – preservationists, developers, property owners, residents – constituencies that have significant interest in the process. He said that they promote inclusiveness and access to be part of the conversation. He said there are different opinions in Belltown and to let constituencies decide; he said it is of great importance to Belltown.

#### Board Discussion:

Mr. Murdock supported nomination and said it representative a quality of the neighborhood. He said it was designed as mixed use and it still maintains that. He said it speaks to the strength of small business. He said it represents the heart of Belltown. He said there are twelve bays and has visual exposure from multiple places. He said eleven bays have high integrity; it is an authentic piece of the neighborhood and meets multiple criteria.

Ms. Johnson said she supported nomination hesitantly. She said we can't landmark all typical buildings and noted there are integrity issues. She said it is still clear in its purpose and use but is right on the edge. She said that Criterion F is relevant for its siting.

Mr. Sneddon supported nomination on criteria D. and F and noted the building's distinctive visual character. He noted the brick pattern work, facing, storefront

entries, multi-use, stepped, single story building has all the distinguishing visible characteristics of the type. He said the auto garage portion has elements as well. He said that regarding Criterion F Seattle is hard to imagine before the regrade. He said that this part of Belltown was the first chapter of a new era and this shows the idea of what it was in the 1920s. He said it was an auto garage, café and then and it has the same type aspiration that the neighborhood now. He said auto-related and service related industries were a distinctive part of Belltown's identity and formed the core of historic commercial districts. He said the building has been altered because that is how they kept the building alive but he noted it has decent integrity.

Ms. Vyhnanek said the community support speaks volumes. She said that as neighborhoods developed in general an identity is built. She said Belltown has a strong and robust identity; sometimes identity can influence and trump integrity arguments. She said the building is reflective of the identity of the neighborhood and is visible from three sides. She said it shows the progression of history. She said there are original windows on the alley side. She said you can see the difference in use as you walk around the building. She said it is right in the heart of Belltown. She said it meets Criterion F as an easily identifiable visible contributor to the identity of Belltown. She supported nomination.

Mr. Kiel said he agreed with Mr. Johnson – that it is a typical building with integrity issues. He said that the alley façade has integrity. He said he wants to hear more about auto shops in Belltown. He said that regarding Criterion F Mama's was more of a landmark than the building.

Ms. Patterson supported nomination and noted that the east façade has nearly perfect integrity. She said she sees it every day and is struck by all the glazing. She said the larger issue is how to figure out how to deal with intangible heritage and how it fits with the criteria. She said that Mama's is tied to use; it is no longer there but the public and community are tied to that. She said that buildings stand as monuments to people who don't have statues. She said to think more about how this fits and noted the labor history of the area.

Ms. Barker said she enjoyed the report and photos. She said that the modifications are jarring but subtle and the changes are reversible. She said the original windows of the café are iconic and welcoming and unaltered She was interested to hear the clientele and labor influences. She asked for exploration of the auto-related business and the gas station across the street. She supported nomination.

Mr. Ketcherside thanked community members who spoke and said it has been fun watching them all come together. He said he appreciated Mr. Peterson's report – it is a great starting point to look at the criteria. He said that he was most struck by Criterion D. He said the alley façade remains untouched and there are two untouched storefront bays. He said no one bay has been completely destroyed.

He said there are interesting chunks of original material mixed in. He noted the stories around the building and questioned how to tie those in to the criteria. He said the criteria are strict and it is not always easy to see how a compelling story fits in. He supported nomination.

Mr. Luoma supported nomination and said it is not an obvious one. He said it reminds him of the retail building in Eastlake that wasn't designated because of integrity issues; it had eclectic items and features. He said that this typology needs a higher integrity threshold and fits what has been called a 'bungalow conundrum'. He said there are others with higher integrity; this one is not the best but it doesn't have to be. He supported nomination based on Criterion D and for the garage alley side maybe F. Regarding Criterion C he asked how does the physical convey cultural stories.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the building located at 2234 Second Avenue for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the exterior of the building; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for January 18, 2017; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/MSN/EV 9:0:0 Motion carried.

*Ms. Johnson left at 6:30 pm.*

## **120716.5 BRIEFING**

### **120716.51 Seattle Asian Art Museum**

1400 East Prospect Street  
Briefing on proposed rehabilitation and addition

See material in DON file for details.

Kim Rorschach, Seattle Asian Art Museum (SAAM), explained the specific focus of the proposed work and its importance to the mission of the museum. She noted it is a non-profit which provides educational and public service and the work is important to the viability of the facility; it is difficult to operate as it stands. She said it has not been modernized. She said that critical functions such as seismic and climate control need to be improved. She said that they have responded to board feedback and minimized the staircase, minimized the bulk, repositioned the freight elevator, removed outdoor terrace, and will look at restoring nearby Olmsted paths.



She said at Gallery Level 3 they plan added program for South Asian art; Level 2 they will add education space, conservation lab and collection care, and mechanical systems will go on Level 1 - they need three times as much space as they have now.

Sam Miller, LMN provided footprint comparisons showing the increase in size of building to accommodate program demands and said that it is less than ¼ of 1% of the park. He went over tree survey from early 2000s and noted protected trees that influenced the buildable space. He went over four massing options explored with preferred being Option D.

Chris Jones, Walker Macy said they received direction from the National Park Service to remove the terrace, walls and foundation plantings and just have a sloping lawn. He went over updated plan and said they have two pedestrian access routes, staff entry on the north, planting buffer at loading dock. He said the existing and proposed grade are very similar. Regarding circulation plans he said they will reestablish Olmstedian paths and made them ADA compliant. He said they are awaiting survey data so they will know the grades and slopes of the paths. He said they are working closely with DOPAR and Friends of Olmsted Parks.

Mr. Kiel asked what would be displaced by the conservation lab and education space.

Sam Miller showed on renderings how program will shift to accommodate changes. He said that office, storage will shift to Level 1 and the education space will move the boardroom out into the addition to take advantage of natural light. He said that Gallery 3 is in addition.

Mr. Kiel asked about programmatic needs what are the differences in board, event and meeting space – they seem similar.

Mr. Miller said the outer boardroom is a meeting and event space but is also used as activity space. He said that the activity use is messier and conflicts with scheduling different kinds of events.

Ms. Rorschach said that it allows for exhibition openings, garden, Saturday university, lectures, pre-function space, rental for meetings and private events, and community space. Responding to clarifying programming questions she explained that there is heavier activity in the summer.

Ms. Barker said that Option C encroaches on a grove of trees in the park and intrudes into dense vegetation.

Mr. Miller said they responded to OPC concerns to build to edge of significant trees / grove and didn't see any strong advantages.

Mr. Jones said there is no significant grove in Olmsted park.

Ms. Patterson asked how they arrived at the necessary square footage allotments as justification and if they looked at other ways to accommodate needs – such as off-site storage / conservation.

Ms. Rorschach said they tried to be as modest as possible about storage and care but said much has to be done onsite – much like theater back of house. She said they have some off-site storage and conservation.

Mr. Miller said that mechanical needs are driven by equipment and gallery needs driven by need for new space. He said they are following the pattern of the existing 1950s gallery with the continuous pattern of existing gallery. He said that the conservation lab is based on labs elsewhere.

Ms. Rorschach said they have been sensitive to the proportions of space in the building. She said they need to represent Southeast Asia and this is the right size to add to allow what is needed to do the program.

Mr. Kiel asked the size.

Mr. Miller said it is 40' x 65'.

Ms. Barker asked the size of the 1955 addition.

Mr. Miller said it is smaller – 30' x 65'.

Mr. Murdock said having a landmark located within a landmark is a unique situation and it shouldn't be about the park versus the building. He said the board follows the Secretary of Interiors Standards and looks at what the most character defining features are of each.

Mr. Miller said the building from the west is a seminal work and one of the best in the City. He said that the building from the east is not the same experience – it has been altered in a negative way and they want to improve that. He said they are sensitive to the architecture and want to bring it to contemporary standards with an appropriate solution on the east side.

Mr. Jones talked about the openness of the site and the east green sward and said it is the scale of space that gives the park its sense of place. He said the museum was placed here and it needs to be viable. He noted the need to mediate between landscape and building which are both important.

Ms. Rorschach explained the challenge of getting art in/out of the building and noted that the doorways between octagonal galleries are limiting but they

will leave them as is. She cited other great museums in Olmsted Parks – Metropolitan, De Young – and said they are sensitive to gardens and parks and how they have evolved over the years.

Ms. Barker asked about lighting impacts with the proposed addition.

Mr. Miller said it will be minimal.

Ms. Rorschach said they will hear from the community about lighting at night.

Mr. Kiel asked how critical the addition of space is.

Ms. Rorschach said it is critical – they need to have critical mass of activity to sustain the museum.

Public Comment;

Gregory Bader said there is a letter in file. He is opposed to the addition and said there is no justification for expansion. He said the architecture should be contextual. He said they should capture the unexcavated area and noted the park is being affected.

Martha Wyckoff said the inclusion that the expansion will make – the Southeast Asian art community – will be an important addition to the museum. She said improved ADA compliant accessibility is important.

Jerry Tone spoke in support and noted the difficulty of urban parks. He noted additions at the Center for Wooden Boats and at the Arboretum.

Suzy Hammond opposed the expansion of the museum.

Allan Kollar said the expansion is needed to support the art.

George Counts supported the renovation to: 1) enlarge education and outreach; 2) recoup space lost to climate control; 3) enlarge exhibit space; and 4) establish conservator center which is the only one on the west coast. He said the benefits justify expansion.

Maggie Walker said the renovation meets the SOI. She said it will not negatively affect the historic landscape, it will restore the façade, strengthen the ability of the museum to serve, and provide programs for benefit of City.

Eliza Davidson said Seattle is the best Olmsted Park system and Volunteer Park is the centerpiece – one of Olmsted's best examples. She noted the national significance of the park. She said the landscape is the more important resource to be protected.

Randolph Urmston opposed the expansion and provided a letter. He said to keep within existing footprint. He asked if other equipment – geothermal – was looked at. He suggested moving the museum back to SAM downtown; to save the park.

John Colwell provided a letter (in DON file). He said he appreciated more information provided. He asked if a whole new museum is needed for Asia.

Jennifer Ott appreciates the need for ADA. She said the tree at the northwest corner and root system should be carefully protected. She appreciated the terrace comments. She cited SOI and said that the green sward is character defining and should be kept intact.

Sandra Pinto de Bader said that it won't be the last time SAAM outgrows its space. She suggested Option E – go back downtown and have a full museum.

#### Board Feedback

Mr. Murdock said the SOI apply to the park and the building. He said this is an opportunity to make repairs to the building and the park. He said to go back and reconsider the proposed doors at the east of the garden court.

Mr. Sneddon said he is supportive of the location, size, mass, and scale of the proposed addition. He said that two sides of the building are interesting and of alternatives considered proposal best protects what is left. He cited the SOI relating to mass and scale and said it is a tough call. He said that what they are proposing is a modern adaptation of what was already done. He said these discussions should have happened in the 1930s before the museum was built. He said the building is there and what is done now is minimal compared to what happened to the park in the last 85 years. He said the park can still convey its significance. He said the renovation may bring in more people to experience the park. He said there is opportunity to improve the park. He said to try to do re-facing of the existing museum in-kind, as much as possible.

Ms. Vyhnanek said it is an opportunity. She said there are size issues but that she understands the programmatic needs. She said she doesn't know if it is the best option. She wants to see clearer pros and cons. She said she is interested in options B and C.

Mr. Kiel said it is weird to have a landmark within a landmark. He said not having the museum occupy this building is a scary thought. He said the number one standard is use of the building as original designed. He said they need to add to it to maintain its relevance. He said this place makes the most sense. He said the greensward will be impacted, but not ruined. He said the

front is inviting but the back is not, and they could make it more welcoming. He said to revisit assumptions about program – how to tighten it up. He said the degree of projection should be analyzed – can you pull it back in some degree – every foot will count. He said the garden court is an organizing feature – keep it as hub.

Ms. Barker said she is haunted by the nominations of the park and museum – friendships were broken up by the addition. She said the projection of the proposed addition is an issue. She said the projection is key – dial it back and reface the east façade in-kind. She said the east side is inappropriate and draws attention to itself. She said to look at Option C further – the wall of windows looks out into the forest. She said the greensward is a contemplative place. She said there should be no new door openings in the garden court. She indicated that the character of the addition felt too urban.

Ms. Patterson said she would support the mass, size, and scale if it were not in a landmark park and if she were convinced by programmatic need. She said she needs to be shown that it is necessary – and she would like to see a feasibility study to be convinced of need and how they arrived at the proposal.

Mr. Sneddon asked if the board has purview over justification.

Ms. Sodt said that the Code speaks to Hearing Examiner and Board decision-making regarding owner’s needs and objectives so board can ask for that information, and exploring alternatives.

Mr. Ketcherside said it would be OK if the site were a parking lot, but because it is within another landmark (Park) we need to test each point of the decision-making process. He said more documentation is needed.

Mr. Luoma noted the difficulty of the decision and the community impacts on both sides. He said the board sees both as equally important, and is objectively looking at the viability of expansion to the east. He said that Southeast Asia is not new and he wondered how that program could be incorporated now. He said the mechanical space makes sense. He said that parks generally take a beating, absorbing changes – addition of bandstand, greenhouse, play area – and suddenly it looks nothing like the original design. He said any proposal needs to benefit both landmarks equally.

**120716.3      CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

120716.33      Seattle Times Building - 1947 Office Building Addition  
1120 John Street  
Request for an extension and update

Ms. Sodt said owner representatives had a check-in for Board.

Jessica Clawson, McCullough Hill Leary, said the board had questions about zoning and the design team has four options to present. She said there is definition in packets about one tower per lot line. Detailed information in DON file – following are Board questions and comments.

The applicant representative said that asbestos abatement in the Office Building is done. He presented the four tower placement options.

*Mr. Kiel left at 8:15 pm.*

Mr. Sneddon asked about placement of 320' versus 360'.

The applicant representative said there is a text amendment for the park on the other side.

Ms. Barker preferred 108 or 110.

Mr. Luoma preferred 2A or 2B.

Ms. Patterson preferred 2A or 2B.

Mr. Ketcherside preferred 2A or 2B.

Mr. Sneddon preferred 2A or 2B.

Ms. Vyhnaneck preferred 2A or 2B.

Mr. Murdock preferred 2A or 2B.

Mr. Luoma said the rectangle is more interesting.

Board members in general preferred 2B.

Ms. Sodt said that she will work to establish next briefing date.

Mr. Luoma said that the preference is for 2B and to look at level in between that.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Seattle Times Building – Office Building, 1120 John Street, to the first meeting in February 2017.

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

1120 John Street  
Request for an extension and update

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Seattle Times Building – Printing Plant, 1120 John Street, to the first meeting in February 2017.

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

**120716.6      APPOINTMENTS**

120716.61      Columbia City Landmark District  
Reappointment of two members for the Columbia City Review Committee

Deferred.

**120716.7      STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator