



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649 Seattle WA 98124-4649  
Street Address: 700 5th Ave Suite 1700

LPB 51/16

### MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting  
Seattle Municipal Tower  
700 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 40<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Room 4060  
Wednesday, January 20, 2016 - 3:30 p.m.

#### Board Members Present

Deb Barker  
Kathleen Durham  
Kristin Johnson  
Robert Ketcherside  
Jordon Kiel  
Aaron Luoma  
Jeffrey Murdock, Acting Chair  
Julianne Patterson  
Matthew Sneddon  
Mike Stanley

#### Staff

Sarah Sodt  
Erin Doherty  
Rebecca Frestedt  
Melinda Bloom

#### Absent

Marjorie Anderson  
Nick Carter

Acting Chair Jeffrey Murdock called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

**012016.1**

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

November 18, 2015

MM/SC/RK/DB

8:0:2 Minutes approved. Mmes. Johnson and Dunham abstained.

**Administered by The Historic Preservation Program  
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods**

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

**012016.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

012016.21 Columbia City Landmark District  
4869 Rainier Ave. S. – Island Soul  
Proposed Signage

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed installation of a blade sign (dimensions: 5’ h x 4’9” w) and retroactive request for approval for the application of 11” h window decals that run along the bottom of the storefront windows. Exhibits included photographs, renderings and samples. The building (historically called: “Columbia Confectionery”) was constructed in 1928. It is a contributing building located within the Columbia City National Register District. The Landmarks Preservation Board approved a Certificate of Approval for window signage on the door in April 2009.

Ms. Frestedt reported that the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application on January 5, 2016. The Committee considered the size and placement of the blade sign and made a recommendation to scale down the size of the palm tree graphic to align with the first full brick course under the parapet. The modifications are reflected in the rendering packet. The Committee recommended approval of the proposal, as proposed.

Joe Springob, New Image Creative Sign, said he scaled the sign down per Committee recommendation.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Murdock said the scale was appropriate.

Ms. Patterson said it is appropriate and compatible with others. She noted mounting is through the mortar.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signage located at 4869 Rainier Ave. S. 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:

**Relevant Columbia City Design Guidelines:**  
**Guidelines/Specific**

**11. Signs.** All signs on or hanging from buildings or windows, or applied to windows, are subject to review and approval by the Review Committee and Board. Sign applications will be evaluated according to the overall impact, size, shape, texture, lettering style, method of attachment, color, and lighting in relation to the use of the building, the building and street where the sign will be located, and the other signs and other buildings in the District. The primary reference will be to the average pedestrian’s eye-level view, although views into or down the street from adjacent buildings will be an integral feature of any review.

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

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

- a. **Window Signs and Hanging Signs.** Generally, painted or vinyl letters in storefront windows and single-faced, flat surfaced painted wood signs are preferred. Extruded aluminum or plastics are discouraged and may not be allowed. Window signs shall not cover a large portion of the window so as to be out of scale with the window, storefront, or facade.
- b. **Blade Signs.** Blade signs (double-faced projecting signs hanging perpendicular to the building), that are consistent in design with District goals are encouraged. Blade signs shall be installed in a manner that is in keeping with other approved blade signs in the District. They shall not hide, damage, or obscure the architectural elements of the building. The size should be appropriately scaled for the building.

**Secretary of the Interiors Standards #9 and #10**

MM/SC/DB/AL            10:00 Motion carried.

012016.22

Pier 54  
1001 Alaskan Way  
Proposed business signage and signage plan

Bob Donegan provided packets showing historical signage on the buildings.

Doug Sharp, Mithun, said that there aren't tenants for all the spaces yet but that they have planned signage for future tenants. He indicated on plan where future signage will go on the east and north elevations and where Kidd Valley will be located. He noted that the Curiosity Shop will move to a different location in the building and said that they will provide signage for 2<sup>nd</sup> floor tenant as well.

He said the Ye Olde Curiosity will reuse the individual carved sign. He said that new lighting and directional signage will be installed; signage can be divided from one to four tenants. He said that the previously approved arrangement has the artifacts etc. for the Ye Old Curiosity Shop on the north. He said that Kidd Valley brand will be used. He said that they will use 5" tall vinyl clings on windows and a changeable readerboard with individual letters that can be changed out for seasonal items.

Mr. Donegan said the menu changes reflect seasonal changes such as berries and Walla Walla onion rings.

Ms. Barker said that ARC asked for more information on the readerboard as it seemed to be a departure and there was concern about proliferation at the corner. She said that ARC understood and appreciated what was proposed.

Mr. Kiel said the blade sign works on the pier as it fits with the pier and the location on the corner.

Mr. Donegan said it was suggested they move the north facing sign one window bay west.

Mr. Murdock said the north side has a nicer layout; the east face has its own language as a gabled end.

Mr. Kiel was fine with what was proposed and noted the context.

Mr. Murdock appreciated the planning of future signage.

Ms. Barker said the readerboard makes sense on pole signs but said she was challenged by the idea because it feels precedent setting.

Mr. Donegan said they used to have a readerboard advertising fish and catch of the day and there were chalkboards on side of building.

Mr. Murdock commented on the eclectic nature of the building, canopies, and appurtenances on building and had no problem with the readerboard.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Patterson said she had no problem with what was presented.

Ms. Barker said that she was comfortable with what was presented here but didn't know that it would be considered on another landmark building. She said that the board reviews on a case by case basis.

Ms. Patterson noted that review is on a case by case basis and the readerboard is tied to Kidd Valley and not the building.

Mr. Kiel said it is tied to being at the Pier and not on an historic building.

Mr. Stanley said the aquarium sign is huge.

Mr. Sharp said that was a similar discussion.

Mr. Sneddon said the building originally had impressive signage and this is an updated version of that. It is consistent with what has been there.

Mr. Luoma asked about future tenant signage.

Ms. Sodt said the board could direct Staff to administratively approve signage shown in blue. She noted that the Controls agreement indicates that Staff can review administratively.

Mr. Donegan said there are four spaces; signage will be same size as doors.

Mr. Murdock asked about Ye Olde Curiosity Shop lighting.

Mr. Donegan said it has been there since 1985.

Mr. Sharp said they are the same hoop lights as over Pier 54.

Ms. Sodt said that there is always the ability to send to the board for review and noted she is comfortable with reviewing signage.

Messrs. Murdock and Stanley agreed the proposal made sense.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed signage and signage plan, at Pier 54, 1001 Alaskan Way.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 123859 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/MST/AL 10:0:0 Motion carried.

012016.23

Harvard Belmont  
1075 Summit Ave East  
Propose landscaping and low wall

Ms. Nashem explained that the owner proposes to remove hedges that were installed by a previous homeowner without approval.

Anne Friedlander explained they want to remove the cypress hedge and construct a low dry stack or mortared stone wall that connects the front of the house to the

garage. She said behind the hedge is a grass patch, Deodar Cedar, 12 square foot patio, garden paths and perennial beds. Responding to questions she said the wall will go 3' back from the sidewalk and will be at seating height. She said the house is stucco and they want a blocky mortared wall to match the stone in the foundation. She said they want to cap off the wall with Pennsylvania Blue Stone. She said that ARC suggested a lower concrete wall but they really want stone for old world charm and didn't think concrete would be aesthetic.

Mr. Luoma said that stacked walls exist elsewhere in the district and what is proposed would distinguish it from the building as different. It is a small wall, not long, and would have minimal adverse impact to the historic structure. He said that a stucco wall with cap and the attempt to keep it like the building surfaces would also be compatible.

Mr. Stanley asked if a boxwood hedge had been considered instead of a wall.

Ms. Friedlander said they want a low wall to allow light in but they was a physical indicator that this is private property. She said there was an open space next to them where people come to take photos. They would plant low growing ferns, hellebore; have some boxwoods that they can repurpose so the wall will be partially obscured.

Mr. Luoma said the Committee said there was no issue with removal of the hedge. He said the landscape and materials on the interior of the wall won't be visible from the right of way and there was no real concern about the work there. He said the committee preferred a concrete, stucco or mortared wall.

Ms. Patterson asked about hardscape.

Ms. Friedlander said the path and funky door exist now. She said a square patio is proposed with Pennsylvania blue Stone.

Ms. Patterson said she preferred concrete stucco or nothing but the rock wall is reversible and not a big problem.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Murdock agreed that it is a minor installation. He said the stone is very different from masonry foundation and it won't be confused with historic fabric.

Ms. Barker said to let details be reviewed by Staff and she is ok with the wall and with the removal of the hedge.

Mr. Sneddon said the proposal is too vague and should have final approval by Staff. He said there are not specs for the wall and there is no specific design.

Mr. Luoma said it should be more definitive and show exactly what is to be installed. He said the wall doesn't really sit on its own and his preference would be to have it directly compatible. He said the yard with courtyard behind it doesn't have to be the same architectural style. He said a plain wall with little adornment is preferable but was okay with mortared colonial wall stone with blue stone cap.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board issue a Certificate of Approval for removal of an unapproved hedge and installation of a low wall and landscaping subject to Staff review of final details.

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

District ordinance

The proposed restorations plans as presented January 20, 2016 do not adversely affect the special features or characteristics of the buildings 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.

4. Fences and Walls:

Guideline: If fencing is required, low fences are encouraged especially in front yards to maintain the existing openness of the district.

Guideline: Fencing and wall materials shall be consistent with the district.

Guideline: Planting is encouraged to soften the visual appearance of fencing and walls.

Secretary of Interior Standards

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

MM/SC/DB/RK            10:0:0 Motion carried.

012016.24

Sand Point Naval Air Station – Buildings 11 & 40

7777 62<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE

Proposed exterior building and site alterations, and signage

Tabled.

**012016.3 COVENANTS FOR TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS**

012016.31 Fischer Studio Building  
1519 Third Avenue

Ms. Sodt explained the TDR program which is an incentive for downtown landmarks. She said that SDCI established the amount available and did an analysis. She said the building is in good standing and there have been ongoing projects to maintain the building. She said the covenant is standard.

Mr. Murdock asked about TDR availability.

Ms. Sodt said there are some on the Market but not enough for what is wanted in terms of incentive zoning needs. She said the owners should be able to sell if they want to. She said the value of TDR is a private market value.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board makes the determination that the Fischer Studio Building at 1519 Third Avenue has fulfilled the requirements for transfer of Landmark TDR pursuant to SMC 23.49.014 and Ordinance No. 120443 – that the building is a designated Landmark with a Controls and Incentives Agreement pursuant to Ordinance No. **123382**; that an authorization letter from DPD has been received and has identified the number of transferable square feet to be 19,454 square feet; and, the building is not presently in need of rehabilitation, therefore no security is required.

MM/SC/RK/AL 10:0:0 Motion carried.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approved the agreement entitled “COVENANTS FOR LANDMARK TRANSFERABLE DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS” as submitted to the Board as the legal agreement required as a condition to the transfer of development rights from the Fischer Studio Building at 1519 Third Avenue, per SMC 23.49.014D(4).

MM/SC/RK/AL 10:0:0 Motion carried.

*Ms. Barker left at 4:36 pm.*

**012016.4 NOMINATIONS**

012016.41 701-9<sup>th</sup> Avenue North

Matt Aalfs, Weinstein AU, prepared and presented the nomination report (full report in DON file). He provided context of the neighborhood and site. He said the building is a typical brick pilaster building with shaped parapet. He said it was built in response to grade changes and noted the banding change. He indicated on photos taken over time where changes had been made to the building. He noted the modified and infilled bays,



all original entry glass has been removed, divided light transoms infilled. He said that all storefront entries have been changed or infilled. He said that two windows on the alley were enlarged to create alley entrance. He said that six roof monitors were altered. He said there are no original windows; the metal parapet cap is gone as is the decorative element at the parapet. He said there is no integrity to convey its significance.

Ellen Mirro, Johnson Partnership, said the building did not meet criteria A or B. She said the building did not meet the double significance of Criterion C. She said that the subject site was original under water and was infilled with garbage which is why it is settling and there are cracks in every bay. She spoke of the trucking industry association and said that while Mack did have a presence here it was only until 1954. She said that the White Motor Company and Kelly Springfield buildings have more integrity and significant associations with tenants. She said that compared to the White and Kelly Springfield buildings this building has no architectural detail or great exterior; it is just typical. She said it has lost its openness and can't convey what it was. She said it was average even before alterations. She said that Henry Bittman was prolific and designed many area buildings; she noted the Decatur, Terminal Sales, Fraternal Order of Eagles, Mann Building, Troy Laundry buildings among others. She said this was an average effort of his. She said that Earl Roberts remodeled the building in 1945; it was not significant. She said that the building did not meet Criterion E. She said that although it is at the corner of 9<sup>th</sup> and Roy it was not prominent and did not meet Criterion F.

Jack McCullough said that the building is not a great work of Bittman. He said that Mack was here 27 years but there is no double significance; he noted White Motor Company and Kelly Springfield buildings as finer examples. He said all the character defining features are gone – the storefronts, windows, transom, ornament, parapet.

Mr. Sneddon asked if there was a connection between storeroom and service or if that was new.

Ms. Mirro said it was particular to the trucking industry; White Motor and Kelly Springfield did as well. She said they would do customization and then repairs on that work.

Mr. Ketcherside said originally it was separated but then they started to co-locate.

Mr. Sneddon said there was heavy competition. Service was used as a way to sell cars.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Ketcherside did not support nomination because there wasn't enough integrity.

Mr. Sneddon did not support nomination. He said that Criterion C would have been pertinent with the role of logging and timber to the City. He said that it was an important transition to trucks and the truck industry speaks to the importance of timber industry in area and how it evolved to sales and service. He said the basic structure is conveyed but he noted there have been irreversible changes to the showroom and service area.

Mr. Luoma did not support nomination. He said that trucking was an important part of the economy then but the building can no longer convey its connection to trucking.

Mr. Stanley did not support nomination because there was no integrity.

Mr. Kiel did not support nomination because there was no integrity.

Ms. Johnson said it had no integrity and did not support nomination.

Ms. Patterson said it had integrity issues. She said the structure can be interpreted but the glazing is gone and there is infill.

Mr. Murdock did not support nomination and said there is a higher bar. He noted the loss of openings and glazing.

Mr. Ketcherside appreciated the extra time on the nomination report.

Action: I move that the Board not approve the nomination of the building located at 701 – 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue North as a Seattle Landmark, as it does not have the integrity or ability to convey its significance as required by SMC 25.12. 350.

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

012016.42

Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, Seattle Branch  
1015 Second Avenue

Mr. Sneddon disclosed that he worked as an historic resources associate and wrote a report on the Federal Reserve Bank.

Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill, said they had no issue with Mr. Snedden participating. He said that several years ago the board voted unanimously not to nominate the building and he hoped the current board would say no as well.

Larry Johnson, Johnson Partnership, prepared and presented the nomination report (full report in DON file). He provided context of the site and neighborhood. He said the building is clad in limestone. He said the building is a simple rectangle with recessed central portion. He said the building has non-original tripartite window panels and spandrel panel. He said the entry has projecting dark granite and original doors; the windows above used to be light bronze. He said the north façade, where the armored trucks came in has scribed concrete. He said the south façade exhibits basement plinth paved and planted as terrace. He said that the original bronze elevator doors, marble panels, teller area with bronze screens, vault doors in basement and subbasement remain. He said the upper floors have been gutted. He said the exterior has integrity and although the windows have been changed they are still in tripartite configuration.

He said that the building does not meet criteria A or B. He said that the building is casually associated with the development of the central business district. He said that after the 1889 fire there was rapid growth and expansion northward. He said that during the depression government buildings were constructed. This building was constructed in 1949-50. He questioned if the Federal Reserve Bank's association and impact on Seattle was significant and if so, can the exterior and lobby are able to convey that. He said that the style fits into no clear category but anticipates the modern style. He said the Nakamura Courthouse is a more true PDA modern federal building. He noted the Public

Safety Building and said the early International Style was applied to American civic buildings. He noted the simplicity and lack of ornament and horizontal and vertical intersecting volumes. He showed photos and detail of other Federal Reserve buildings. He reported that an earlier design was found and that what was built is very different from original intent of architects. He said that this is a more conservative building.

Mr. Johnson said there are better examples of NBBJ's work. He cited Susan J. Henry Library, Scottish Rite Temple, First Presbyterian Church, Clyde Hill Elementary School, Seafirst Tower, Financial Center, and One and Two Union Square among others. He said the building does not meet Criterion F.

Mr. McCullough said the building is in the same condition it was at last nomination; it is intact but has had window changes. He said the board at the time voted unanimously not to nominate. He said the discovery of an earlier design supports the view that this is a Plan B building.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Kiel said that other entities deem this significant.

Mr. McCullough said it is on the National Register and other speakers may cover that.

Mr. Luoma noted the story of NBBJ's evolving design and how it was pared down. He asked about the material on the façade and how that speaks to that.

Mr. Johnson said it was the bank's choice.

Jeffrey Ochsner said that Bain wanted Chuckanut Sandstone; the Federal Reserve Bank wanted limestone.

Mr. Johnson said that limestone is slightly cheaper.

Ms. Mirro said they used similar limestone on other Federal buildings.

Mr. Johnson said that Bain was proposing something local which was part of the Modern movement.

Mr. McCullough said it was a second choice building.

Mr. Johnson said that it is an unfriendly building; transparency was not important. He said that after 911 it was felt that this building wasn't defensible and the vault was moved to a non-descript secure location in Kent.

Mr. Sneddon asked if how money was processed and stored was reflected in the space and how did the building reflect the latest security measures.

Mr. Johnson said that when built they used heavily reinforced concrete but now they do much with electronics.

Mr. Ochsner said that 1949-50 was the beginning of the Cold War and there was fear of bombers dropping bombs. He said they needed to be able to distribute cash and they

needed to defend the vault. Later they needed to protect the truck and they added vault with a gate.

Mr. Luoma asked if there were specific thoughts about why Scheme B was used.

Mr. Johnson didn't know.

Ms. Mirro said that Pietro Belluschi did the same thing on the Portland building.

Public Comment:

Patricia Gelenberg sent a letter (in file). She said the building was built after WWII. She said the building was built for stability, solidity, for image; it was sound and safe. She said that it served a purpose. She said to preserve it. It is a representation of what it was intended to be. She supported nomination of the entire exterior including the roof.

Kevin Tisemen said he loves the building and said it is beautiful because of its simplicity and elegance. He said if not landmarked it won't survive. He said he read Attachment A by David Van Skype, and a report that Jeffrey Ochsner made about history of Seattle architecture and men how designed it. He said it meets all criteria.

Kent Pausch noted where the building sits in relation to other buildings and to leave it as it is.

David Rash said he did research for the National Register report. He said that all four NBBJ principals listed the building as one of the representative projects. He said the building gave the City the same status as other large cities. He supported nomination.

Jeffrey Ochsner said he did research for the National Register report. He said Larry Johnson was contracted to do the research. He said the contract allows independent comments. He said that in his UW course he includes this building as representative building in the history of city architecture. He said that NBBJ is significant. He said that this is the only public building that survives. He said it is representative of cold war modernism and represented solidity, stability, strength of American economy. He said the building was built for a conservative client. He thanked the new owners for cleaning the building; the staining has been removed and the limestone is the color it should be, the way it was designed. He said the building is recognized by being on the National Register. He said the board knows more about this building than the one last time did.

Susan Boyle said she did the nomination five years ago. She said the building meets Criterion C. She said when brought to the board last time there was a more populist perspective. She noted the exposure to new information and more study about post war economic and how this impacted Seattle. She said the building meets Criterion C; the hermetic solidity expresses unseen hand on economy.

Dave Van Skype provided a letter (in DON file). He said the building meets the criteria for nomination. He said it was a significant moving player – the Federal Reserve – in the community. He said focus on other buildings is not relevant; the focus is on this building. He said to look at how this building fits with a period of public plazas. He supported nominating.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Luoma said it is important to look at the building as it stands today and not to look at the future. He said that it is interesting to see alternative schemes and evolution of design. He said the building was not unsuccessful and represents the transition period where the designers wanted to push a new style but had a conservative client who stuck with material they were familiar with. He said it was a transition building. He said the building has a monumental feel and an institutional quality; it is heavy in a sense that it is a federal institutional building. He said it conveys that it was a significant player in banking downtown. He said the building meets Criterion C in how banks support unseen transactions. He said it doesn't meet Criterion E – it is not outstanding as a building but that maybe as a firm as a transitional building for their practice. He said there is a lot there and it is not just one particular aspect that makes it great; it is collectively a lot of smaller things. He supported nomination.

Mr. Kiel noted the evolution of the design – compromised design – and the intermediate steps the architect takes as design changes over time. He said that the building tells the story of its time and architecture and the client is part of that story in how the architect shifts and changes. He supported nomination on Criterion D but no other criteria although he said E possibly for business reasons rather than design philosophy.

Ms. Patterson supported nomination and noted A and C as applicable. She said that at the time it was built after WWII the building was representative of thoughts feeling emotions of the City to what the Federal Government wanted to project to citizens. She said that the building was the projection of stability which was prevalent when built. She said that Seattle Was excited about this building and what it meant; she said that it put Seattle on the map. She said the building embodies the Modern style. She said that earlier sketches show progressive thought but shows the transition of working with the client. She said this shows where NBBJ was as a firm. She said that they remained involved with remodel and re-design which again shows the progression of the firm. She said the building contrasts significantly in scale to what is around it. She said the building holds its own.

Ms. Durham said D, E and F were applicable. She appreciated the transition drawing. She said there is a long standing tradition of bank language and more austere representation. She said that what the architect wanted versus what was produced is interesting. She said the building is representative of its time. She said that it is not outstanding work of the designer but it represents the early period of NBBJ and is one of the only remaining buildings of this era. She said that the building is starkly different from what is around it.

Ms. Johnson supported nomination and noted that it wasn't straightforward. She said the building seems diluted and it not the best example of NBBJ's architecture. She said there is a scarcity of this in Seattle and the silence is distinctive. She said it is not the original plan but NBBJ still thinks of it as important work.

Mr. Sneddon supported nomination and cited C, D, E and F. He said it relates to the response to the Great Depression and the role played by the Federal Reserve. He said it marked Seattle as a center for finance with a dedicated building. He said that it shows marks of the cold war – the bunker vault design; stable, strong design. He said the architecture reflected cultural currents; he said it is fascinating to see the way traditions

and style came into Modernism. He noted the old tradition of permanence and stability in neo-classism and to think of the wider role of influences. He said the two design version was interesting and illustrates the push-pull with client. He said the designers wanted to build the Public Safety Building and this is what was built. He said that NBBJ thought the building outstanding – that was reflected in architectural journals and understand in context the building was path breaking. He noted the unusual location with the plaza and the relation to other buildings. He said he was swayed by the National Register nomination and Section 106.

Mr. Stanley said the D merits consideration as a transitional style. He wanted to hear more about scale, composition as relates to criterion F.

Mr. Ketcherside supported nomination and cited C, D, and E as applicable; he noted F was interesting. He said the path that led to the design is important because the client was important. He noted the importance of the Federal Reserve to the City’s economic heritage; he cited a series of events starting with the Yukon Gold Rush, Assay offices, INS, and this building. He said that the Federal Reserve and the U. S. Chamber of Commerce arose at the same time. He said that Seattle was an important backdrop to conversations. He said to look at Seattle as having a regional role in the creation of National body of Chambers.

Mr. Murdock said the building is unique and the typology is significant and the mass, security, monumentality conveys what it is. He said it provides rich storytelling of the immediate post war era.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, Seattle Branch located at 1015 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 and the interior of the main entrance elevator lobby and teller area on first floor; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for March 2, 2016; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

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

*Mr. Stanley left at 7:05 pm.*

**012016.5 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

012016.51 Lloyd Building  
601 Stewart Street

Jack McCullough requested an extension to the first meeting in May. He said he is working with the new owner.

Ms. Sodt said she is comfortable with the extension.

Action: I move to defer consideration for Controls and Incentives for the Lloyd Building, 601 Stewart Street, until the first meeting in May.

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

012016.52 Seattle Times Building - 1947 Office Building Addition  
1120 John Street

Ms. Sodt explained the request for a three month extension to the first meeting in May. She said they are still dealing with a complex situation. She said it is a vacant building and had been occupied by homeless people; there have been two fires in the building.

Action: I move to defer consideration for Controls and Incentives for the Seattle Times Building – 1947 Office Building Addition, 1120 John Street for three months.

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

012016.53 Seattle Times Building - Printing Plant  
1120 John Street

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

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

**012016.6 STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator