



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 95/16

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
Seattle Municipal Tower
700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor
Room 4060
Wednesday, February 3, 2016 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Marjorie Anderson
Deb Barker
Nick Carter
Kathleen Durham
Robert Ketcherside
Jordon Kiel
Aaron Luoma
Jeffrey Murdock, Chair
Julianne Patterson
Matthew Sneddon
Mike Stanley

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Kristen Johnson

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

020316.1 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
December 2, 2015
Deferred.

Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Items reviewed out of agenda order.

020316.3 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

020316.31 J.W. Bullock House
1220 10th Avenue East

Ms. Doherty explained the signed agreement and noted the owners are excited to have the house landmarked.

Action: I move to approve Controls and Incentives for the J. W. Bullock House, 1220 10th Avenue East.

MM/SC/NC/DB 11:0:0 Motion carried.

020316.2 NOMINATION

020316.21 Bryant's Marina / UW Police Facilities
1109-1117 NE Boat Street

David Graves represented DOPAR, owner of the property.

Susan Boyle, BOLA, prepared and presented the nomination report (full report in DON file). She provided context of the area on the north shore of Portage Bay and included aerial views of the site over time to illustrate the complicated history of the building assemblage. She said buildings have been moved, some demolished and names/ID #s have changed without permits or permit drawings. See report in DON file for details. She said the building assemblage meets the National Register criteria for its association with Jerry Bryant and Bryant's marina in the 1930s-40s. She said that the shoreline was different at the beginning of the 20th century and the assemblage of buildings operated as a lumber mill. She said the assembly of buildings is also shown in the 1912 Baist map and cited as the Federal Mill, Pacific Mill and later the Puget Sound Lumber Company and the Puget Sound Box Company. She said that it was a lumber mill that did other things with other activities such as resource extraction. She said that water was used as a transportation route. She said this was not the only mill in the area and noted Denny Mill.

She said the use as a marina illustrates post war recreational boating and indicates a change to the tradition of middle class activities. She said that Building C with its sawtooth profile is one of the primary milling buildings and was built in the 1920s. The front was clad in 1946 to give it a modern appearance. She said Building C is warehouse building and is a long structure; it has wrapping to camouflage the sawtooth roof along with new cladding and windows. She said that entry assemblies, ramps, and stairs have been added. She said the space was used for a drama school at one time and remodel by Benjamin McAdoo for this purpose has been since altered.

She said that J. Bryant acquired the property and used it for about a decade. She said that a number of the lumber mill buildings were repurposed. She said that buildings F and D were relocated. She said that in 1946 architect Lamont Shorett transformed and paneled Building C to modernize it. Shorett was a water skier and boater and did a lot of marinas. She said that the marina operated activities in all the different buildings. King 5 purchased from Bryant, and UW purchased from them. In the 1960s when UW purchased the property, the lumber mill structures were demolished or changed. The space is now occupied by UW Police on what is now a dense university campus.

She said the property does not meet criteria A or B; she noted the association with J. Bryant but questioned the overall significance of him in the history of the city. She said it does not meet Criterion C and said that the lumber and boat industry associations are general rather than significant. She said that it doesn't meet Criterion D and noted while there are some distinctive elements such as heavy timber but it lacks clarity and distinction. She said designs by Lamont Shorett and Benjamin McAdoo are not outstanding and she didn't know that Criterion E was met. She said that Criterion F may apply more because of change of context with University of Washington buildings, but she noted there are integrity issues.

Mr. Sneddon asked about police and security for the UW.

Ms. Boyle said she didn't develop a historical narrative for the UW police.

Mr. Murdock asked about Puget Lumber and Box Company in photo.

Ms. Boyle said she didn't know much about the business.

Mr. Murdock asked if the sawtooth roof exists behind the parapet.

Ms. Boyle said that it does and it is visible from the other side of the building; the skylights are all there are well although some are covered.

Mr. Luoma asked if the buildings are on grade or on piles.

Ms. Boyle said that some of buildings B and C are on grade. She said that building B is over water with a portion of it on pilings. She said gabled portions of building D are on bulkhead. She said that the sawtooth building is on land.

Mr. Luoma asked about changing water levels.

Ms. Boyle said it is close to historic levels. She noted that the shoreline under building B had changed.

Ms. Barker asked if the use of sawtooth was typical at the time.

Ms. Boyle said it was a type of manufacturing building that was used to bring in light. She said that 1950s and 1960s modernists may have been inspired by this. She said it seems advanced for the earlier period and noted it is seen in industrial buildings.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Stanley said that the integrity is gone but said he was interested in the lumber mill aspect and Criterion C. He said that F may be applicable because of the shape of the original building on the waterfront. He was 'on the fence'.

Ms. Dunham was also undecided but noted that the lumber mill was important. She said the building and overall structure are there. She said that the design is not distinctive; it is vernacular-industrial and strong, but noted the windows are gone and the movement has impacted integrity of building envelope.

Ms. Patterson said that there are integrity issues but noted they could be part of the vernacular evolution. She said the roof monitor is interesting. She said that the view from the water is intriguing and it stands out.

Ms. Barker echoed other comments and noted the sawtooth component on building C as innovative and noted the interiors of building D. She said she wanted more information about modifications.

Mr. Carter did not support nomination noting integrity issues.

Mr. Ketcherside supported nomination and said that he had concerns about integrity. He said it would be helpful to break it down building by building, with timeline etc. He said D is the only building where one can see its original form and said that if not for building D he would say no – that is the building is he most interested in. He said that he is interested in the sawtooth roof but it isn't visible – the entire façade was cut apart and covered. He said that windows were covered and another opening was cut in the shed. He said he didn't see the maritime industry reflected in building B and questioned what it represents. He said that the building does look like a lumber mill. He said that Bryant's use was significant and the changes made for his use should be taken into consideration.

Mr. Kiel said he leaned toward not supporting nomination because of integrity issues. He said he wanted more information about possible significance related to the lumber industry.

Mr. Sneddon said he had reservations but would support nomination. He said that it represents North Lake Union industries that are gone now, especially the lumber/milling industry. He noted the connection to the recreational boat industry

but didn't know if could convey that. He wondered if original windows are beneath boards. He noted the connection to UW Police department and the development of UW in this area and wondered about the formation of the campus police in the 1960s.

Mr. Luoma commented on the cultural and economic association with any site or building adjacent to water and wondered how it would convey that significance. He noted integrity issues. He said that the gabled roof on building D speaks to a different era and he noted its association with and proximity to water as well. He said the sawtooth roof on building C is interesting but spans different eras for use not tied to lumber. He said there are integrity issues from the street side and the commercial front addition is significant. He said that being an extant building associated with the lumber industry along Lake Union is significant. He said he wants more information about alterations and when they were made. He said that if there are integrity issues to building D he didn't know if he would support designation.

Ms. Anderson wanted to hear more about the roof form and the connection with the site. She said the differences about the experience of the site from land and from water tell a story about how the area has changed over time and what happened there with the timber industry.

Mr. Murdock supported nomination and requested a tour to see how the buildings have shifted around. He noted the story of the site transition from raw lumber to manufacturing. He said the movement of the buildings and change in nature of utilitarian illustrated the vernacular evolution on the site. He said the cultural link to lumber in the middle of the city is compelling.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of Bryant's Marina / UW Police Facilities at 1109-1117 NE Boat Street for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the site; the exteriors of the buildings; and the currently exposed timber trusses and columns; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for March 16, 2016; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/RK/AL 9/2/0 Motion carried. Messrs. Kiel and Carter opposed.

020316.4

BRIEFING

020316.41

Space Needle

219 4th Avenue N

Briefing on proposed exterior alterations

Ron Seibert, Space Needle, explained the proposed top to bottom refurbishment.

Alan Maskin, Olson Kundig, presented via PowerPoint (detailed report in DON file). He explained their proposal to respect character defining features and to renew and refresh the customer experience. He said the proposed five components: new observation deck, new elevator system, observation and restaurant level glazing, restaurant level floor, and observation level doors.

- New observation deck safety enclosure. Higher than height of heads with no visual obstruction. One option has bench integrated into it and one does not. Gaps to allow photography.
- New elevators. Plan for improved redundancy and fire-life safety. One elevator is service elevator. Replace single cabs with double cabs for the passenger elevators.
- New glazing at observation and restaurant levels. Propose to remove sill/curb, use electrochromic glass, no mullions, and narrower panes.
- Restaurant level floor. Glass floor for improved view. Replace metal soffit with glass. Turntable system in need of replacement. Match fritted glass to steel decking color.
- New observation deck doors and accessibility. Propose six double doors for improved circulation. Propose no frame.

He said what is proposed is meant to be in keeping with original concepts.

Ms. Barker asked about citizen review process regarding the bench.

The owner's representative said they held two focus group round tables in the Los Angeles area. They were shown existing images which they described as dated, dark and old. She said the groups said the Space Needle should be futuristic and technologically forward. They liked the proposed renderings and thought the designers had achieved that. She said they loved opening up of the view. She said there were eight round tables of 12 persons each.

Mr. Luoma asked about water drainage at observation deck glazing.

Mr. Maskin said it drains to deck and down to floor as it does today. He said there is 4" between panel and floor that would be used for draining.

Mr. Kiel asked about the space where bench and camera would meet.

Mr. Maskin said that there is a 1/2" gap with ridge behind to catch coins, pens; he said there are enough mesh screens to catch items.

Mr. Luoma asked about the angle/pitch of the bench and noted it looks steep.

Mr. Maskin said the glazing panels match the angle configuration of the original design. He said the seat responds to the angle of the enclosure. The built a mockup to test the ability to get up off the bench.

Ms. Patterson asked about sight lines from outside – how it might change if someone stands on the bench.

Mr. Maskin said that people inside watch people outside.

Mr. Murdock asked about maintenance with regard to birds.

Mr. Seibert said they are exploring that and think they have a number of ways to clean the glass, inside and out.

Mr. Luoma asked about modesty issue with lower glazing sill.

Mr. Maskin said one would have to crawl for it to be an issue.

Mr. Sneddon asked about decisions that were made regarding original design and what was built.

Mr. Maskin said they can only speculate and don't know why the original glass was reduced in size. He said there were timing issues and glass would have needed to be pre-ordered. He said perhaps there was concern about wind issues.

Mr. Murdock asked about profile of proposed glass soffit below restaurant.

Mr. Maskin said that they would use three different pieces of glass to create a faceted curve.

Mr. Carter asked about horizontal line beneath the restaurant turntable.

Mr. Maskin said it is structural – the white structural rib connects back to the box to support rails.

Ms. Barker asked if the goal of the glass floor is to allow views into turntable structure.

Mr. Maskin said it was the first rotating restaurant and they want to try to show the engineering / internal part of structure. He said it is no longer functioning well and they are proposing a new mechanism.

Public Comment:

Abby Lawlor, Unite Here, said she was excited to see the updates to the building and that it is good for guests and workers. She asked them keep their workers involved in the conversations.

Mr. Murdock said he appreciated efforts and although he would love to make it cooler he has to respond to changes that alter the way the building is perceived and under the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. He said it is exciting and thought provoking about how the historic preservation process absorbs changes. He said access /

egress changes make good sense and are important, but that he was troubled by the new glass walls, bench and soffit. He said the design was a product of its the time and the technology was a huge part of that. He acknowledged early conceptual design drawings but added that we know what was actually built. He said he appreciated the improved deck enclosure with no mesh, and noted he was not in favor of the bench because it changes the feeling of moving around. He said that a little bit of a safe place is important to some users; there is too much transparency.

Mr. Luoma said the Space Needle is an iconic structure and that was the intention of the designers. He said that earlier designs concepts were not the deciding factor in why it was landmarked. It was landmarked because of the way it was built and the way it looks today. He said the focus should be on how it was originally built rather than early design concepts. He said that there are things that can be done without as much change to the character. He said the Needle as it stands today provides an experience for the user; it can be refreshed but it doesn't need to be reinvented; it's disturbing. He said the Secretary of Interior Standards should be the guidelines for change. He said the bench is a distinctly modern element of today and not appropriate. He said that maybe structural glass was possible to design but it wasn't part of their design vocabulary at that time. He said he had no concern with the elevator upgrade. He said the floor to ceiling glass may be in keeping with design. He said that glass floors were not in the design vocabulary or language of that era and would be a modern addition. For example, he said they don't need to put a glass floor on a train to see its inner workings or appreciate it. He said glass floor was not part of their thinking back then. He said he is less concerned about the doors because of the benefits associated. He said doors with frames are more common. He said that structural glass would be a modern element.

Ms. Barker said she was not keen on the bench and said that people will want to be up against the glass to take photos. She said the bench will create a different view than what has been historically visible. She said that she felt like the rhythm is being forsaken with proposed mullion-less glass. She said the glass floor is an unnecessary expense. She was OK with the door alterations.

Mr. Kiel said he was a supporter of what he called the 'best proposal in a long time'. He said the Secretary of Interior Standards are important but the landmark should remain relevant. He said the test shouldn't be that it is a time capsule. He said the test of it was that it was possible to build it that way. He said that what is proposed would be distinctly new and differentiated. He said the overall composition would be maintained in a real way. He said the building is experienced from being inside and that would be enhanced.

Ms. Patterson agreed with Mr. Kiel and said she likes what was proposed. She said it would be improving the experience without changing it. She said it was adaptive reuse. She said the changes are not really obvious and would be an improvement. She said she loves the safety enclosure, but not the "selfie bench". She said it changes the perspective; and is in favor of retaining existing benches to the focus to be on the outside rather than on a selfie. She supported the elevator changes. She said the observation level glazing changes the experience significantly. She said removing mullions changes the profile and makes it more 2016 than it was intended but that it is not visible from the street. She said she prefers mullions and said the change of height of the glazing is disturbing. She said she likes the glass floor and soffit and is an improved experience to see the mechanism. She said the doors and accessibility changes are appropriate.

Ms. Dunham said it was a great proposal. She said that more transparency at the observation deck perimeter is good. She said that the proposed removal of historic material is disturbing. She said the view point is changed and it takes away from the Needle as historic. She said they should preserve the 1960's image of modernity, and said it is a visual and cultural landmark. She said the accessibility items meet the Secretary of Interior Standards. Regarding the restaurant floor she said the original turntable mechanism would be removed so the need for transparency doesn't hold. She said the bench change is awkward and noted the loss of original observation deck. She appreciated the report.

Mr. Ketcherside said the elevator, observation doors, and glazing are OK. He said the view is out and not down and said he was confused by the proposed views down through the restaurant floor and soffit. He said he likes the open-ness of interior windows.

Ms. Doherty noted that the restaurant floor and turntable mechanism are not part of controls. However, the soffit below the restaurant is within the Board's purview.

Mr. Carter said the views are meant to be out and not down and said it feels gimmicky especially if they are changing out the original mechanism. He said that the bench would change the experience and people will stand on it. He said they are enhancing experience of the Needle views. He preferred no door frames on new doors and had no problem with double cab elevators. He did not support the bench.

Ms. Anderson said she was OK with the double elevator cabs, and new double doors with no frames. She said the proposed "selfie bench" is both good and bad, and thinks it's a big change. She said she was uncomfortable with the transparent restaurant floor and said the point is to look outward rather than down and would impact user experience. She said the proposed glazing and improved shading are fine. She said the mullions obstructing view is unfortunate but noted it was a 1960 way of looking out. She said if they change the glazing system they should not have to replicate the mullions.

Mr. Sneddon said it is a historical monument and is a marker of the 1962 World Fair. He said the Board is charged with protecting it and using the Secretary of Interior Standards. He wants to see protection of historic material and character defining features. He said the observation deck glazing cage doesn't reflect original design – it was added later. He said the proposed glazing doesn't meet SOI – it is tinted glass and is narrower than original dimensions. He said the bench looks new but noted that as integrated you wouldn't be able to distinguish new from old. Regarding replacing metal with glazing in the soffit below the restaurant, he said the downward look would be a 2016 thing and blurs original versus new line.

Mr. Kiel commented that what characterizes the property is from outside at ground level or head on. He said that the width of the glass panels not lining up and it is just a band of glass – it won't show up. He said it is not defining from the ground. He said it is changing vs. enhancing the experience. He said the elevators are OK but questioned why the other proposed changes are not. He questioned what specifically conveys the 1960's idea of modernity.

Mr. Murdock asked how much railing is from 1962. He said the window mullions, structural rib divisions are visible from a distance; the building is experienced from a distance and close up.

Ms. Patterson said items addressing necessary changes – accessibility, building systems – are OK but that the lower glass is not necessary.

Ms. Barker said mullionless windows impact the rhythm and are different.

Ms. Dunham said new glass should be in-kind. She said the cage should be removed because it is not original. She said raising the height of glass is a safety issue. She said the bench, lack of wall, and lack of mullions are changes in design that remove historic material.

Mr. Maskin said they can match the fritted glass to the existing metal soffit.

Mr. Murdock said the board's charge is to protect the landmark from changes that alter its character.

020316.5 BOARD BUSINESS

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator