



The City of Seattle

# Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 387/20

## MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting  
Virtual Meeting Via WebEx Events  
Wednesday October 7, 2020 - 3:30 p.m.

### Board Members Present

Dean Barnes  
Roi Chang  
Russell Coney  
Matt Inpanbutr  
Jordon Kiel  
Kristen Johnson  
Ian Macleod  
Harriet Wasserman

### Staff

Sarah Sodt  
Erin Doherty  
Melinda Bloom

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

**In-person attendance is currently prohibited per Washington State Governor's Proclamation No. 20-28.5. Meeting participation was limited to access by the WebEx Event link or the telephone call-in line provided on the agenda.**

### **010720.1**

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

September 2, 2020

MM/SC/IM/KJ 8:0:0 Minutes approved.

September 16, 2020

MM/SC/HW/DB 8:0:0 Minutes approved.

### **010720.2**

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Deborah Frausto, Uptown Alliance said they are enthusiastic and unanimous in their approval of the package. She said they are excited with approach to signage. She said it celebrates and respects the landmark. She said during the EIS the community expressed concern about lights being a distraction to cars and the team has addressed that. She said the area is one and should have porosity. She said to make sure the Northwest Rooms are not a back door. She said more signage could be used there. She said OVG did outreach and engagement.

Paula Rees said she has worked with sign codes for 30 years and said she has never seen a code that allows this amount of digital signage without regulation. She asked if the large digital signage will be synchronized. She worried all the signage could be a cacophony of color and activity. She said the LED signs are energy hogs; they are hidden behind trees in rendering and are only shown in a daytime setting. She said to be careful about the number of NITS. She expressed concern the large TV screen will have lots of sponsorship ads and is not being accurately represented.

Ms. Doherty said all letters received about signage were sent to board members.

**010720.3 CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL**

010720.31 Dexter Horton Building  
710 Second Avenue  
Proposed Third Avenue lobby interior alterations.

Patrick Butler presented a proposal to alter the lobby off 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue. Originally, there were three to four different retail spaces including a barber shop. Marble surrounds and vaulted ceiling are all original. He provided photos of existing conditions showing the storefronts had been changed to display cases. He proposed removal of doors and glass at storefronts and demolition of existing offices. Two existing conference rooms will become building amenity spaces: seating, usable nooks with wainscot and carpet. New doors to match style of storefronts will be installed to better replicate what had been there. He said the display areas are 1' deep now; they will make them deeper to create gathering spaces with glass delineating the room. He stated they were able to find original plans for the space; the storefront where they are putting in a door is original so door will better match what had been there originally.

Mr. Kiel said ARC had reviewed the project twice and he noted appreciation for applicant responsiveness. He said the applicant did a good job responding to ARC comments and he was able to find the original drawings.

Ms. Wasserman appreciated the work the applicant did and that he found more information and changed the plan.

Mr. Macleod asked if the proposed glazing will be frosted or clear.

Mr. Butler said it will probably be a single piece of clear glass.

Mr. Inpanbutr said clear would be more consistent with the rest of the lobby.

Mr. Kiel noted the applicant's good response to ARC. He said what is proposed is reversible and maintains historic fabric. He said the project moves in the right direction from a display case to amenity space.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed interior alterations to the Third Avenue lobby of the Dexter Horton Building, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The interior alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 116970, 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/MI/DB            8:0:0    Motion carried.

010720.32

Brehm Brothers House #1

219 36<sup>th</sup> Avenue E

Proposed alterations to the exterior and interior at the back of the house, and the rear yard

Andrea Ermoli explained the house is one of two cottages designed together by Ellsworth Storey for the Brehm Brothers. He said the proposed work is on the rear of the house: open up kitchen, remodel bathroom, and enclose covered porch. He said the family room remains unchanged with exception of recapture of the closet; floor to be patched to match what is there. He said two French doors will be installed, one on north and one on south of the rear façade, and two new sets of stairs leading to patio will be installed. He said there will be a new bank of windows for breakfast area. He said that some of the original lattice work will be reused. The patio will be repaved in bluestone pavers.

Mr. Ermoli said the window and door detail will match original muntin patterns without the cross pattern at top to differentiate new from original. He said an 18" Magnolia is being preserved and a yew hedge along west property line will be installed for privacy.

Mr. Barnes asked about elimination of basement door.

Mr. Ermoli said there will be interior basement access only; they don't need exterior access. He said it looks like the exterior access was added at some point.

Mr. Barnes asked if the bathroom was a full bathroom before.

Mr. Ermoli said it was.

Mr. Macleod asked if the building next door was used as a point of reference. He said it is interesting that the subject house was gutted by fire the year it was landmarked.

Mr. Ermoli said he didn't use it as a reference because it is quite different in character. He said each house has its own character, so he thought it was more appropriate to focus on the subject house.

Mr. Macleod said it made sense. He said it seems like it was meant to have symmetrical staircases to patio.

Mr. Ermoli said the owners wanted to activate the back yard.

Mr. Kiel said ARC reviewed the project and thought what is proposed was appropriate and keeps the character of the house.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed site and building alterations to the Brehm Brothers House #1, 219 36th Avenue E, 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. 108734, 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*.

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

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

010720.33

Gas Works Park

2101 N Northlake Way

Proposed selective removal of trees

Kevin Bergsrud, Department of Parks and Recreation (DOPAR) explained that 20 Western Red Cedars are affected by insect and/or fungus, drought conditions / climate change. He said 15 trees are dead, and five are dying. He proposed removal of the trees, and they will subsequently assess appropriate replacement trees species which will be similar in form. He said a separate application will address planting of trees and installation of an irrigation system.

Mr. Coney asked if issues could be due to association with site being a Super Fund site.

Mr. Bergsrud said he didn't know. He said berms were composed of all imported soil. He said Western Red Cedars are dying up and down the west coast.

Mr. Coney said some photos show trees look OK. He asked if it was a natural succession, trees were crowded out or wrong tree in wrong place.

Mr. Bergsrud noted drought conditions and possible insect causing stress both likely contributed. He said trees are close together. He said when they consider different tree varieties, they will look at spacing them farther apart.

Mr. Coney asked about the number of trees affected.

Mr. Bergsrud said 20 trees are impacted: 15 are dead, five are dying.

Ms. Doherty said the Staff Report notes 20 trees.

Mr. Kiel said it doesn't take an expert to recognize dead trees.

Ms. Chang asked what size tree will replace these.

Mr. Bergsrud said he wasn't sure but that they would likely be younger trees.

Nick Johnson, arborist with Department of Parks and Recreation (DOPAR) said the replacement trees would need to be smaller for evergreen varieties for better success.

Ms. Chang asked the estimated timeline for planting new trees and installing irrigation system.

Mr. Johnson said he wasn't sure how long it would take to repair the irrigation system but that they hoped to have planting done by December 2021 with a Certificate of Approval application submitted by September 2021.

Ms. Doherty suggested January 2022 as a completion date and noted the agreed-upon date would need to be added to the motion.

Mr. Bergsrud said they try to get application approved two-three months prior to planting.

Mr. Johnson said there are Cedar trees on site that are drought-stressed. He said they may be giving off hormones that attract Cedar borers. He said he thinks there will be more dead trees next year.

Mr. Barnes suggested approving the removal of 20 trees, and have others similarly affected reviewed by staff to make it easier.

Ms. Doherty said she was willing to do that if DOPAR provide similar documentation.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed removal of trees and any others adversely affected at Gas Works Park, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed removal of these trees affects the features of the landmark as specified in Ordinance No. 121043. But the applicant has demonstrated the need to perform this work to address safety concerns.
2. The proposed size and species of replacement trees is required to be reviewed and approved by the Landmarks Board. These new trees shall be replanted before January 2022.
3. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

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

Ms. Doherty said additional trees to be removed will be reviewed by Staff per the Board's feedback.

010720.34

Northwest Rooms  
305 Harrison Street  
Proposed alterations to north breezeway

Presentation materials in DON file.

Julia Levitt, Seattle Center provided background on the project and noted in 2016 there was a similar project to declutter and remove the non-historic elements. She said there was no follow-through because the bids were too high. She said now the context has changed with the Arena and they can move ahead with changes to breezeway and the DuPen Fountain which will finish out entry to neighborhood.

Rico Quirindongo, DLR Group read through the project description and goals in Section 1 of the presentation document.

Tibor Nagy, DLR Group went through Section 2 slides. He said the 1962 building was opened up as a breezeway in 1991-92 and embellishments were added. He proposed clean-up of the area and went over the scope of work. He noted existing conditions and proposed demolition of elements: including lower swoop canopies, storage spaces, bollards, ramp. He said a roof hatch and ladder would be added as well as three new stair risers and an ADA ramp. Columns and structure remain. He reiterated that panels, bollards, handrails, cast in place concrete, canopies will be removed and showed rendering of proposed condition.

Ms. Levitt explained that owner will install bird deterrent of stainless steel spikes and wires; wires will follow roof trusses.

*Mr. Kiel left meeting at 5:00 pm.*

Mr. Coney asked if there is a way to remove the ladder and said he thought it was an attractive nuisance.

Ms. Levitt said it is the preference of the operations team to have it there and said they could revisit it. She said if it is an aesthetic concern, they could match the ladder to background color. She said they felt the ladder at the 6' height would keep

people off of it. She said there are patrols of the center but it is not watched 24/7. She said there could be an option for retractable ladder.

Mr. Coney said it is a distraction because it wasn't there before.

Mr. Macleod appreciated the applicant addressed the bird issue. He said it would be nice to see the ladder go away. He said the cover is another distraction. He asked if lighting is directed up or downwards.

Ms. Doherty recollected up lighting.

Mr. Barnes noted aesthetics versus practicality/maintenance with ladder. He said if not there, a maintenance person would have to carry to location.

Ms. Doherty noted that OSHA may require a fixed ladder for safety.

Ms. Johnson said there are very specific OSHA standards and a fixed ladder is always preferable.

Mr. Barnes said it is a safety issue.

Mr. Quirindongo said the ladder could be painted the same color as wall to minimize appearance. He noted the utility of the space.

Ms. Johnson said the space has been so simplified that now anything is visible. She said there is no 'back of house'. She said it would be nice if it were not there, but it seems like an operation issue. She said it has been simplified as much as possible.

Mr. Inpanbutr asked interior spaces were explored that might be more secure.

Ms. Levitt said tenant spaces are all leased and occupied; it would be more complex to put an operational ladder there.

Mr. Inpanbutr said electrical equipment enclosure conceal panels.

Ms. Chang asked if the vehicular ramp had been used before.

Ms. Levitt said this is a busy event center and she noted the activities relate to day to day operations. The ramp was not previously designed for vehicles; this is an operational upgrade. She said the planter in the middle was to catch leaking water from skylights.

Mr. Inpanbutr said it cleans up nicely and opens up the breezeway to the public. He said it was a nice proposal.

Mr. Coney supported the application and suggested relocation of ladder.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed breezeway alterations at the Northwest Rooms, 305 Harrison Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 124584, 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/IM/MI            7:0:0    Motion carried.

**010720.4            BRIEFINGS**

010720.41            Century 21 Coliseum / Key Arena  
305 Harrison Street  
Briefing on proposed site and building signage

Todd Leiweke, Oak View Group (OVG) said the signage plan is thoughtful and respectful. He said he was glad to have a world class arena that preserves what was there. He said the project is 100% privately funded. He noted the design challenges to save the roof and they found an architect to make it work. He said the roof held. He said this is the most beautiful arena in the world. He said Seattle takes it rightful place in music, Kraken, Champion Seattle Storm, and in being the first zero carbon building. He said from top to bottom it is a model globally. He said ice for rink will be of rainwater collected from the roof at Seattle Center. He appreciated the partnership with Landmarks, Seattle Center, City and with community. He said there was not one challenge to the EIS.

Robert Nellams, Seattle Center Executive Director said the signage plan has come a long way. He said the plan was part of the arena negotiations. He said OVG started with a vision and brought that to Seattle Center who provided feedback and pushed back on several items including the number and order of signs. OVG revised the plan and shared with this board and the National Parks Service (NPS) who pushed back and OVG responded and made revisions. He said this is the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> iteration of the site plan (note: 2<sup>nd</sup> iteration for the Landmarks Board). It has been shared with the community, resident groups, and has received positive feedback. He said OVG kept the roof and they kept the look, feel, and vision of public spaces. The building was designed to be an optimistic vision of the future and that vision will continue. He said OVG will pay for 100%; no public funds will be used. He said the signage will enhance the entire Seattle Center.

Geoff Cheong, Populous Architects said the space is a 360° pedestrian-oriented space, it is an arena in a park. He said signage pays homage to design of the World's Fair. He said they will show how new entries will function, the placement of signage, and he identified accessible pathways.

Kelly Holton, Populous Architects said there is a lot of LED neon; inspiration was taken from the roof itself. She said the font chosen was used throughout the 1950s-

60s. The 'fly-through' video was played as Ms. Holton identified proposed signage and its placement.

Christine Lazzaretto, Historic Resources Group read through NPS approval on page 15 of the presentation package and noted the reduction in massing and size and quantity of signs.

Ms. Holton identified changes informed by NPS & Landmarks Review including reduction in size of signs above the entry canopies, reduction in size of entry signage on historic curtain wall, reduction in size of Alaska Airlines Atrium signage. She provided a summary of the evolution of signage and walked board through details in the briefing packet. She said the light on naming right signage will mimic neon. She stated that originally 30 pole banners were proposed; that number was reduced to 12 and following NPS and LPB review it was reduced to 8.

Laura Haddad, Haddad | Druggan introduced proposed public art (p 59) and identified locations to receive art and which art pieces would be placed where.

Mr. Cheong said it is a unique project that has required LPB and NPS review. He said there is critical operational signage and synergy – honor historic roof and features of the landmark.

Mr. Coney asked if the satellite globes part of the installation. He noted one Thirty panel was destroyed at the upper north plaza.

Mr. Cheong said the atoms piece is being reinstalled; it is being moved reinstalled in the north courtyard.

Ms. Doherty said the Thirty panel is not going to be recreated, based on feedback from the Landmarks Board.

Ms. Levitt said they are planning to propose a plaque to memorialize the history of the courtyard.

Mr. Inpanbutr thanked the team for the well laid out and clear presentation. He appreciated the applicant's response to board concerns and comments. He asked the significance of the NIT level of digital signs.

Julie Wilson-McNerny, Perkins Coie said as part of the project the City proposed an arena overlay to accommodate signage law and did not address this. 500 units changed to 500 NITS as unit of measurement but there was no increase in brightness.

Mr. Barnes appreciated the work and proposed signage. He said the cleanup is outstanding.

Ms. Wasserman said she was glad to see the changes and noted it is an improvement. She said the plan has tightened up and is neater. She said she was glad to see the art plan.

Mr. Barnes asked for more information about the memory rail in the art plan.

Ms. Haddad said there will be 21 etched panels, drawings with a few words that tell stories visually. She said the stories are real perspectives.

Mr. Coney said he appreciated that Messrs. Leiweke and Nellams were at the meeting today. He said he has lived in Seattle all his life and lived mostly on Capitol Hill and mostly on the same street he grew up on. He said he has a lot of history here, including at Seattle Center. He said he doesn't have memories of the World's Fair but of shortly after including climbing up the support beams to the roof. He said he has stories about that and can talk about that later. He hoped they have some sort of remediation plan to prevent that. He noted energetic, happy fans coming out after a big win get riled up and do crazy things. He said there was a story of someone injuring themselves from falling off one and then the Center put ponds around those support beams. He said as kids they just took off their shoes, waded across the pond and then climbed the support beams. He said this is a world-class facility and it may be the best in the world. He said it is an amazing engineering feat. He said as a citizen of Seattle, he is proud of that. He said that as a CPA with a master's degree in taxation and as the finance member of the Landmarks board, he said that although no public funds are being used, they are getting historic tax credits which is a contribution by the public even though the public did not write a check. He said he could understand the wayfinding signage. He said a Climate Pledge arena has electrified signs, but they are low power. He said what disturbed him about this proposal and what was shown today is that considering the campus as a whole, Pacific Science Center, MoPop, Center House, International Fountain, Horiuchi Mural, he did not appreciate the pole signs and the dynamic LED displays. They have no precedent with the Seattle Center. He said that the ethos of the people of Seattle has been very green and forward-looking; this seems in contradiction to that. He said there are lighted flashing signs. He said it is a new era but there are better ways of doing it. He said he is opposed to the pole signs and the dynamic LED displays. He said that if we have them, he is opposed to them being bright. He said 50 NITS versus 500 units sounds like a lot. He said he is not a sign person. He said he does not like the pole banners or the LED displays. He said he is opposed to anything with motion. He said he didn't think the motion signs are allowed on highways with the exception of the one in Fife but that one sits on Native American reservation land. The moving motion signs disturb him. He said it is not appropriate in a mixed-use facility like this in a residential area. He said it seems anti-Seattle. He said it isn't what the folks in this City would expect. He said the motion is just advertising. He said facing 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, it will be a distraction to traffic; it is garish and inappropriate. He was glad for a reduced number. He said the faux LED, white lights do its purpose and are not so offensive, assaultive. He said he was concerned about light pollution at night. He said that some folks who have made presentations heard this from him before but he reiterated in terms of respecting the historic roof and the curtain wall that the large support beams be returned to their original color, red.

Ms. Johnson asked if the pole signs are illuminated 24-hours

Allison Bickford, Seattle Kraken said she thought they would be on for a certain time period during the day.

Ms. Levitt said there is a time limit in the sign code on the video signs; they should be off from 10:00 pm to 7:00 am unless there is an event at the arena. Signs will be on for an hour after arena events conclude.

Mr. Coney asked how many events per year are expected to run past 10:00 pm.

Ms. Bickford said there will be 41 hockey games, not all games are night games. She said depending on the length of the game, it is variable. She said there will be concerts and, she hoped, to attract lots of events to build credibility as an events venue for the City. She said they will be respectful to the neighborhood in terms of when those events start and end.

Ms. Doherty asked Ms. Levitt to clarify what she meant when she said ‘video signs’ and if that meant the large rectangular image signs or the pole banner signs.

Ms. Levitt said she thought only the pole banners signs were changing image.

Ms. Holton said the LED displays are noted as changing image.

Ms. Levitt said she didn’t think there was video on the pole banner signs.

Ms. Doherty asked if that meant they would be off after 10:00 pm.

Ms. Levitt said according to the sign code; the sign code regulates the time of operation of the video signs.

Mr. Leiweke said they have a track record of being respectful to the neighborhood and how they have operated during construction. He said he thought they had become a model in many ways and that is how they are going to operate the building. He said they know they are in a neighborhood and that people live here. He said they will be respectful in how they will run the building. He said beyond regulations, and before all that is their desire to be a great citizen to the community and neighborhood.

Ms. Johnson appreciated the reduction in signage. She said it is a modern building, and when you see a sports use signage is expected. She noted the tension between historic and modern arena needs. She appreciated that what is on the building is the faux neon, white, signs which are great. She appreciated that the bright signs are pulled away from the historic building. She said from a landmarks perspective she was glad the really large signs are on the edge, away from clearly historic building. She said she was comfortable with proposal.

Mr. Macleod said he attended the previous signage briefing and that he appreciated how much dialed back the proposal is and how it has matured. He said the non-dynamic signage, faux neon, and wayfinding look fantastic. He said the typeface is good. He agreed with Mr. Coney about the dynamic signs. He said it is a modern sporting facility. He said this is a historic building in a historic context. He noted the minimal video signage at CenturyLink and T-Mobile stadiums. He said Husky Stadium has an enormous video board that is on 24-hours a day. He said it is striking how very visible it is. He suggested static graphics rather than video. He appreciated the phenomenal effort restoration. He said there are a few too many signs but it is a huge improvement. He said they have taken away 30-odd signs. He preferred toning down flashing further.

Ms. Chang asked about Controls for the site. She asked about landscaping impacts.

Ms. Doherty said the entire site is designated. The board already approved improvements to the site including planting, paving materials; the renderings reflect that. Trees shown in

renderings at the street edge are existing. She said there will be no vote today as it is the second briefing for the signage. She said the roof sign was approved by the Board recently. She will talk to the design team to determine if they are ready to submit for the Certificate of Approval or if they want another briefing.

Ms. Chang said it will be interesting to see the light studies to see how the signs would stand out at night. She said it may be beyond what is required. She appreciated views and 3-D provided.

Mr. Coney said he likes the white faux neon and said he had no problem with sponsor signage. He said the art has a lot of illumination and he was concerned about light pollution on site. He said other sports facilities don't have a lot of dynamic LED video there and he asked for restraint.

Mr. Inpanbutr said originally it seemed appropriate but after hearing comments about brightness he wants to do research more on his own and think about it.

Mr. Macleod echoed Ms. Chang and asked if it might be possible to do studies of lighting levels. He said light pollution is a concern.

Ms. Chang said it doesn't have to be complex, just more detail with times these things will be lit – art, wayfinding and pole signs -so we can see the bigger picture with and without events.

Mr. Macleod said the art is wonderful.

Ms. Johnson appreciated the seating, and picture-taking opportunities.

010720.42

Original Van Asselt School

7201 Beacon Avenue S

Briefing on proposed addition to 1909 school building

Briefing packet in DON file.

Ethan Bernau, SOJ explained how the site would be used as an interim school during the renovations or replacements of several public schools. He said they must stick to scope, budget, and meeting their educational specification.

Caroline Lemay, Bassetti Architects provided context of the site, existing conditions and programmatic constraints and buildable areas.

Lorne McConachie, Bassetti Architect provided Edgar Blair's 1911 expansion site plan where options were explored at that time.

Mr. McConachie and Ms. Lemay went over Options A, B, C, D, and E with Option C being the preferred option. Option C provides breathing room in front of historic building that is more gracious than Option B. Relocation of the historic building was explored but was problematic and expensive and not consistent with *Secretary of Interior's Standards*.

Mr. McConachie said other options were explored that left the 1909 building untouched with new building around it. He read from the Ordinance about why landmarks are preserved. He said the preferred approach is re-use and rehabilitation of the landmarked building. He said incorporating the 1909 building into the new design allows for its seismic stabilization and re-use and noted now it is a structure boarded up, and a safety hazard. He explained options E.1 and E.2 were explored and why neither would be feasible. He said Option C was upgraded to C.1 and is preferred. He said it involves full use and revitalization of the 1909 for intended use. He said the third story was removed and the footprint was minimized at the west portion of the addition, courtyard space is larger, and gasket around the 1909 building is added.

An animated 'fly-through' of Option C.1 was presented.

Mr. Macleod appreciated the additional E. 1 and E. 2 options studies and asked why they weren't feasible.

Mr. McConachie said when the historic building is not used, they have to build more new building which costs more.

Ms. Lemay said the 1909 building doesn't work as a standalone and noted it has been boarded up for 11 years. She said it would be too costly to bring this building up to Code on its own including adding sprinklers, elevators, meeting ADA Code.

Mr. Macleod said the economy of sharing improvements between the two makes sense.

Mr. Bernau said it is the economy of reusing a four-classroom schoolhouse, so they are building 26 classrooms instead of 30.

Mr. Coney asked about the programmatic needs without the 1909 building since it has been boarded. How many students can be accommodated in the 1950's building and how many more students are you trying to accommodate, with how many classrooms?

Cherie Hendricks, Broadview Associates said that there are approximately twenty stations in the 1950's building. Because they are adding 26 in addition. She said there are special needs students who need to be served they cannot count each of those stations as a 30-student teaching station. While up to 900 students could be accommodated in the new addition if they were all full-size classes, the combined total that we are able to accommodate is about 1000 students. She said because they need to accommodate 10 special education classrooms, some of which have two students, others have eight or 10. She said that some of the specialized classrooms, like arts and music, have different capacities depending on the number of students who sign up for those. She said they are confident the number of students they will accommodate will be about 1000 students. She said that each program that rolls through this has to have the flexibility to assign classes to different spaces as they see fit. She said the particular assignment to the 1950's building or the addition, or the 1909 will depend on which programs they see fit to place in each building. She said that is the total capacity they are shooting for.

Mr. Coney clarified the total capacity of 1000.

Ms. Hendricks said that is correct.

Mr. Coney said he understands the school district has a rotation of different schools with temporary spaces while the home schools are rehabilitated, remodeled, rebuilt. He said it is a transitory situation here.

Ms. Hendricks concurred.

Mr. Coney asked what the plan is for this property once that is over.

Ms. Hendricks said there is no definitive plan, these are the projects that are at least partially funded. She said the project that is fully funded is for Mercer Middle School to move into this campus in 2023. Through the current BEX levy there is funding to design the renovation of Aki Kurose Middle School, not the money for construction. She said they are optimistic and assume the next levy funds the construction of Aki Kurose. She said when the master plans were done for the area, 26-27 were done in preparation for this BEX levy; the next middle school that would be in line would be Washington Middle School. She said it is an increasingly tentative as time goes on. She said after that, there are seven or eight elementary schools in the southeast region that need to be replaced. She said they have done master plans to show how pairs of schools could occupy this site. She said they have also done studies to see how a high school, with some revisions, might be able to occupy this site. She said there is a need to seismically upgrade one of the unreinforced masonry buildings, Franklin High School. She said the further out they get, the less certain they are about who will occupy it but there is pretty good certainty that there will be a series of schools in this site over a period of time.

Mr. Coney said that certainty does not include Kurose because there aren't funds to build a new school.

Ms. Hendricks said they have funds to design it so there is a higher degree of confidence. That design process is going to start during this funded levy. She said there are financial and political influences. She said those three schools with the possibility of a high school thrown in. She said there are a variety of factors that could shift that plan over time.

Mr. Coney said of course. He said to be clear the design for Aki Kurose School is funded but not the construction. He asked if Washington Middle School is designed and funded.

Ms. Hendricks said it is not funded but has been master planned. She said racial equity was a factor in determining who would be funded next. In the last analysis, it was deemed likely that Washington Middle School would be up next. She said that could shift if demographics change. She said over time it may be another school that is up next.

Mr. Coney said this site is going to be consistently transitory for at least a decade.

Ms. Hendricks said that is their understanding.

Ms. Wasserman appreciated the notes that call the historic building a little gem because she agrees. She said you can't plan forever ahead but you can hope levies can be used for a long time. She said all kids deserve great schools to attend. She said historic buildings should be preserved and used. She said she won't support anything that keeps the building boarded up. She said Preferred Option C.1 is not optimal but uses it and you have to look at funding. She said this is not temporary construction and will be there a long time.

Mr. Barnes asked if the African American Academy was located at this site.

Ms. Hendricks said this is the original Van Asselt school, the African American Academy is a different building now called Rising Star.

Mr. Barnes agreed with Ms. Wasserman that the historic building should be used. He said most of the schools in the southeastern part of the City are relatively new; the 1909 building provides historic context to the environment. He said the kids need a good structure for the time they are there. He said to maintain and use the 1909 building.

Ms. Chang appreciated the presentation and said it added insight hearing from the presenters. Regarding Option C.1 the new building heights are different and she likes the driveway and said the path leading in centers the landmark. She said she likes this option because she does a lot of seismic renovations and saw the need to attach the old building to the new for support. She said she likes to see transitions between new and old interiorly and exteriorly; she cited the Douglass Truth Library as an example. She appreciated the set back and walkway with windows. She would like to see the front piece be made a bit smaller. She said she likes what is being proposed here.

Mr. Macleod said he was on board with Option C back in August at the ARC briefing. He said his hesitation then was the parking right in front and he was glad to see that it was refined and now frames the historic building well. He said he likes the melding of old and new. If the building were not to be utilized, it would be a gross shame. He said the historic building needs to be used. He said what is proposed enhances the campus and is on the right track.

Mr. Inpanbutr said Option C.1 is developing nicely. He said it is good to bring the 3-story volume down to be more fitting with 1909 and the neighborhood as well. He asked where the main entry is.

Ms. Lemay said the original entrance will still be in use but is not ADA accessible. ADA entrance is located in new construction.

Mr. McConachie said how the entry is used will be a management choice in terms of ADA and security.

Mr. Coney expressed concern that they were desecrating the landmark with no long-term plan. It is a transitory school and they no long-term plan. To further add on an appendage when there is no plan for the future. He said it is a temporary structure built on a historic structure. He said they should work with the 1950's building

instead. That was specifically not landmarked. He said this is not the right direction for a transitory school. The school district needs to decide if there is a better location for these middle schools. This is a bad decision to glom something on to this building that will likely be vacant in ten years. He said as a CPA he would like to audit the School District. The building should stand alone. The addition is temporary, the landmark is permanent.

Ms. Hendricks said she described the long-term plan even if it is not a long-term specific community that will be located here. Secondly, that Mr. Coney has described this as a desecration to the landmark.

Mr. Coney said it should not be built upon, it should remain stand alone, and the 1940's addition be removed. He said to take a look at John Hay School up on Queen Anne. He said talk about racial equity... here is a separate wood structure, turn of the century building that stands alone. He said in addition to Seward Park which is not standing alone is a respectful addition and a light touch. He said he felt like everybody in the south end is getting short shrift. He said a temporary structure is going to be built and after a decade, who knows what will happen to it. He said that long term means 40-50 years not six, eight, ten years. He said he wasn't happy with the proposal and would not support it. He said they have either the wrong site or wrong design. He said he would not support any addition to the 1909 building. He said it has been boarded up since 2009 and that is the fault of the school district, not what's going on here at the landmarks board. He said to put a second story on the 1950's building and to look at their programmatic needs. He said he thought applicant said 900 students could be accommodated in 1950's building.

Ms. Hendricks clarified that she said 900 students in the addition with the 1909 building.

Mr. Coney asked how many could be accommodated with in 1950's building.

Mr. Bernau interjected and said he heard Mr. Coney's feedback and said they have laid out that there are certain constraints that don't allow them to do what Mr. Coney is proposing. He said they would like to hear from other board members as well.

Mr. Coney asked if Mr. Bernau was from the Seattle School District.

Mr. Bernau said he is the project manager.

Mr. Coney said he would like the Seattle School District to opine, and that they have the wrong site to house these people transitorily in a temporary fashion while their schools are being rebuilt.

Ms. Doherty said Mr. Bernau acknowledged that they heard Mr. Coney's opinion.

Ms. Johnson said probably everyone would prefer that that historic building remain standalone and the team has laid out the case why that is not possible. She said there are lots of issues, users, many complications. She said the siting of this building is so strange with the 1950 addition. She said with school projects flexibility is needed for the kids. She said moving the historic building is difficult and standalone is not possible. She said the new massing is respectful; it steps back, has a symmetrical

walkway up to it is helpful, the new steps down and in. She said in a perfect world the historic building would stand alone but she understood the complications.

Mr. Coney said money is not our purview; we are not here to judge estimates, budgets on any of this. Money and use are not considered when discussing a landmark.

Ms. Johnson said the addition is acceptable to her.

Mr. Barnes said the C.1 driveway option is nice and functional and asked them to look at expanding it a little bit more.

**010720.5 STAFF REPORT**

Ms. Doherty thanked Mr. Macleod for his service on the Landmarks Board as this was his last meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator