



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 96/16

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Seattle Municipal Tower

700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor

Room 4060

Wednesday, February 17, 2016 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker

Kathleen Durham

Robert Ketcherside

Jordon Kiel, Vice Chair

Kristen Johnson

Aaron Luoma, Chair

Jeffrey Murdock

Julianne Patterson

Matthew Sneddon

Mike Stanley

Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Rebecca Frestedt

Genna Nashem

Melinda Bloom

Absent

Marjorie Anderson

Nick Carter

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

021716.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

December 2, 2015 Deferred.

021716.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

021716.21

Fort Lawton

Proposed installation of signage

Ms. Nashem explained the installation of new signage on the structures and surrounding properties and an amendment to previously approved LPB208/15 for changes to the approved monument sign. ARC recommended that the applicant propose an alternative sign package that was more consistent with the previously approved monument signs and the existing white metal with black letters and trim house number signs, both of which the ARC thought were more consistent with the history and character of a military base.

P. J. Benedeno, GGLO, explained that in response to ARC comments they propose monument entry, building and site signage that is the same dimensions, similar aesthetic with upgraded materials as the previously approved signs. He said that they will use metal fabrication painted white to match trim on Officers Building on Officers Row. He said they will add plants per previous approval and as approved through DOPAR. He said the text is simplified. He said they will add a placard to each location on Montana Circle and Officers Row.

Elena Howard provided context of the site and said they will take a more militaristic approach to signage per ARC comments. She said it will be minimalist and of a higher quality and durability. She said replacement will be one-for-one; there will be no new signs.

Mr. Benedeno said that all signage will be smaller in scale than existing and will meet the Guidelines. He said the signs are white with black trim. He said that at Officers' Row they will take addresses off the houses and put them on the approved plinth. He said that black and white aluminum composite "Private Property" signage is staked 2' high.

Mr. Ketcherside asked if the signs were military style.

Ms. Howard said that the black on white was chosen. Responding to other questions she explained that the one way signs are not governed by SDOT because they are on private – not public – roads.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Barker said that ARC reviewed the sign options and suggested the return to the existing black on white sign. She said the applicant at the time wanted the monument with brick theme. She said ARC asked the applicant to simplify the materials and not to use brick.

Mr. Murdock said the new language is preferred; he said it is more consistent with the sign plan as well as more durable.

Mr. Kiel said that ARC comments were well addressed.

Ms. Barker said she is OK with the materials proposed.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board issue a Certificate of Approval for the installation of signage as proposed.

The proposed exterior alterations meet the following sections of the District ordinance and The Fort Lawton District Guidelines:

District ordinance

The proposed restorations plans as presented February 17, 2016 do not adversely affect the special features or characteristics of the buildings as specified in Ordinance #122750.

The other factors of SMC25.12.750 are not applicable

The Fort Lawton District Guidelines

DISTRICT-WIDE GUIDELINES

Signage

Signage shall comply with the Sign Code, Chapter 23.55 of the Seattle Municipal Code, in addition to the guidelines in this document. In the event of a conflict, the more restrictive provisions control.

Signage should be unobtrusive but sufficient to enable people to locate the District and to identify and appreciate its elements. Signs may also be used to identify private areas.

Signs should be neutral in color and suitable to the site.

Each building may have one flush-mounted sign for identification purposes, measuring not more than 10x10 inches.

Zone 3: WASHINGTON AVENUE (OFFICERS' ROW)

Landscaping

Maintain lawns, foundation plantings and planting beds with appropriate, non-invasive plants.

Foundation plants should be small in scale and spaced so that the porches and the building foundations remain largely visible. If replacement of plants and/or shrubs is necessary, use plant materials similar in size and form, as far as possible.

ZONE 4: MONTANA CIRCLE

Landscaping

Maintain lawns, foundation plantings and planting beds with appropriate, non-invasive plants.

Foundation plants should be small in scale and spaced so that the porches and the building foundations remain largely visible. If replacement of plants and/or shrubs is necessary, use plant materials similar in size and form, as far as possible.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

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 shall 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.

021716.22

Columbia City Landmark District
3810 S. Edmunds St.
Proposed paint colors and awning repair

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed exterior paint colors and replacement of the awning fabric on the existing frame. Exhibits included photographs, renderings and samples. She reported that the building was constructed in 1954. It is a non-contributing building located outside of the Columbia City National Register District. On February 2, 2016 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. The Committee recommended approval of the application, as proposed.

Rob Mohn, property owner, provided context of the building and provided photos showing ripped awnings, peeling paint, and security grates over windows. He went over proposed colors and application. Responding to clarifying questions he said that the southeast wall has moss growing in cracks and graffiti. He said he is trying to make the building recede.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Ketcherside said it is straightforward and tasteful; it is clear where the entry is.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations located at 3810 S. Edmunds St. This action is based on the following:

The proposed exterior alterations 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

3. Building Surface Treatments. Approved surface treatments shall be consistent with the historic qualities of the District. No paint shall be applied to unpainted masonry surfaces. Painted surfaces shall be:

- a. Repainted with the original historic color(s) of the building, provided that the business or property owner obtains a professional color analysis; or
- b. Repainted with subdued colors that are appropriate and consistent with the building and other buildings in the District. Local paint stores have an "historic colors" palette that may be useful as a guide. The Board Coordinator also has a palette of historic colors that may be used as reference.

10. Awnings/Canopies/Marquees. Marquees, awnings, and canopies will be encouraged at street level. Shiny, high-gloss materials are not appropriate. Distinctive architectural features shall not be covered, nor shall installation damage the structure. Awnings may be installed on upper levels where appropriate.

Secretary of the Interiors Standards #10

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

021716.23

Pier 57

1301 Alaskan Way

Proposed exterior alterations and signage

Robin Murphy explained minor exterior changes were proposed including moving three windows and move carousel sign east. He said that they have a permit to add an amusement ride to the interior and will add a new entry into the theater. He said the carousel sign will be moved 60' to the east. He said they will remove three windows and infill with wall; a new door will be added. He said siding and paint will match existing. He said that two new totem poles will be added with sign between them. He said that a rain screen will fit between the totem poles. He said a new sign will replace the existing carousel sign. He said the cedar totem poles will be 25' tall and will be hewn and painted on site. He noted steel clasp detail will attach totem poles to wall; they will be secured at the base and at the top. He said that work is all reversible.

Katie Kendall, McCullough Leary, said that ARC raised concern with eagle portion of the sign and wondered if neon was allowable.

Steve Zamberlin, National Sign, said he worked with Steve Samson

Ms. Sodt said that the shoreline sign code the neon is no issue – there is neon all along the piers. She said there is no animation just three sections 'chasing'. She said flashing is not allowed.

Mr. Ketcherside asked who was making the totem poles.

Kyle Griffith said a Native American artist is advising.

Mr. Ketcherside said leaving the awning between the totem poles is awkward.

Mr. Murphy said they anticipate queuing line outside and want to provide some rain protection.

Mr. Ketcherside said the awning is just for stepping in and out – it is straddling in with the sign.

Mr. Murphy said they will bring it in about 6 – 12" from either side of the totem poles.

Ms. Sodt said a revised plan might be needed.

Mr. Luoma said that it was previously approved.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Barker said she loves the eagle and it will be interesting to see how the chasing goes. She said it is pretty far down on the pier and is OK.

Ms. Johnson said there are other nearby chasing signs.

Mr. Kiel said it is not a precedent. He said that the piers are unique and this is part of the character of the piers. He said that there is accommodate for those changes and additions.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations, at Pier 57, 1301 Alaskan Way, with staff review on dimension of awning between / around totem poles.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 123861 as the proposed work is reversible and is 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/RK/JM 10:0:0 Motion carried.

The following item was reviewed out of agenda order.

021716.5 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

021716.51 Franklin Apartments
2302 4th Avenue

Ms. Sodt explained the request for a four month extension and noted the applicant will submit briefing packets to ARC next week. She said she was OK with the extension.

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

021716.6 BOARD BUSINESS

Ms. Sodt said she would arrange a tour of the Federal Reserve Bank.

Mr. Ketcherside said he has seen enough photos of the teller area and didn't feel the need.

021716.25 University Methodist Episcopal Church Parsonage
4138 Brooklyn Avenue NE
Proposed alterations and addition

Ms. Doherty provided an overview of the history of the site and said a previous owner had looked at demolition of the Parsonage; and that has since been dropped. She said that Maria Barrientos purchased the property and is planning to rehabilitate it.

Historic photos were reviewed and site analysis provided; report in DON file details historic elements to be retained and proposed changes to the historic building and site. Christopher Palms, Schemata Design, went through materials and samples and said they took their palette from the church colors. He said the purple banding will turn the corner. He said they will keep leaded glass windows and will repair detail at bay windows. He said they will remove the chimney. He said they will put in a canopy that recalls historic elements of the Parsonage but doesn't mimic them.

Maria Barrientos said the Parsonage building will be the student activity center with study and media rooms as well as a place to hang out.

Mr. Sneddon asked for more information about how the ADA ramps connects to the front porch.

Mr. Palms said that the ramp on the north connects to the main entry porch; one of the cheek walls on the north wide is being altered to provide the connection.

Ms. Doherty said that one early option had proposed removing both cheek walls and this alternative has just one side being removed.

Ms. Barrientos said that the interior will house multiple study and congregate areas so students are not too isolated. She said study groups are in larger areas for safety.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Murdock said he is unhappy with the loss of the chimney; it is a loss in form of the overall building and what the clinker brick adds to it. He said the background building is directly connected to the Parsonage and the design is strengthened by moving the Parsonage to the sidewalk and connection to the church. He noted the painting and proximity and lots of details and said that overall the project has been responsive to board requests. He said he appreciated most of the moves. He said that pedestrians will have a better understanding of the landmark.

Ms. Barker said the building has settled in a lovely spot and is more visible. She said the colors, composition and building to south are responsive to ARC. She wanted retention or an acknowledgement of the chimney and said the south façade doesn't meet the quality of the rest of the design. She said the canopy and exits are good as are the street façade and color. She appreciated the railing but noted the removal of the chimney and the blank space left. She said the red door on the south and the window above it should be consistent with other doors. She said the blank area should have a specimen tree or something to give life back to it.

Ms. Patterson asked about the connection of the rear building to the back of Parsonage.

Ms. Doherty said there is a bridge / gasket in the 4' space between the two buildings.

Ms. Barrientos said the Parsonage is the main entry to the buildings and where students will get their mail and have social interaction.

Mr. Kiel said the massing of the new building is more a product of zoning. He said that it engages the landmark and is part of the larger built-up neighborhood.

Ms. Johnson said the relationship between the Church and Parsonage has been maintained.

Mr. Luoma said it is about connecting and strengthening the relationship with the church. He said the design retains intimate relationship with the church. He said they preserved and rehabbed and allowed flexibility. He noted the paint color and that connection with the church. He said it is a great project. He said that the chimney is a lost opportunity but it won't affect his approval.

Mr. Sneddon said he had some concerns about the south elevation – chimney, porch, windows but the building has a new purpose and he noted the rehabilitation efforts.

Mr. Stanley said the loss of the chimney is related to moving the building. He said the house will be re-used for home and front door of the development. He said the building is fully utilized.

Mr. Ketcherside agreed and said it is a great creative project that covers a spectrum of re-use; he said this is toward the end where it should be. He said that there was an earlier effort to get rid of the Parsonage but now it will remain and be a fantastic building. He said the door on the south with the upper lite looks weird. He suggested going with the same configuration of glazing as the front door.

Mr. Luoma said there was some board disagreement on the door/glazing configuration on the south façade.

Mr. Kiel said that it is like an echo of the window that what was there.

Ms. Barker said that she preferred a green door rather than red.

Mr. Ketcherside said to stick with the proposal and noted that the south façade could be considered again.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed rehabilitation of, and addition to, the University Methodist Episcopal Church Parsonage at 4138 Brooklyn Avenue NE, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed rehabilitation and relocation of the building does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 110350, 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 proposed 7-story addition is undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future the essential form and integrity of the historic building will be unimpaired, as per Standard #10 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
3. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/JM/JK 10:00 Motion carried.

021716.24

Anhalt Apartments
1005 East Roy Street
Proposed alterations to roof

Ed Kean, Northwest Commercial Real Estate Investments, explained the existing roof is leaking badly and needs replacement.

Chase Glidden, roofing contractor, went through material samples of shake replica and architectural style composite shingles both of which have 50 year life.

Ms. Doherty said that ARC questioned what was originally on the roof, and in a 1930s WPA photo that it appears to be timber shake roof. She said that it is a wood shingle roof now – not original – but similar to what was there originally. She said the drawings of the original building said ‘shingles’ and that it was probably wood shake when built. She said the lower tower has slate and that will remain. She cited the Preservation Briefs noting the preference for in-kind replacement.

Mr. Sneddon said he read in the 1978 landmark report that all three turrets had slate roofs.

Ms. Doherty said she thinks the 1970s narrative was describing the original condition. She does not know when the other turret roofs were altered.

Mr. Stanley asked about flashing material.

Mr. Glidden said that flashing will be used at all edges and where the roof meets other elements – brick chimneys, eyebrows. Flashing is 26 gauge aluminum powdercoated brown. He said they want to eliminate the wood shingles because they are a fire hazard and there are costly. He said they want a fire rated assembly. The shingles can be treated for moisture (prolonging their life span) or for fire resistance, but not both. Fire retardant treatments reduce the life of the material to 17 years.

Mr. Kean said that when built available materials were limited, so slate is limited as a feature. He said that shake is not a good long term solution and they want to protect the building due to its life span.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker said ARC asked about “shake” pattern and noted that one option has more horizontal lines like the existing pattern. She said that the color is compatible.

Mr. Kiel said the existing flashing is not copper. He said the proposal includes adding a layer of sheathing over the existing. He said a continuous ridge vent will be added; he said the additional ¾” thickness will not be noticeable from the ground. He said the Landmark series is a better match to the character of the existing roof than the fake “shake” profile.

Ms. Patterson said the roof should be replaced in-kind with wood shingle. She said that in the Pacific Northwest you can still have a wood roof and that is part of the character of the building.

Mr. Murdock said the roof is a character defining feature but noted the cedar shakes today do not have the same longevity of old growth wood. He said it is possible to replicate the rhythm and quality of roof without using cedar shake.

Mr. Sneddon said that Anhalt buildings had shake roofs and that is part of the Craftsman influence. He said that visually he was not troubled but that it completely erases the original method of construction.

Ms. Patterson said it is easy to replace and to stick with original shake – a lot of historic roof material is being lost.

Ms. Barker said it has been approved in the past.

Ms. Doherty asked to confirm that the Board was selecting the Landmark TL Series, color: Shenandoah. They agreed.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed roofing alterations at the Anhalt Apartment Building, 1005 East Roy Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed change from wood shake to composition shingle on the main building roof does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 108731 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is compatible with the massing, size and scale of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/JM/DB 8:2:0 Motion carried. Ms. Patterson and Mr. Sneddon opposed.

Mr. Stanley left the meeting at 5:20pm.

021716.3

DESIGNATION

021716.31

Lincoln High School

4400 Interlake Avenue North

Mr. Kiel recused himself.

Ellen Mirro, Johnson Partnership, prepared and presented the report (full report in DON file). She provided context of the site and neighborhood and went over building additions and changes over time. She conducted a virtual walk-around via photos and noted the 1907, 1914, and 1931 portions of the building. She said that the Masonite panels were added later to the stair guardrails as a safety measure. She noted the historic water fountain with Batchelder tiles. She said the Jacobean parapets are gone and some original windows have been changed. She said the slate stair treads wore out and were replaced with a plastic composite. She said that extensions to the tops of the stair rails were added in 1937. She said that all railings, balustrades, newels, and caps were taken down, repainted, reset in 1997. She said that stair C was built in 1997 after a portion of the building collapsed. The boys' interior running track is extant but the girls' track was demolished. She said that seismic work was done in 2003 but is not very visible. She said that the greenhouse was removed.

Ms. Mirro said that there have been major alterations to the building and noted the loss of windows and the Jacobean parapet. She said that the building does not meet criteria A or B. She said that portions of the school were designed by each of the district architects and noted the impact on the local neighborhood but said she wasn't sure it met the double significance of Criterion C. She said that the style is Jacobean influenced but that parapets – the most character defining feature of the style – are gone. For the 1950s buildings she said the sawtooth skylights were a common method of bringing light into a building and is a factory form of building used in school setting. She said it is characteristic of International Mid-Century Modernism used after the war but is not a good example here. She said the building had multiple designers – school architects James Stephen, Edgar Blair, and Floyd Naramore and may meet Criterion E. She said it may meet Criterion F.

Mr. Luoma asked if there were two fountains.

Ms. Mirro said they only found the one with Batchelder tile.

Ms. Durham asked if the north end fence is original.

Ms. Mirro said that it should be.

Mr. Luoma said the brick north-south retaining wall (on the former east edge of the property) seemed to predate the 1958 addition.

Ms. Mirro said they had to acquire the land for the 1958 addition.

Mr. Sneddon asked about addition of the greenhouse and if that was done elsewhere.

Ms. Mirro said that there was interest in 1931 in adding specialized classrooms such as sewing, botany etc.

Public Comment:

Lorne McConachie, Bassetti Architects, said a structural report has been done on the building and noted that the 1958 gym and theater buildings are made from precast concrete. He said the structural integrity is not good. He said the buildings require major work to repair the cladding and make seismic improvements.

Lucy Morello, Seattle Public Schools, said much work was done in 1997 remodel – interiors of the Central building, new staircase C, and roof and noted that the greenhouse was demolished at that time.

Ms. Barker did not support designation noting that it was a hodge podge of architects and styles.

Ms. Durham supported designation but noted it was not the finest example. She said that it reads as a coherent unit at least from Interlaken. She said it is a 20th Century school and there are still some Jacobean features there. She said windows, detail and integrity in the 1914 portion. She did not support the NBBJ addition. She said that the buildings meet Criterion F – it reads as a school and is a landmark in the neighborhood. She supported designation of the 1907, 1914 and 1931 portions and said the A and B staircases are intact and sensitively refurbished. She supported inclusion of the boys' running track and noted it is the last of its kind.

Ms. Johnson supported designation of the 1907, 1914, and 1931 buildings only. She appreciated seeing the expansion of the school with different school district architects. She said that there are many original windows. She supported Criterion C with the association of the cultural development of the community. She supported including Criterion D along with other criteria but not on its own. She supported including the water fountain and stairs identified.

Mr. Ketcherside agreed that the boys' running track should be included as well as stairs A and B, and the exteriors of the 1907, 1914, and 1931 portions. He said this represents the three different school architects. He said that the NBBJ portion is not attached to the earlier buildings. He supported designation on criteria C, D, and F.

Mr. Murdock supported designation on criteria C, D, and F. He said the school conveys the history of the school system over a period of time. He noted the wrought iron details, north facing wall (on the Blair addition) is amazing and he commented on the concrete corbels with integral draining mechanisms. He said the boys' running track is fascinating. He supported inclusion of the fountain and the two stairs.

Ms. Patterson supported designation on criteria C, D, and F. She said the earlier buildings are separate from 1958; she supported the 1907, 1914 and 1931 portions but not the 1958. She said it is cohesive and reads as one building but with distinct characteristics and clearly attempts to tie them together, and noted the brick striping pattern that has been echoed throughout the older buildings. She noted the 1990s remodel and the attention to restoration. She supported including the boys' gym, track and fountain and including Criterion F because the school is very visible from Aurora Bridge.

Mr. Sneddon supported designation on criteria C, D, and F. He said the disjointedness is historically significant. He said the building represents four eras of architects. He supported including the 1958 portion even though it is not of great architectural significance. He said that it is historically important on the site as a transition to new

modern architecture. He said that the gym spaces illustrate the changes in importance in curriculum: in 1907 there was no gym and in 1914 it was included much like the later additions of shop and vocational classes. He noted the transition between gender separation to co-ed. He said that the 1958 work is not a great example of Mid-Century Modern but precast cladding was new. He said the sawtooth monitors remind him of Albert Kahn. He supported including F because it has been part of the fabric of the community for 100 years. He said that it is powerful that the first African American district teacher was hired here in 1953 – it was a path breaking moment. He supported including the boys’ gym and track.

Mr. Luoma supported designation on criteria C, D, and F. He said that the association with Mr. Littlejohn is powerful, but questioned how the building as a whole could convey that; in any case he thought the associated history would contribute to Criterion C. He said he would want to exclude the 1958 buildings, but include stairs A and B stairs, the fountain and the boys’ running track. He wondered if the whole gym or just the elevated running track should be included. He noted the slope of the floor and said it may not be usable and poses a unique design challenge. He said that its significance can continue even if it is not used and it is a worthy challenge.

Ms. Barker said she did not go on the tour, but she has been able to see the building through other Board members’ eyes. She changed her mind to support designation.

Ms. Durham said she would not oppose the inclusion of interior spaces.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of Lincoln High School at 4400 Interlake Avenue North as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C, D and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the site; the exteriors of all of the buildings (excluding the 1958 buildings); the two central stairs (A&B) in the 1907 building; the interior of the boys’ gymnasium in the 1914 building, and the historic drinking fountain with Batchelder tile surround.

MM/SC/RK/JM 8:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel recused himself.

021716.4 BRIEFINGS

021716.41 Smith Tower
506 Second Avenue
Briefing on proposed elevator alterations

Detailed report in DON file.

Darren Williams, Unico, provided an overview of Unico. He explained the desire to add modern amenities and upgrade the elevator service in the building.

Mike Utall went over existing conditions and history of the elevator. He said that the equipment is original and there are no parts available for repairs. He said it is an obsolete system and does not meet current code.

Becky Green explained that the parts are obsolete and they must upgrade. She said the current call button is too high off the ground and they propose a digital keypad with ADA button. She said they will use two existing locations and add one more; they will use existing penetrations. She said the lanterns will remain but with new energy efficient lighting and they will add removable vinyl numbers. Lobby-side door will remain but internal glass door will be added so can still see operation; changes won't be visible. Machinery on floor 35 will be upgraded. She said these are non-designated elements.

Ms. Sodt explained that although they are not designated elements and not historical features it still needs review – it just not original feature of elevator. She said that the interior features of the elevators are designated. She said board approval is needed even for the not designated items.

Ms. Green said that the scissor gate is not original.

Mr. Uttal said the fully glass doors are needed to meet code and have safety stop.

Ms. Sodt reported the applicant's desire to modify elevators noting the scissor gate issue and its unclear installation date. She said that it is now known the scissor gates are not original and were installed in 1980.

Ms. Barker said that the original building scissor gates were manual; the material changed but not the operation.

Mr. Murdock asked if they have focused resources to keep Elevator 6 original.

Mr. Uttal said it is difficult because the elevator system in this building is unique; it is obsolete and there are no parts available. He said there is no possibility to reuse or keep.

Ms. Green said they will dismantle it to remove.

Mr. Uttal said the armature is too heavy and has to be cut and taken apart in pieces.

Ms. Barker asked who sees the 35th floor.

Mr. Uttal said the Chinese Room is there.

Mr. Luoma asked if the smart button is for efficiency.

Mr. Uttal said it is for Code.

Mr. Luoma asked if changing mechanics will change speed.

Mr. Uttal said the elevators are running slower than desired.

Mr. Luoma asked if there would be no significant change in speed.

Board members asked questions about redirecting elevator services.

Mr. Ketcherside said they are proposing to go from the lowest technology to the highest. He said he needs to see the math behind the fancy pad and asked if it is really needed and if it would make a huge impact. He asked if it is significant to warrant this kind of change.

Mr. Sneddon said it seems intrusive and overkill.

Mr. Sneddon said it is extreme and asked if there are other ways to do this that are not so intrusive and without destruction of fabric.

Ms. Barker said she wants to see the math. She said she didn't want changes to call buttons but that she was OK with hall lanterns. She said the scissor gate feels like a visual change and she wanted more information. She asked why it can't be fixed or retrofitted.

Mr. Ketcherside said he needed more concrete information.

Mr. Kiel said the machinery should be kept as a relic and should still be on display.

Mr. Murdock said the Smith Tower is an early skyscraper. He said the equipment is a unique feature.

Ms. Sodt said that cab 8 is preserved in place already and has all the features inside.

Mr. Ketcherside said they need to prove their case – there aren't other systems like this.

Mr. Sneddon said that the motor is very interesting – it was how the Seattle system was built. He said it is a relic of early Seattle Utility industry.

Mr. Luoma said the efficiency arguments are hard to swallow. He said that it is fascinating and that the slowness, mechanical-ness, and funky-ness are part of the history and part of the experience. He said to keep as much mechanical-ness as possible. He said that making sure it meets code but not losing mechanic-feel is important. He said the AC DC story should be preserved.

Ms. Johnson said the elevator upgrade is good but other options or a middle ground should be explored.

021716.42

Seattle Times Block

1120 John Street

Consultation regarding emergency request for partial demolition of designated buildings

Ms. Sodt explained that it is an unprecedented moment and said it has been determined that the Seattle times Block – and clarified that this is the north block of the two sites that are under development – poses a challenge for the police and fire departments due to the unique layout of the buildings on the site and the interior condition of all the buildings on the block. She said that there is major concern for the safety of the police officers and fire fighters and any other individuals that may or may not be inside the building. She said that apparently the property owners are unable to secure the building sufficiently with the resources that they have so give that Code section SMC 23.40.008 B -

Demolition of Landmarks has been invoked; copies were provided to board members. She said that the Director that is mentioned in this code section is the Director of Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections now and the Director has determined that this is a threat to public health and safety and that it is so imminent as to preclude deliberation by this board regarding the matter of the demolition. She said that a part of this process is that the Director will consult with the Landmarks Board and the Director of the Department of Neighborhoods about alternatives to demolition. She said this is a consultation and no Certificate of Approval will be required - this consultation will be a part of the review process. She said that she will be reviewing the emergency demolition permitting with SDCI as they proceed. She said that the alternative to full demolition they will show today, includes bracing the John and Fairview facades of the office building, the office building addition, and the printing plant.

Rich Hill, McCullough Hill Leary, explained that he is counsel for the property owner. He introduced Michael O'Keefe who is the structural engineer for the project. He said that as Ms. Sodt has indicated the Mayor has directed the property owner to develop a bracing system for the facades that Karen (Karen Gordon) and Sarah (Sarah Sodt) have identified to the Director of DCI. He said that a system has been proposed, developed by Michael and his firm. He said the City has provided conceptual approval for this bracing system. He said that Martin O'Donnell with DCI and William Bou with SDOT. He said that SDOT is most concerned with public access and the right of way. He said that both the options that will be shown will keep the sidewalk open for the public. He said that with respect to that the Mayor has asked the property owner to brief the board on the bracing system which is why we are here tonight. He said that Michael will review the bracing system that has been reviewed by the City to date. He said there are two options that he will present; both of the two options keep the sidewalks open and both of them have been reviewed and given conceptual approval by DPD, DCI and SDOT.

Ms. Barker noted to say the "S" before DCI.

Mr. Hill said that Seattle Tower Smith Tower that was just heard – when he was a brand new attorney in 1978 he did some volunteer work for the ACLU which was in Smith Tower and they had the actual person opening and closing the doors. He said they are here to show the bracing system. Michael will review two options; both options keep the sidewalks open and both have been reviewed by DCI and SDOT with conceptual approval. As the design proceeds with the two organizations there will be a determination made as to which of the two options to actually implement. He said they will show the status.

Ms. Sodt said that one very important thing is that the emergency demolition permit will not take away of the board purview related to the new construction that is proposed for the site. She said they will still need a Certificate of Approval for any alterations that they make to the site for the redevelopment.

Mr. Hill said that as he understands it that will be a condition of the emergency demolition permit.

Ms. Sodt said that will be one of the conditions of the emergency demolition permit.

Mr. Ketcherside asked if the building was going to collapse.

Ms. Sodt said the threat is basically there has been encampments in the building and when the police and fire have gone through and swept the building it is really a risk to the police and fire officers going into a building that has holes in the floor that they don't know about. She said apparently there was a room full of batteries. She said there have been two fires in the building so it is really about the safety of City personnel.

Mr. O'Keefe said that there are two options they looked at. He said he would walk through both options with an explanation of how they will maintain access to the sidewalk as well as how they will protect the façade so they keep the integrity of the existing façade. He said that they have some example photos of similar buildings they have worked with showing similar bracing systems, showing them in operation – how it works and how they protect the façade so it doesn't get damaged during construction. He indicated the site plan – the two elevations – the existing office building and the production block. He said that across on the site plan across the bottom is the John Street and the office building façade that they will be retaining. He indicated the production façade and said that they are slightly different in materials – one has a limestone stone façade and the other is concrete. He said their approach to both will be the same in terms of how they will hold them up.

He said the first option is basically putting up steel braces; braced bays 15 feet on center. He said the idea is that the square portion of the brace is where you would walk through as a sidewalk so we keep that sidewalk clear. He said the braces are sized so that they only go on to the sidewalk – they don't extend in to the road. He said that they understand they are not allowed to impede a lane of traffic while these braces are up. He said that on the left is the taller brace where we have a three story façade to hold up you need a little bit more. He said on the right is shorter.

Mr. Ketcherside asked how much sidewalk is left over.

Mr. O'Keefe said right now the sidewalk is about 12' so you have about 7' clear between. He said that the way the bracing works is that the steel columns go up against the outside face of the façade. He said they go through the windows with some lagging and some steel angles and on the inside there is some channels that grab the back side of the wall so they are essentially sandwiching this wall between some members. He said if you look on the section number 1 you have the column on the outside, you have limestone façade and on the inside you have a series of channels that are pressed up against the back of the limestone façade. He said the idea is that there is no attachment between those channels and the limestone I mean the column and the limestone and there is actually when we do this there is wood between them so it is wood up against the limestone.

Mr. Ketcherside asked where the limestone is located.

Mr. O'Keefe said the office.

Mr. Ketcherside asked if he was talking about those buildings at the south end of the lot.

Mr. O'Keefe said yes.

Mr. Ketcherside said he thought somebody – was it not just the north end they are proposing this for – it is for the entire surround of the entire block?

Mr. Hill said that Sarah could answer that.

Ms. Sodt said that the Seattle Times – the landmarks are located on the northern block – there are two blocks that the Seattle Times owned. One is a big parking lot to the south.

Mr. Ketcherside said there is a parking lot and there is a newer building to the east – west of it. He said we are talking about north of the parking lot and the little park.

Ms. Sodt said we are talking about the part that is north (across John St.) of the little park.

Mr. Ketcherside said it is the only designated section.

Ms. Barker said right and so you have the original office and the addition there.

Mr. Ketcherside said he was thinking it was just the printing building.

Comments on which buildings are designated structures. It might help to make the image a bit bigger.

Ms. Sodt said this is the John Street façade and this is the office building façade with the addition; this is the printing plant façade along Fairview. So just these facades with as much of a return as possible.

Mr. Ketcherside said brace these walls and destroy behind them?

Mr. Hill said that is what the Mayor has directed.

Ms. Barker asked what was designated.

Mr. Ketcherside said everything. The exteriors.

Ms. Sodt said but no interiors.

Ms. Barker asked if we designated this wall – the north wall.

Ms. Sodt said yes. You designated the entire printing plant, the office building, and the office building addition.

Ms. Barker said the demolition is happening that is not up for debate?

Mr. Ketcherside said when we designated this building the loading docks – I'm talking about a personal level loading docks were not something that made sense to me as something to hold on to. I expected there to only be probably a façade or a little bit more than that perhaps along the east side but the office building I did not expect us to be asked about removal – in fact when they first came with the proposal I happened to be attending ARC that time and our feedback to them was 'get off the roof of that building – retain the roof of that building.' I feel like I am being harassed – stuck here at 7:40 at night and I'm being told that because the property owner sat around and didn't take action – didn't like the fact that we designated the building and now I'm going to have to post facto apparently approve demolition of a building. It is pathetic – it is absolutely pathetic.

Ms. Sodt said that there is no action that you are taking – this is just a consultation.

Mr. Ketcherside said where is the SDCI Director – this is pathetic.

Mr. Sneddon asked why they only proposing such a limited amount retention of the facades.

Mr. Ketcherside said why isn't the back wall – we told them to keep the back wall. He said when they first came we said you have got to maintain the courtyard and keep that sidewall as well.

Ms. Barker said that is the west wall.

Mr. Ketcherside said the west wall of the addition.

Mr. Hill said he understands that everyone is concerned and feelings about this I don't want to at all minimize them. He said we have been asked to explain to you the framing system and if you are willing I would like to just continue with that and address that because that is basically what the Mayor has directed us to do tonight. He said if that is something you are willing to consider that is what we have been asked to do.

Mr. Ketcherside said I have to hear that because if I don't hear that then the whole thing goes down so please present that.

Mr. Hill said thanks.

Ms. Barker said Nick (Nick Carter) is our structural guy – he is not here tonight.

Mr. Luoma said we are not approving anything.

Ms. Barker said she realizes there is nothing for us to approve this is just a consultation.

Ms. Sodt said that my plan is that I will be reviewing subsequent details regarding the bracing and I will be reviewing that with SDCI, structural engineer, and I have been reviewing it with him so far. She said my plan was to loop Nick in on this discussion.

Ms. Barker said with that – I know you want to talk structural – conditions of approval – you indicated there would be conditions of approval. Wouldn't those be shared with us as well?

Mr. Ketcherside said that there would be a COA on the remaining chunks when they go to develop the building.

Ms. Barker asked if we will be able to look at that language before the thing is gone – the building is gone.

Ms. Sodt said I think that it is perfectly reasonable for you to ask to look at the language that is drafted.

Ms. Barker said I am concerned about this precedent setting task that they are undertaking.

Ms. Durham said...you were unable to secure the building because of financial limitations was that right you said that?

Ms. Sodt said that within the resources they have they could not secure the building....

Mr. Luoma said why don't you finish your presentation and then I'm sure we all have thoughts and comments and I think it would be constructive that we can just go around and share comments if you feel like you have any and we will leave it at that.

Mr. O'Keefe said there are two proposed bracing techniques. There is this sort of technique and it shares a lot of similarities with the second technique. I think is it more useful to look at the other option would be instead of bracing on the sidewalk we would actually use as part of the eventual shoring for new construction. We would just put piled columns on the inside face of the existing façade very similar sort of bracing that we would use – wood wailers with some steel members to sort of sandwich the existing façade so we can hold it up. This does all need to be designed to the City of Seattle Code. It does go through a complete plan check. It is designed for both wind and seismic in terms of its capacity. Look at pictures of some examples where we have done this so you get a sense of how it works. The steel bracing on the outside to brace it. We see that we protect around the windows with some wood framing. When you see it from the back side – in this case we had another heritage building beside we did hold up this. These wall were actually contiguous but it was done. This bracing we use is stiffen up the other building didn't move during demolition of this building and its wall was not damaged. And if you see if from the back side it is all that wood that goes up on the back side again nothing is physically attached in this case to the brick. It is all just by sandwiching the two – the outside and the inside together and protecting it with wood so we don't damage the façade. This again is all stiff enough that the integrity of the wall was maintained while the building behind was demolished.

Ms. Barker asked what happens to the windows.

Mr. O'Keefe said the windows were removed and refurbished and put back in this case.

Ms. Barker said in that case or in what you are proposing.

Mr. O'Keefe said I am not sure what is proposed for these windows.

Ms. Barker said and that will also sandwich both the stone and the metal the window frames? See you've got your stone and then your window component – sandwich it all.

Mr. O'Keefe said in all the ones I've been involved with the windows have been removed just to protect them from damage during construction.

Ms. Barker said the spandrels underneath the windows.

Mr. O'Keefe said those would stay it would just the window frame itself. Those spandrels could stay. So that is just to give a concept and from a practical view how that works. He said other examples the DC Electric Building in Vancouver that we did. Similar sort of bracing on the outside. The sidewalks maintained underneath.

So you can't see it. Again all that was done without any actual physical attachment to the façade. It was all done just with wood pressure blocking. Another example Jamison House this was a – this one we put up a very stiff bracing system because the existing building was in very poor shape or the existing wall was in very poor shape that we had to maintain and we were actually coming building the new building up right tight to the underside of the existing wall because it was right on the property wall. We couldn't keep the new building back from it. So again it is possible to do these things with the structural steel bracing and protect the wall from damage and keep its integrity. So in terms of the structural aspect of it that is how it is done. Any questions:

Ms. Barker asked do you have any buildings that you have done that are office buildings – 1930 – 31. Have you done those?

Mr. O'Keefe said what I showed

Ms. Barker said they looked older.

Mr. O'Keefe said that was like 1901 – 1902 building.

Ms. Barker said are they unreinforced masonry?

Mr. O'Keefe said the DC Electric Building was in the 20s so similar you see the spandrels there were maintained. So really it was just the frames and the glass that we are taking out. The heavier framework was left in place and then the glass was framed in the window frames were put back in.

Ms. Barker asked what is the duration that something like DC Building how long is this system able to stay in place.

Mr. O'Keefe said it was seven stories of underground parking until we got back up to the fourth floor so it was nine months.

Ms. Barker said can these systems last years?

Mr. O'Keefe said they are designed actually they are design for full code loading so there is technically forever.

Ms. Barker said they can be a forever thing.

Mr. O'Keefe said there is no limit like you can't say it is only going to be good for 10 years it has to be designed for forever.

Ms. Patterson asked if bracing from both sides absolutely necessary or is there a way to do it so just from the back side so the public part of the façade is visible.

Mr. O'Keefe said you could do that but you would have to drill into so if we did it just from the backside you would have to be drilling into the façade with some anchors to hold it.

Mr. O’Keefe said usually not because usually the heritage consultant doesn’t want you to drill it. He said that a lot of times with a particular piece older olden facades if you drill into very susceptible to cracking.

Ms. Barker said to clarify the Seattle Times would not have the advertisements or is there the walkway – what goes with that. She said I guess that is weather protection or what.

Mr. O’Keefe said that in the case of doing that one there is no need to no.

Ms. Barker said so there is a cover on it or...

Mr. O’Keefe said no most typically done without a cover. It is just the bracing.

Mr. Hill said that SDOT – when they reviewed it William Bou at SDOT – that was his primary concern to make sure that the sidewalk access of the public would be unimpeded. And that we didn’t intrude into the traffic lanes.

Ms. Barker asked how tall is the cross brace.

Mr. O’Keefe said that the first horizontal is about 10’ up.

Ms. Barker said that no one could get up there not without...

Mr. O’Keefe said not without really trying.

Mr. Ketcherside said well they got into the building without really trying so they’re going to get up there and they are going to climb the whole thing.

Mr. Luoma asked is that the conclusion of your presentation.

Mr. O’Keefe said yes.

Mr. Ketcherside said you mentioned about support on the inside so that is not being proposed?

Mr. O’Keefe said the second option is putting the steel on the inside of the façades that were not in the sidewalk at all. There could be some economics there if we use those pieces for the later excavation shoring there are other ways that may be helpful.

Ms. Barker said that the pictures you showed us were...

Mr. O’Keefe said those examples were all done on the outside.

Ms. Barker said all from the outside sandwich not inside sandwich.

Mr. Ketcherside said this is what I’m used to on Capital Hill. There is façadism on every block in my neighborhood. The things is they have a design project before they begin so they understand how those supports are impacting their ability to construct.

Mr. O’Keefe said we don’t get that luxury here.

Mr. Ketcherside said if we put these in would then restrict the possibilities of the future.

Mr. O'Keefe said yes.

Mr. Ketcherside said construction methodology or whatever.

Ms. Sodt said or you have to do a different type of bracing. They could have different phases of bracing.

Mr. Hill said that one of the things that Karen and Sarah have made kind of as a focus is that whatever the bracing is it can't restrict whatever the board ends up deciding is the appropriate way to develop the property.

Ms. Sodt said that is correct.

Mr. Sneddon said that it seems that Option 1 is a little better suited to that in a small way.

Ms. Barker said that Option 1 being the exterior or the streetside.

Mr. Sneddon said that then you are not impeded however improbable it seems by the interior piles.

Mr. Luoma asked if Mr. Sneddon had any additional comments.

Mr. Sneddon said no that they both seem like they are going to keep that front up without damaging it. I know to me it is an aside to the demolition.

Mr. Ketcherside said I have seen both of these systems used and I am confident that you're a competent engineering firm that can execute this either way.

Mr. Murdock said I do remember a building in Pioneer Square where they braced the façade when it fell down in the late 90s. Have you seen failures in the system?

Mr. O'Keefe said I haven't no. I was not involved in that one.

Ms. Barker said what about the west wall of the office addition.

Ms. Sodt said that that is still a question I still have. I believe that there is some of the original wall still there. Maybe Evan can jump in. There is basically a stone return of some feet in depth – not too much – and the rest of that west wall is some kind of masonry.

Mr. Ketcherside said my memory is that is that it was about one panel or maybe it was two panels at the most. It wasn't the full length of the wall.

Mr. Hill said I can jump in my understanding is there has been some initial exploration to determine whether there is any original wall and that has not discovered any yet but it is not totally conclusive but there does need to be there is asbestos in the wall material so there would need to be removal of that to determination of the wall. The owner would coordinate with Sarah to make sure that if there is wall there it will be preserved.

Ms. Sodt said we do have the original drawings and we have some drawings from when the 70s building was built up against it. The original drawings don't show that the stone façade returned all the way on the last but it had some kind of masonry.

Evan said I think the original condition was red brick along there past the initial return.

Ms. Sodt said I don't know if that is true but it wasn't the stone that returned and there was this large industrial sash openings along that façade.

Ms. Barker said I think that is what I recalled seeing in your proposal for that future wall. That existing future wall.

Ms. Sodt said I don't know if it is just red brick masonry or some other kind of masonry.

Mr. Luoma said for efficiency of time are there others who would like to make comment, question or statement on the structure.

Mr. Murdock said on the preservation of the façade? I would like to request the possibility of having to be able to ask questions of whoever was responsible for this process which to us or to me at least feels like this is all happened and it almost reads like the code says 'we will have the opportunity to consult with somebody' obviously life safety causes that not to happen but seems for a board of professionals going through this process and the amount of time we that we spent on this project with my perception of very little response to our involvement in it. That it would be great to have the ability to understand you know how much effort was put into securing the building, what issues were addressed when the current owners bought the building; what kind of due diligence went on. It feels like we are it just feels very disrespectful to a group of people that spend so much time on this property not to have a better understanding of what is happening.

Ms. Sodt said it sounds to me like someone probably the director of SDCI coming and speaking is what you want because they in their department they are the vacant building officials. Everything you have mentioned is in their purview.

Mr. Ketcherside said yes at the end of the agenda – not 3:30.

Ms. Durham said what kind of consequences are there for demolition by neglect which essentially this is. Are there any in our Ordinance – is there any kind of reason why many landowners couldn't just let their buildings fall down and then

Ms. Sodt said there is no minimum maintenance requirement.

Mr. Ketcherside said unless they want a tax refund. This is not intended to stop squatters it was intended if there was an earthquake to knock down a building that is going to fall on someone. If there is a fire to get rid of burning embers – that's what this provision is for. It is not for 'we've got some squatters and we didn't know how to fill the place with Styrofoam fast enough to get them out of there'. This is ridiculous this is absolutely ridiculous. I honestly don't know what my reaction is going to be to this. I'm just absolutely – we heard about problems with the property for months. For months. For months. From the day that we designated it was clearly an issue. The fact that someone decided to pick words in a provision saying ah well someone make a decision and then

ask them what their opinion is. Oh great let's just do that. This is just ridiculous. I think that we've given you your approval then please go save what is left. Please do that.

Mr. Sneddon said if they had put their engineering resources into securing it...

Ms. Durham said exactly if they are going to all this effort and money to do this but they didn't do that to begin with to protect the building until they were able to develop it makes no sense.

Mr. Ketcherside said I strongly feel that we would ended up approving the construction plan that ended up with this exact same level of structure left. That's what pisses me off the most is that this is where we were headed anyway and all this is a shortcut to that now. I had to contact the city about squatters in front of the former Value Village. I think I read a headline I haven't had a chance to read it yet because I haven't been home. No personal statement but I think I read something that there is an arts group moving in. Like thank God someone will be making use of an unused space because now I'm worried about every single time I designate a structure. You know I'll just leave it open unlock the door. We know that there are squatters because we evicted them out of the buildings they were living in and they are going to go live in our empty buildings and then we will knock those down. It infuriates me. I'm really upset. I have nobody here to direct it at. There is nobody here I can direct anger to.

Someone said the KOMO 4 cameraman left.

Seattle Times person noted her presence.

Ms. Durham said in Philadelphia there is a demolition by neglect provision so you are not allowed to let your building fall down.

Ms. Sodt said we do have minimum maintenance provisions in Pioneer Square and the ID but not anywhere else.

Ms. Barker said they didn't get onsite security in until after how many rounds of sweeps? They could have done that at the beginning but it costs a lot of money so.

Ms. Patterson echoed pretty much what everybody has said. I think it is grossly irresponsible that the building has gotten to this level. Not just to the landmarks preservation board but also to be people in this city that are responsible for keeping everybody safe. The fact that they have been put in this situation where they have to go in and put out fires that who knows how they are being caused. In this building with no safe way to actually get out is just disappointing but also disgusting to me. But when I look at these façade support systems and I know already based on the existing relationship that this is to be a long several year process. I know just in walking by the building last Friday its already become a blight in the city in the situation in the condition it is in right now and I worry about the extensive bracing system on the building for years and I would almost be in favor at the cost of damaging the building to have a bracing system that is just on the inside so that there is at least something that is providing a sliver of public benefit. Or I'd honestly just say tear the entire thing down.

Mr. Luoma said it made me think of some park projects that I have worked on and you may wonder what the connection is. Parks often have to deal with homelessness and

vagrants and illicit activities all the time because they are by nature very porous and often times in very urban areas as well and can be historic and landmarked. We are taught and it has been proven and clearly shown that you don't put a fence around these places and tell people to get out or you can't put up a sign that says closed at dusk. That doesn't work. But the best defense against illicit activities is really positive activities and bringing in people into those spaces any time of day. I think this project is a demonstration of what has been said already. A real intentional lack of care by the property owner. I don't really care about securing a site because I think you could have put up 20' tall fences and people could have still gotten in. But it shows a real lack of care that there could have been other things done temporarily before construction were to begin because I think we are probably several years still out that could have helped deter these activities. I think that was a real opportunity that was missed that could have had a lot of benefits because the city as a whole is struggling with homelessness and there have been deaths recently. It is sad I don't think it is precedent setting because we are not saying it is here and we are not approving it. I only have my own conscience I feel resolved with that. And that this is within the hands of others. I leave it at that and if there are other comments to be said but I think we are done. Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator