



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 236/18

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
City Hall
600 4th Avenue
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room
Wednesday, May 2, 2018 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker
Manish Chalana
Russell Coney
Rich Freitas
Garrett Hodgins
Kristen Johnson
Nicole McKernan
Julianne Patterson
Steven Treffers

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Genna Nashem
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Kathleen Durham
Jordon Kiel

Deb Barker, Vice-Chair called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

050218.1

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

March 7, 2018
MM/SC/KJ/JP

7:0:2 Minutes approved. Messrs. Chalana and Freitas abstained.

March 21, 2018
MM/SC/KJ/ST

5:0:4 Minutes approved. Mmes. McKernan and Patterson, and Messrs. Chalana and Freitas abstained.

050218.2 SPECIAL TAX VALUATION

050218.21 Fort Lawton
4002 Washington Ave W

Ms. Nashem explained the Special Tax Valuation program. She reported that submitted costs were \$343,225; eligible costs were \$310,814. Disallowed costs were \$32,411. She explained that work was performed in conformance with Certificate of Approval issued by the Landmarks Preservation Board.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: 4002 Washington Ave W, 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/GH/JP 7:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Chalana abstained.

050218.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

050218.31 Fitch-Nutt House
4401 Phinney Avenue North
Retroactive proposal for addition of roof dormer

Dan James, property owner, said he received Code Enforcement letter. He said he bought two houses at the same time. He did a complete remodel inside. The basement and “barn” were put on foundation in 1924 and have been remodeled many times. He said he didn’t realize more than the front portion of the house was landmarked. He said the dormer was on the back of the house when he bought it in 2010. [Staff Clarification: One dormer existed as the time of purchase. The more recent dormer is the subject of the NOV and C of A.]

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Johnson said ARC agreed new dormer was similar to one previously there and noted it is not on the front. She said it does not detract from the character of the house.

Ms. Barker noted benefits of landmark designation, Controls and Incentives, Special Tax Valuation. She said the exterior of the house is designated.

Ms. Doherty said the property does not have an Ordinance. She will mail information to the owner about financial incentives.

Mr. Coney noted that now the applicant is aware that the exterior of the building and site is landmarked.

Mr. James concurred.

Mr. Coney said the future changes to the exterior and site must come to the board.

Ms. Barker said that if he plans to do anything to contact Ms. Doherty first.

Mr. James said he wants to paint the house.

Ms. Doherty said it will require approval unless it is the same color. She said a signed Controls and Incentives agreement could exclude some items from review and some could be administratively approved. This would be a good reason to resume negotiations.

Mr. James said part of SMC 25.12 says owners should be able to reasonably carry on business. He said it is a 100-year-old home. He said the roof needs work.

Ms. Doherty said there are grant programs etc. that can be helpful.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the retroactive application for the proposed exterior alteration at the Fitch-Nutt House, 4401 Phinney Avenue North, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alteration does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Report on Designation (LPB 430/07), 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/GH/ST 9:0:0 Motion carried.

050218.32

Neptune Building
1301 NE 45th Street
Proposed alterations to theater marquee

Brian Layton, Seattle Theater Group, explained the marquee is in disrepair and it has been hit by busses. He said they came up with a new design. Jim Richard, who designed the blade sign at the Paramount Theater, found a MOHAI 1946 photo of the marquee and have learned more about that early sign to inform their proposed design. He said the existing sign projects out to the edge of the existing sidewalk and it is dangerous for their staff to maintain and changes the signboard letters. He said to make changes to the marquee now, they use a 14' ladder and it is scary. He said that letters routinely blow off the marquee. He provided a mock up. He said the new marquee digitally recreates lines so it will appear the letters are snapped on. He said that all exposed light will be neon as per the period. He said the sign will be 50% lighter in weight than what is there now.

Mr. Richard said they will maintain all original steel structure and there will be no new penetrations into the building face.

Mr. Coney asked what it will look like when it is off.

Jim said it will go black.

Mr. Coney asked if there will be lights on the upper side.

Jim said they will; they just didn't do it on the mock up. He went over structural details as noted on page 8 of the packet. He said all structure stays as is; if there is rust it will get a fresh coat of paint.

Ms. Doherty said the whole exterior of the building and some portions of the interior are designated. She said the existing marquee is the one in the 1946 photo but has had a number of alterations since then. It is also not the original entry canopy.

Mr. Richard said the original one was cast iron, non-illuminated.

Mr. Hodgins asked if they will follow the curve.

Mr. Layton said they will, but it will be just a bit more shallow to keep it away from the street edge.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Deliberation:

Ms. McKernan asked if anti-bird elements would be installed.

Mr. Richard said not initially; later, if needed.

Ms. McKernan asked about the brightness of the LED screens.

Mr. Richard said it will be auto dimmed at night.

Mr. Chalana asked what will happen to the existing sign.

Mr. Richard said there will be nothing left to salvage; it is just rust.

Ms. Doherty said the whole skeleton will remain in place the pieces will come off.

Mr. Treffers said ARC found the proposal reasonable; the existing marquee is too deteriorated to fix. He said there are safety issues. He said the design is based on archival research of the historic property.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alteration at the Neptune Building, 1301 NE 45th Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alteration attempts to recreate in part a character defining feature as specified in Ordinance No. 124430, 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 applicant has demonstrated the need to change the format of marquee text, to improve safety for their staff.
3. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

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

050218.33

Coca Cola Bottling Plant

1313 E. Columbia Street

Proposed alterations to building exterior at loading dock

Jesse Chapman, Miller Hayashi, proposed to infill loading dock opening on west side with storefront. He said concrete wall, steel frame and rolling door exist now. He proposed aluminum storefront system with insulated glass panels, laminated glass for safety; there will be a small entrance canopy. He said the only penetrations will be where the plate steel tie rods attach to anchor bolts. He provided material and color samples. He said there will be a new concrete curb, storefront, steel canopy over entrance door, ADA push button access and ramp. He said the space is in the back part of the building and it is hard to see from the street. He said that Seattle University is relocating a department here from another building.

Ms. Patterson asked if this is the only roll up door.

Mr. Chapman said there is a whole series of them on the back elevation. He said this is not an original door; it was installed in 2009.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Johnson said ARC reviewed the project and was comfortable with it; it is back of the house and recessed.

Mr. Treffers said it is a concrete building, easy to patch.

Mr. Chapman noted it is rough finish concrete.

Mr. Coney said it is inset from the building, not visible or publicly accessible. He said they are not removing steel jambs.

Mr. Chalana asked if the aesthetic is compatible with the building era.

Mr. Chapman said they just wanted the largest opening possible to bring light into the basement.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations at the Coca Cola Bottling Plant, 1313 East Columbia Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 123294 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/ST/JP 9:0:0 Motion carried.

050218.34

Wallingford Center / former Interlake School
4416 Wallingford Avenue North
Proposed alterations to site and entry for accessibility

Mirta Villaran, Johnson Architecture, explained the upgrades for ADA compliant accessibility. She said they will demolish the planter to accommodate the new main ramp; the existing ramp which is too steep will remain for building services; the asphalt will be filled with concrete for slope; and add sidewalk to ramp. They will provide new handrails, accessible parking spots with access to ramp, push button door opener, widen an entry door, and install curb ramp.

Responding to clarifying questions, Ms. Doherty said she believes the planter is from the 1990's.

Mr. Chalana asked what kind of door will be installed.

Ms. Villaran said it will be similar to what is there; the closer will be replaced.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Deliberation:

Mr. Treffers said all of the elements in this area are contemporary. He said the railing is dictated by ADA; it is busy but is similar to railing already on the property. He said ARC found it acceptable because the site features are not historic and what is there is not character defining.

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

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics 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/KJ/GH 9:0:0 Motion carried.

050218.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

050218.41 Sullivan House
1632 15th Avenue
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for extension to June 20, 2018 meeting. She explained the nomination and designation were opposed by owner. The owner's representatives are in the process of evaluating economics of property to try and demonstrate that no controls should be imposed.

Ms. Barker said the house was built in 1898.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Deliberation:

Board members had enough information to make this decision.

Action: I move to defer consideration of the Sullivan House, 1632 15th Avenue, until June 21, 2018.

MM/SC/RC/ST 9:0:0 Motion carried.

050218.42 Century 21 Coliseum / Key Arena
305 Harrison Street

Ms. Doherty read the signed agreement to the Board.

Ms. Barker asked for clarification on Service Center and Seattle Center Pavilion.

Ms. Doherty said it is the same building.

Ms. Patterson asked if there is a signage plan already.

Ms. Doherty said that as part of the arena project she expects that they will propose one.

Mr. Coney asked about a proposed reader board.

Ms. Doherty said that a sign of that size is not something she would review administratively. She said that if Staff is not willing to approve a proposal the applicant can always bring their application to the Landmarks Board.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to approve Controls and Incentives for the Century 21 Coliseum / Key Arena, 305 Harrison Street.

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

050218.43

Bressi Garage
226-232 1st Avenue North

Ms. Doherty read the document and said Attachment A shows the footprint of the two main buildings; the kiln shed is not included.

Action: I move to approve Controls and Incentives for the Bressi Garage, 226-232 1st Avenue North.

MM/SC/KJ/GH 9:0:0 Motion carried.

Ms. Johnson left at 4:55 pm.

050218.5

DESIGNATION

050218.51

East Pine Substation
1501 23rd Avenue

Rebecca Ossa, Seattle City Light, said they support designation.

Susan Boyle, BOLA, said the substation was built in 1967. She provided context of the site in the Central area, Renton Hill Addition. The surrounding blocks to the west, north, and east largely contain single family residences. She said the substation is surrounded by a series of brick masonry walls, including “high wall” and “corrugated” sections, viewing grille panels, and metal gates that enclose the electrical switchyard, and integrate a small control building. The original substation also provided a children’s play area and viewing tower at its northwest corner.

It was designed by Seattle architect Fred Bassetti of Fred Bassetti & Company Architects. She said that Bassetti embraced the integration of structural design with architectural design and was an innovator. She said he cited this as one of his favorite projects. She noted his use of brick and concrete during this time and said he used minimal materials in a fashion that strengthened them.

Ms. Boyle said the original 1966 site plan shows corrugated walls on all four sides, high walls around the tall equipment, gates, setbacks at northwest corner, and control building with recessed view area. She said the Open House brochure indicates national and local design awards for the substation.

She said the original Control Building entry was off 23rd; it had tall windows and a stepped terrace. She said it was changed out to a panelized system. She said the original Children’s Viewing Tower, had multiple landings and consisted of a

hardscape of cobbles, broom-finished concrete, and brick pavers around hexagonal-shaped sand box. The play area was inoperative by the 1970's due to vandalism and illicit use; it was removed in 2003 when the switch yard was expanded. The Control Building got an addition on the south side, new equipment and transformer were added. She noted that new walls were straight rather than corrugated.

She said the neighborhood context is the same. She noted the perimeter walls, view grills, gates, and high yard walls. She said the view panels have concrete cap across them. She noted the concrete construction addition to the Control Building. She said custom brick pieces, designed by Richard Beyer, identify the substation and architect. She noted brick detail at lower portion indicates where stairs were taken away. She said that all gates are along 23rd Avenue. She noted exterior perimeter lighting and up lights to emphasize pattern of corrugated walls. She said some of the original pre-cast equipment supports remain. She indicated on site plan changes that have occurred over time.

Mr. Coney asked where the Beyer installation is.

Ms. Boyle indicated the three locations.

Mr. Treffers asked the number of residential post-war substations in Seattle.

Ms. Ossa said there are a couple; she noted University and Viewlands.

Mr. Treffers asked if this is one of the earliest ones.

Ms. Ossa said it is; after this there was more responsiveness to neighborhood installations.

Mr. Chalana asked to what degree has it achieved its integration with neighborhood.

Ms. Boyle said it still retains a park-like character and some of the landscape materials that Rich Haag picked out. She said she met neighbors using the site and noted one neighbor remembers using the space to teach her child to ride a bike. She said when the viewing space was closed, SCL had concerns about safety.

Ms. Ossa said that the "T" supports were added in 1975 and are being replaced over time with newer seismically resistant steel supports.

Ms. Patterson asked what is included in designation.

Ms. Doherty said her staff recommendation excludes all equipment in the switchyard.

Ms. Ossa said the switchyard and equipment are excluded in the staff report; she said she had no problem with the recommendation as written.

Mr. Chalana asked if they have plans to reactivate view tower access again.

Ms. Ossa said today's decision will impact changes going forward.

Mr. Coney said people were throwing stuff down from above and getting over the wall; he noted the illicit activity that took place.

Public Comment:

Lorne McConachie, Bassetti Architects, spoke in support of designation. He said it meets Criterion D for its distinct visible characteristics of style or method of construction. He noted the undulating wall and the simple functions that capture Bassetti's interest in Modernism. He said it meets Criterion E as an outstanding work of Bassetti, who had personally loved this project. He said Bassetti spoke of it many times at their firm. He said it epitomizes Mr. Bassetti's approach to functional Modernism. He said Fred told a story about a simple glass insulator in his office and said he hoped to make a building as beautiful as that was. Mr. McConachie said he did just that.

Lisa Chadbourne said she is a long-time neighbor and she taught her daughter to ride a bike there. She said Bassetti talked about this building as Optimistic Modern or Brutalist Whimsical. She supported designation and said to respect the tower and save as much character as possible.

Penny Lewis is a neighbor and appreciates the beauty of the crenelated walls and landscape. She said Ann Bassetti sent a message that this was one of her father's favorite projects. Allen Moses said it is uniquely good design and an outstanding example.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle and Docomomowewa, thanked SCL for bringing the property before the board. She said she conducted an oral history with Fred Bassetti. She loved the personal connections with him and this site. She said the site should be celebrated and she would love an educational tour. There is so much great information about it and it is great to share with the public why this is significant.

Board Deliberation:

Ms. Barker said written public comment in support of designation was received from Jeffrey Ochsner and Rich Haag.

Ms. Patterson supported designation based on the Staff Report, criteria C, D, E, and F and the features as noted. She said it is nice to hear a widely supported nomination and it was heartening to hear the passion for the property. She noted the beauty and whimsical nature of the design and said the single width brick walls are amazing.

Mr. Treffers supported designation and said he agreed with the Staff Report, but only criteria D, E, and F. He said the loss of the viewing area and park are detrimental. He agreed with the features as noted in Staff Report but took issue with not including a feature because it is not convenient for the owner. A feature should not be excluded because it is inconvenient.

Mr. Coney said the Control Tower at Broad Street Substation was within the gate and was included. He said the bones are here. He said he agrees with Mr. Treffers' comment if something is unique. He supported designation on criteria D, E, and F. He said he didn't object to inclusion of Criterion C but that he didn't fully support it.

Mr. Hodgins supported designation and agreed with the Staff Report on features. He supported criteria D, E, F but not C.

Ms. McKernan supported designation on criteria D, E, and F but not C. She appreciated SCL bring forth the nomination and said it is a special, not just utilitarian structure. She said it is an example of showcasing power which was often overlooked. She said the building is whimsical which is not usually associated with Brutalism. She said the building stands out in its typology.

Mr. Chalana supported designation on criteria D and E. He said it is a fine example of Mid-Century Modern and less Brutalist. He said it was a blend of Brutalist with Humanist. He said it is an outstanding work of Bassetti's and he noted it won awards. He did not support Criterion C as it has not retained the full spirit of the design nor the access to public as in original design. He did not support Criterion F because it turns its back on the neighborhood. He agreed with the area as noted in Staff Report.

Mr. Freitas noted the loss of play and viewing area compromised the site. He said he read the nomination and visited the site which he called a public amenity. He said it is so well integrated into the design and is a park like setting. He supported designation on criteria C, D, E, and F and inclusion of the entire site. He noted that Rich Haag Maples and landscape elements are still there.

Ms. Barker supported designation. She supported Criterion C because of the idea and what it stood for; throwing the public in with the substation was a radical thought at the time. She supported criteria D, E, and F and areas of control outlines in the Staff Report.

Mr. Hodgins did not support Criterion C but wouldn't vote against it.

Mr. Treffers did not support Criterion C but wouldn't vote against it.

Ms. Patterson said the substation can still convey significance of Criterion C; she noted the whimsical nature of the walls and said there are still three viewing areas.

Ms. McKernan said that the integration of the public could be covered under Criterion E. She said it was more attributed to Bassetti than to community.

Mr. Hodgins said the Children's Play Area and Viewing area were the biggest amenities and are gone.

Mr. Chalana said that he did not support Criterion C, but he wouldn't vote against it. He said it doesn't speak to the neighborhood.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the East Pine Substation at 1501 23rd Avenue as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards D, E and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the switchyard enclosure composed of walls, fences and gates; the exteriors of the integral tower and control building; and the portion of the site outside the switchyard enclosure.

MM/SC/RC/GH 8:0:0 Motion carried.

050218.6 BRIEFING

050218.61 Coliseum (Key Arena) / Bressi Garage
305 Harrison Street / 226-232 1st Avenue North
Briefing on proposed addition, alterations, and rehabilitation

Presentation via PowerPoint. See full report in DON file. Following are board and public questions and comments.

Robert Nellams, Seattle Center Director, explained the value that the arena brings to Seattle Center and provided their purpose statement. He said they are looking for balance in maintenance of democratic open space and a service that will maintain and pay for it. He said they want the arena to be here another 50 years. He explained the need for a financial model that enables them to run the building and do other things such as a free health clinic one week each year. He noted the benefits of the partnership formed when they brought Chihuly in; there was new energy, and more people came to the campus. He noted KEXP and the investments made in that space. He said the bigger picture is important and he noted the value of a dedicated revenue stream.

Jill Crary said there will be a curbside management plan with use of streets for loading.

John Shaw, SDCI, said the DEIS was released last week. He explained the EIS process, OVG proposal Alternatives 1 and 2, and DEIS transport mitigation.

Jeff Cheong, Populous, described truck and vehicle access, curb cuts and driveways.

Barbara Swift, Swift Company, further elaborated on curb cuts and driveways. Using site diagrams moving through and around the site she noted they are using topography in programming.

Mr. Cheong said they evaluated three options for the historic curtain wall areas that are not currently glazed. He said they received direction from the Historic Resources Group that they approved the transparency, but the glass should be visually distinct from historic glass. He said they propose the color and mullion be the same but the plane of glass is forward and butt glazed.

James Stieg, M-E Engineers, explained ducting options and ways to minimize plaza discharge.

Mr. Cheong went through site diagram and egress layout via glass egress stair vestibules. He went through egress and mechanical layout and noted the use of Art Not Gallery space. He said historic Thiry panels would be maintained in historic configuration. He said another option would add 10' on the end of the KEXP space, move Thiry panels or leave Thiry panels in place and reuse the ones from the NASA Building to create an offset. He went over current and proposed arrival points.

Ms. Crary said the north side is part of a separate study of the north courtyards; they have engaged Schemata Workshop for the design there and will bring that to next briefing.

Board Questions:

Mr. Hodgins asked about northwest option, view of glass curtain. He said on site arrival there is a white wall.

Mr. Cheong said it is not a wall, the model was over-extruded in the drawing.

Mr. Treffers asked about SHPO review and what their thoughts are particularly about the mechanical/egress.

Mr. Cheong said they have not discussed that yet.

Mr. Hodgins asked about pedestrian use at Thomas Street.

Ms. Swift said that at Thomas and Warren there will be a 15' elevated walkway what is the same height as the sidewalk.

Ms. Barker said it is like a big speedbump.

Ms. Patterson said she likes the 1200 square feet out of the trough and wondered if they got rid of the skylight roof if all 5000 square feet of mechanical could be accommodated there within the roof system.

Mr. Cheong said the challenge with the duct work is that the louvers would take over the Atrium space.

Mr. Stieg said it would take up too much space.

Ms. Patterson said they showed preferred options of mechanical combined with egress but noted she didn't see other options.

Rico Quirindongo, DLR Group, said there are multiple options for SE, NW, and NE.

Ms. Patterson asked where they come out of the Garage East option.

Ms. Barker said where the restroom is.

Ms. Patterson asked the height on the garage west short end.

Mr. Cheong said on the north side it is 8' or 10'; not accessible for roof access. It will appear like retail space.

Mr. Chalana said it is an intervention on historic site like the Louvre and should be true to its time. He questioned how to see the marriage between historic context and new.

Mr. Cheong said they wanted distinction between historic arena roof and intervention and didn't want to mimic that. He said they want to play off the original theme of 'remembering tomorrow'. It will be the old and new brought together.

Ms. Swift said there was a strong plane that came out from the building and they are bringing that back. She said the London Plane trees will provide larger scale spatial structure. She said they will build a frame in grid of trees which provides step down in scale. They will build places for people to use and linger. She said this is a rapidly growing urban village.

Mr. Chalana said he likes what they are doing; it is inviting. He likes the steel and glass modernity – 21st Century modern. He said the materials are compatible and complementary. He said they need to make sure the global modernity doesn't overshadow the Mid-Century Modern.

Ms. McKernan said Thomas will be heavily loaded and asked about curbside management plan.

Ms. Crary said they have to revise the curbside management plan. She said it will probably be used more. They are working with design team to reduce the curb cuts overall.

Mr. Coney asked for clarification on mullions.

Mr. Cheong said the existing are steel channels welded at seam to create column. They would need a holistic paint job, color hasn't been discussed yet but to receive historic tax credits it would need to remain the same dark color as it is.

Mr. Quirindongo said they have spoken at a high level about historic glazing but will get more specific at their next briefing.

Mr. Coney said HRG said it is not the same historic material in mullions.

Ms. Patterson asked for clarification about NW egress Option 2 with 10' addition with Thirty panels borrowed from NASA Building and alley.

Mr. Cheong said they are just getting into the design. He said the panels could be cut to size and put on extension of building.

Ms. Barker asked about Alternative 1, sign modifications.

Mr. Quirindongo said the moniker at the top will change.

Mr. Shaw said it is part of EIS. He said OVG has signage; they need a variance to have a big message board.

Ms. Barker asked if mechanical towers combined with stairs could be transparent or be planted.

Mr. Stieg said it could be anything. He said they are trying to extend it up out of the ground. He said glass could heat up.

Mr. Treffers asked about preferred option at NE corner, International Fountain Pavilion.

Ms. Crary said there would be no rooftop addition at the pavilion.

Ms. Doherty said they would have to alter the roof to allow for ventilation and some alterations to the exterior for egress doors.

Mr. Chalana asked how the intervention could enhance energy consumption.

Mr. Cheong said they are studying that; they haven't had energy code discussion yet.

Public Comment:

Maria Barrientos supported a northwest courtyard restoration plan. She said that Use is important but difficult to maneuver now; she noted importance of arts and culture. She said she supports activation on four sides. She said the whole NW entry will be light, safe, and welcoming. Regarding mechanical and egress structure she supported getting intake and exhaust air for Seattle Center off the buildings. She supported integration in landmarked International Fountain Pavilion plaza. She said the SE and garage is good and she supported the re-do of Thomas. She said she didn't like the SW egress mechanical, but she understands it is a big need. She said she is neutral on KEXP extension; she was not thrilled but didn't hate it. She said to be thoughtful. Regarding the sign she said the Uptown Alliance is doing design guidelines and they encourage bright dynamic lighting. She said they want to celebrate the arts and cultural district.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, said overall, they have done a great job. She is thrilled with whichever way they go on the historic curtain wall. She said she has issues with the mechanical in northwest room add on; she said it seems like an appendage and doesn't seem right. She hoped they would find a better solution. She said the Thirty panels are art pieces in themselves. She said that large dynamic signage is awful; she noted the awful ones on I-5. She noted all the money being spent and then the focus would be on the sign.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Patterson preferred option 1A for the curtain wall and said 3A may not be the best. She preferred the Art Not space for egress, mechanical; SE garage elevator; preferred option, 10' onto KEXP but challenged to make it smaller or fit into existing space; garage west and south west need more work. She had no preference for parking. She said they are headed in the right direction.

Mr. Treffers thanked Mr. Nellams for his perspective on the need for balance. He said he loves Seattle Center. He said he begrudgingly supports parking garage access off Thomas and said he didn't know where else it could go. He said they have done a good job trying to work the site around it. Regarding the windows, he preferred Option 1A and said to keep as much as possible. He said the frosted glass goes too far. He said to use different mullion configuration to differentiate. He said he was good with mechanical alternative approaches. He said the garage landscaping blocks off circulation. He said to integrate the arena SW better. He said bumping KEXP out creates a false sense of history but has the least impacts; Option 2 is preferable, and it works with the site without sticking out as much. He said to continue to explore further.

Mr. Hodgins preferred KEXP Option 2. He noted the pedestrian only issue with the garage entry. He preferred window replacement Option 2A. He did not support the arena SW box.

Mr. Chalana preferred curtain wall option 1A and noted energy efficiency. He said the arena SW is boxy-looking. He preferred NW KEXP option 1.

Ms. Doherty asked about the character of the addition.

Mr. Chalana said as they develop it, to think about Mid-Century holding its ground.

Ms. McKernan preferred glazing option 1A. She said she is uncomfortable with the SW mechanical/egress addition; it blocks the arena. She would prefer to see the garage access at the SW corner of the block rather than mid-block.

Mr. Coney said he doesn't think the existing curtain wall materials are historic or character-defining. He said he is OK with any option. He noted Option 2 and said it will look the same when all done. He said to leave parking to regulatory agencies. He preferred Option 2 for northwest corner mechanical; a 10' extension and use NASA panels to construct new wall. He supported Art Not Gallery; garage elevator, Option 1. He said the arena SW is a big blank box and needs more refinement. He asked about combining egress and mechanical. He said to respect Thiry's original plan regarding the south plaza. He looks forward to seeing the proposed signage.

Ms. Barker appreciated opening up of the site. She said going back to accessible visual quality is good. She said the northwest with addition is her favorite mechanical option. She said the NE is OK. She said to continue addition and wondered if it could accommodate non-profits displaced from Blue Spruce. She said the elevator overlook SE is OK. She preferred curtain wall option 1A. She was not okay with SW building and said to make it more transparent. She was also not okay with the parking access on Thomas and would like to see it at the SE corner. She said to think about where crowds will go and what experience they will have when they go to the light rail station; that will influence where they leave the building and site. She said there is not enough vehicular access to green street. Need to show where the traffic is expected to go, she was against dumping drivers into the middle of pedestrian area; need other options. It feels unsafe.

050218.7 STAFF REPORT

Ms. Doherty explained that the recent Wilsonian (7-Eleven) Certificate of Approval application encountered a problem with SDCI, regarding the proposed translucent window film on the south windows. If it is removed from proposal you will see a portion of the back of the casework above the window sill. The Board members agreed that this would be fine because the applicant proposed to paint the back of cabinetry black to reduce its visibility. They said it did not need further review.

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator