



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 134/16

Minutes

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
Seattle Municipal Tower
600 4th Avenue
Boards and Commissions Room, L2-80
Wednesday, March 2, 2016 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

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

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Rebecca Frestedt
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Mike Stanley

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

030216.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES
December 2, 2015

MM/SC/NC/DB 8:0:2 Minutes approved. Mmes. Durham and Johnson abstained.

December 16, 2015
Deferred.

Mr. Murdock arrived at 3:34 pm.

030216.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

030216.21 Columbia City Landmark District
Hastings Building
4901 Rainier Ave. S.

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed Phase II of building renovations. She said that work includes: masonry and stucco repairs; installation of seismic rosettes and structural repairs; reconfiguration and construction of new storefront, including the addition of accordion or sliding storefront windows on a portion of the east façade; revealing the transom windows (new frames and glazing); exposing previously in-filled window openings on the north façade; the addition of a steel and glass canopy; construction of a new entrance on the north façade and window modifications on the west (alley) façade. She noted that building colors and signage are not part of this proposal and will follow under a separate application.

Ms. Frestedt said the Hudson Building was constructed in 1905. The building has undergone extensive storefront alterations and is considered an historic non-contributing building. The one-story building is clad in stucco on brick. The canopy was added in 1938. The storefronts were renovated in 1958. In August 2014 the building was significantly damaged due to the impact from an auto accident. The Landmarks Preservation Board approved a Certificate of Approval for Phase I, which included temporary structural improvements, securing the storefronts with plywood coverings and canopy removal in July 2015 (LPB 432/15). The CCRC received a project briefing in December 2015. Committee members expressed support for the proposed canopy removal, masonry repairs and seismic work. The Committee recommended the addition of a stem wall under the storefront windows to be more consistent with the design of other storefronts in the District.

On February 2, 2016 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. Two alternate window configurations for the Rainier Ave. façade were presented – sliding and accordion windows (preferred). Following discussion, the Committee supported the preferred alternative. The placement and canopy configuration was discussed. Following discussion, the Committee supported the canopies, as proposed. The Committee discussed alternate treatments for the material treatment at the stem wall -- metal panels (preferred option) or board form concrete. Members were not supportive of concrete and were split on support for metal panels. Members were in agreement that tile would be preferred and more compatible with surrounding buildings. There was a preliminary discussion about building colors, not part

of this application. The Committee ultimately made a unanimous recommendation to approve the application, as proposed, conditional upon submission of plans that include tile along the stem wall. Revised plans, reflecting a tile-clad stem wall, were submitted on Feb. 9th, 2016.

Richard Floisand, Floisand Studio, explained that the building has always had three storefront bays and they propose to recreate a modern version of the original design. He said they will add new elements, clerestory, glazing, bays. He said they will rebuild part of the wall and will match texture of stucco. He said on the north side filled in openings will return to windows and glazing. He said they will add one door and window system. He said that Pagliacci will be in the corner space. He said they will use existing windows on the alley side and will put in an access door in existing window location. He explained seismic upgrades would be done; he said moment frame will be held back and parapet will be braced from the back.

Mr. Floisand said that storefront systems will be anodized aluminum, dark bronze. He said the porcelain tile will be embossed. He said that paint on the canopy will be a dark color and canopy glazing will be frosted. He said they will paint rosettes.

In response to an inquiry about the building's contributing status, Ms. Frestedt noted that 1950s renovations removed many original details of storefront systems. She said the building is historical non-contributing in the National Register.

Ms. Barker asked about the depth of the canopy in relation to the building to the south.

Ms. Frestedt said the canopies are not all uniform in the district. She said the CCRC supported the design of the proposed canopy. She said there are no minimum requirements.

In response to a question about building colors, Ms. Frestedt said that CCRC was briefed on color options, but that colors were not part of this proposal.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Luoma noted it is a historic non-contributing building.

Mr. Ketcherside said he was glad they are bringing back some character and said it looks current and classy. He commented on the historic use as a Tradewell grocery store.

Mr. Sneddon said the proposal is stark, but not inappropriate and the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the district. He said the scale is being maintained and they are bringing back a storefront system.

Mr. Luoma said the metal coping seems stark. He said any other color than stark white will help tone it down. He added that if the building was a contributing building to the district there would have been a bigger discussion.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for Exterior Alterations - design located at 4901 Rainier Ave. S. 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/General. #8. Emphasis should be given to maintaining the character of, and enhancing compatibility with, contributing buildings.

Guidelines/Specific

2. Building Materials and Fixtures. Integrity of structure, form and decoration should be respected. Building facades should be brick, wood, or other materials that are in keeping with the historic character of the District. Exterior light fixtures shall be in keeping with the historic character of the District.

4. Storefront. Building facades should have a greater proportion of window and door openings than wall spaces on pedestrian levels. Any exterior façade alteration shall respect the original architectural integrity of the storefront. Recessed entryways and/or alcoves shall be maintained for existing street-level storefronts. Original fenestration shall be preserved (i.e., windows, transom areas, and door design). Storefront materials should be brick, wood, concrete, and tile, or a combination thereof.

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 #2, 3, 6, 9 and 10

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

030216.22 Northwest Rooms

305 Harrison Street
Proposed exterior tenant signage

Cassie Hibbert explained that the KEXP logo recently changed prompting a requested change to previously approved signage. She said that signage at 1st Avenue and at the courtyard will hang from eave; individual letters – halo lit – will be installed on “goldenrod” color backers. Halo lighting is amber in color. She said that on the south façade they will place the sign further east on the wall in response to board comments. She said they shrunk the sign down to fit within the 10’ wide motif panel; it will be halo lit with amber LED similar to others. She said the framework on motif panels will be mounted into the grout seam. She said that newly proposed La Marzocco Café sign will hang from ceiling and will be visible at the storefront.

Amy Hattimer said the mounting rods inside the windows will align with the storefront mullions to mitigate their appearance. The sign will be lit with white LED. She said they will use the same black box with white lettering; it is easily removable.

Ms. Hibbert said at the 1st and Republican corner there is new glazing associated with the library. She said they propose signage to recognize donors, with white translucent dusted crystal letters on the glazing as illustrated. She said KEXP black letters will hang from yellow interior wall at eye level set back several feet from the storefront.

Mr. Ketcherside asked about donor names at base of the south wall.

Kate Burnside said that is a separate set for larger donors and was previously approved.

Ms. Barker asked about the height of the letter on north façade library window from the ground up.

Ms. Burnside said it is a couple feet – 1’-4”.

Mr. Ketcherside asked about one window at the far right with names.

Ms. Burnside said it equally frames window on both bays.

Ms. Doherty asked how far back the letters on the wall are from the storefront.

Ms. Hibberts said they are 10’ at least.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Murdock said that primary concern at ARC was the exterior wall sign attachment to that building, and that is OK. He said they offered feedback on the Café sign and the applicant has responded to those concerns.

Mr. Sneddon said the revised signage is a better fit and an improvement.

Ms. Barker said the new branding complements the building. She said she felt misled about what was proposed for the corner library and what the finished product is now. She said the lower level placement of donor names doesn't translate well.

Mr. Luoma said the rebranding is more complimentary to the geometry of the building. He said most of it is reversible.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior signage at the Northwest Room & International Fountain Pavilion, 305 Harrison Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed signage does 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/DB/NC 11:0:0 Motion carried.

030216.3 BOARD BUSINESS

030216.31 Seattle Times Block
1120 John Street

Follow-up by a representative of the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections regarding the emergency request for partial demolition of designated buildings.

Diane Sugimura, Interim Director of Office and Community Development, introduced herself and noted she was Director of Department of Planning and Development (DPD) up until December 31, 2015. Nathan Torgelson, Director of Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections introduced himself. Ms. Sugimura said the two offices are the split from DPD.

Ms. Sugimura apologized and said we had a little bit of miscommunication as they were expected at the last meeting. She said that this is not the way that we would normally want a project to go. She said we've got some struggles with the project and that is what they want to talk about in terms of what they have been working with. She said as of August of last year when they started becoming aware of issues and contacted the owner that there were problems in terms of transients getting in. She said since that time the owners have been working with them in terms of trying to get the building secured. She said we then had a meeting with multiple city representatives including police and department of neighborhoods and others to talk about what we could do to try to get that building secure. She said they met with the property owners and talked about things about do you put a fence up near the building? How to keep people from going inside – should you have lights on it? 24-hour security – that was something that was clearly asked for, other things to try to get it secured. She said that DON staff went out there I believe to walk about the site to talk about what the important facades were and those kinds of things in terms what needed to be done carefully. Putting plywood on historic buildings and trying to secure the building is perhaps more challenging than just a regular building when it is not so much concern about how things like that are attached. She said as she recalled initially it was to go around at the street level which is normally what we would expect people to do when we don't have a secured building. She said initially that was done and then it was clear that you have to go up to the next row because just one row of securing the windows openings did not work. She said that it is a large site as you know there are multiple buildings. She said she understood there is kind of a maze inside in terms of buildings. She said that it got to a point where it appeared there were many people inside the building. She said they worked with the owners and with police. The owners needed to prep the building before the police would go in and do a sweep and so that meant that they wanted to have as much of the building secured as possible but in order to do the sweep they had to make sure there was a way for people to get out. She said that once that happened police went in – she thought it was late September – did a sweep and then they tried to make sure the building was secured after that and they had hoped it would be. She said there has been 24/7 security ever since then. She said that then on November 12 there was a fire – a multiple alarm fire – it consumed 40% of available on duty fire resources for that fire. It was a big one. She said there was another fire December 11 that required 20 unites and 54 fire fighters out there. She said these are – if there is a term – sophisticated squatters. She said they have tools and equipment. She said they had gone in and they got into the electrical vault and were taking wires and selling it and a variety of things. She said it was her understanding there were booby traps set up the first time police went in. She said that things came swinging at them and whatever. She said that it seemed like almost every time the building was secured or we thought it was secured you may know what a Sawzall is – they came in and open up and there would be people back in there. She said the fire department felt that it was a hazard to the neighborhood and the health and safety of the community and it was

also a hazard to fire personnel who would have to go in there and respond. She said that our inspectors have gone to check 27 times in 5 ½ months in responding to make sure the building is secure. She said that police indicated they had over 100 calls in December.

Mr. Torgelson said he thought that he thought the bottom line is that they don't believe this is setting a precedent for future buildings and historic buildings. He said they feel that given the size of the block and the fact that it is three buildings and just the aggressiveness of the transients that this will not set a future precedent when this type of situation comes before us again. He said that nobody wants to demolish this building but given the unique circumstance here they don't see an alternative situation. He said that as Ms. Sugimura mentioned the police did a sweep of the building, it was secured and by code the securing of the building has to go up 10'. He said the property owner went higher. He said the transients are now using the sophisticated tools to get in the building. He said they are pushing out the boards. He said the police won't go into the building anymore. He said they feel like they are in a dire situation. He said that the key thing is that they are working with Department of Neighborhoods (DON) staff and that they are working with the bracing plan with the applicant and they need to make sure as they work on the demolition permit and with DON we are clear on what remains. He said they are committed to protecting the façade during the demolition of the project. He said that they know a bond will be required to cover the costs if the shoring should fail at any point during the demolition and after the demolition occurs. He said that they are committed to saving the façade of the building.

Ms. Sugimura said that it will be clear that the applicants have to come back here for Certificate of Approval for the project. She said it is not like once this is done.

Mr. Torgelson said that right now they just have seriously life-safety issues inside of the building given the booby traps and the fires.

Ms. Sugimura said there was a fire today.

Mr. Torgelson said the other thing is when the police did their sweep SDCI did contact adjacent property owners who have had vacant buildings and strongly encouraged them to hire their own private security if the squatters in the building then decided to move into adjacent vacant buildings. He said there are other obviously vacant buildings in South Lake Union and in Downtown. He said they are trying to get the word out.

Mr. Carter said it sounds like you want to demolish the whole building but you are willing to keep portions of the façade.

Ms. Sugimura said it was never the whole building.

Mr. Carter said he wasn't there the last presentation and didn't know how much they would demolish.

Ms. Sugimura asked Ms. Sodt for clarification.

Ms. Sodt said that demolition is proposed for the façades along Fairview and John with the return from the north and west side but essentially the floorplates and everything the roof will have to be demolished because it is (*unintelligible*). She said the theory is that if you left any of those there would be (*unintelligible*).

Mr. Carter said so that is the original building and the printing press.

Ms. Sodt said that is correct.

Mr. Ketcherside said that is not saving the façade of the printing press.

Ms. Sodt said saving the slab of the printing plant.

Ms. Sugimura said it would be the south, east....

Mr. Carter said obviously the developers right now are in the midst of a design for whatever they are going to put on that site. He asked if they (DOCD and SDCI) have a feel for how long the shoring will be staying there and if they (DOCD and SDCI) are comfortable with leaving that shoring in place if the developers suddenly decide 'we are not building this building right now because the market has changed' and all of a sudden we have got the façade of a multi-street building hanging out there over Fairview for years. He asked what the city's position on that if the façade is going to be sitting up there for a long period of time. Or are you assuming that is not going to happen?

Mr. Torgelson said their (DOCD and SDCI) commitment is to move the permit as quickly as possible obviously a lot of that is in the hands of the applicant. At this point we don't really see another alternative. He said that one of the risks is that if there is another fire in the building the whole building could go which would be terrible.

Mr. Carter said he has seen situations where we try to save a façade – I'm a structural engineer so I've submitted things where we have tried to save the façade and there is a lot of concern from the City about the façade and how long that façade is going to be shored up. He said that is why he is asking the question is to make sure that the City is obviously committed to maintain this façade for as long as necessary.

Mr. Torgelson said and that would be one of the reasons for the requirement for the performance bond.

Ms. Barker said we did ask that question how long does this temporary system remain. She said she asked over years and the fellow said yes as she recalled.

Mr. Carter said if we have another economic down turn and all of a sudden they are not building that building.

Mr. Ketcherside said he is not defending but that his statement and you can vet how plausible it is - his statement is that it was potentially permanent installation that what he was putting in to place was intended to meet code for however long – 50 year life or whatever – whatever the life of a building is.

Ms. Barker asked if they could explain what it means by ‘the owner had to prep before SPD would sweep the building’. She said what did the owner have to do.

Ms. Sugimura said that was sealing up the majority of the building but not totally because people needed to get out.

Ms. Barker said like push them that way.

Ms. Sugimura said yes so hopefully they would all come out one way and then there weren’t other ways that people could.

Ms. Barker said so the owner was able to prep the building

Ms. Sugimura said ‘prep’ was her term.

Ms. Barker asked if they were able to do that.

Ms. Sugimura said they required that before police department would go in.

Ms. Barker apologized that her questions may be not known and that they said that 24-hour security was asked for when...what was the date for that.

Ms. Sugimura said she is not sure can tell that but she could go back and go through her notes.

Mr. Torgelson said it was some time last year.

Ms. Barker said we know it was last year.

Ms. Sugimura said we talked about it at the meeting in the fall if we were out there the sweep was in end of September the meeting must have been in September we discussed it at that time. She said that she couldn’t tell now.

Ms. Barker asked Ms. Sodt if she remembered when this was before ARC and we brought up security.

Ms. Sodt said she thought that was in summer – June perhaps.

Ms. Barker said that it is kind of crazy that ARC brought up security I think that was about the same time that the Seattle Times article brought up security and yet it appeared that the owner really didn't grasp the importance of security until gosh a few months later. She asked to have required fees explained for all of this going on – how is the City reimbursed. She said there are bonds but how is city time and dealing with the 100 calls in December – how is the City reimbursed for any of that – what is the developer paying fee-wise in all of this. Cost recovery? Anything?

Mr. Torgelson said they would have to do research on that. He said the performance bond would be if the façade failed.

Ms. Sugimura said you are asking for the service from fire and police.

Ms. Barker asked if there are fees for demolition.

Ms. Sugimura said there are demolition permit fees.

Ms. Barker asked what they typically would be for something this size. She asked them to guess.

Ms. Sugimura said they can find out.

Mr. Torgelson said with other vacant – there are a lot of vacant buildings in Seattle now

Ms. Sugimura said it is usually all wrapped up into one

Mr. Torgelson said they tell the owners to board up the building to prevent squatters from going in; if they don't do that we will go out there and do that and then bill the owner of the building. He said in this case the applicant – the owner of the building – did do the boarding up of the windows and all the openings.

Ms. Sugimura said that normally the demolition permit is all in one with the rest of the permit. She said that some people come in with a separate demolition permit when they are not doing a development. She said she can find out the difference between those but there is a fee for the demolition permit, there is a fee for reviewing the plans and all those kinds of things just like there is a fee for reviewing plans for a new development.

Ms. Barker asked if there are conditions placed on a demo permit.

Ms. Sugimura said that they are going to be placing the conditions on the demo permit and that is where we set the bond, those kinds of things. She said they also wanted to put on and this is in consultation with DON we wanted to put on the statement that it is clear they have to come back for the Certificate of Approval and some of those kinds of things. She said that those would be the kinds of things.

Ms. Barker said she thought that is important because from this process with ARC they have not presented a future plan that has met with approval yet. She said that wanting to take down all of the guts of a property and leaving a couple walls you may think that it kind of opens everything up to put the towers where you darn well please. She said she would certainly hope that the condition of approval would reflect that there is nothing that has been approved tower-wise with this project.

Ms. Sugimura said she thought that would be part of the wording.

Ms. Barker said she would be in favor of something like that. She said that lastly Ms. Sugimura / Mr. Torgelson said it was not precedent-setting because of the size, the aggressive transients, the unique circumstances, aren't there other buildings like this that this could happen to?

Mr. Carter said he thought that was up to the board to decide; the board needs to decide if this is going to be precedent-setting. He asked if we are basically saying 'we've made your building a landmark but if you open it up to squatters then we will let you tear it down'.

Ms. Sugimura said this is the statement and whether it stops people or not this is clearly I've made in the paper that this is not intended to say a signal that 'yes bring the transients in and we'll...' but we hope it is not something that continues and one the things that we'll be watching for. She said we do have a lot of challenges with vacant buildings these days. She said that we hear from police and fire most of them are the single family homes and the smaller apartments that are waiting for development. She said we have a lot of people asking us to move faster on those kinds of permits. She said that this one Mr. Torgelson and I believe is very unique; we hope it doesn't happen again. It is not where we want to be but because of the safety issues that we feel like we need to do this.

Mr. Ketcherside said that looking at the specific Ordinance or the code that has been invoked here he said he was very curious about the term 'health and safety' and where you draw the precedence for this use of the term 'health and safety'. Chapter 23.40.008. He said we were given a copy of the City Code piece that you are using to demolish this building and when he read through it there are a few really salient pieces. He said the most important part is that this building is a health or safety risk – that is the exact term 'health or safety risk'. He said there are other words 'the Director will consult with the Landmarks Preservation

Board’; he said that ‘consult’ is incredibly poorly defined there – it is very vague. He said he thought they could have sent an email to the board and that would have sufficed probably...not on a legal ground. But he wondered about ‘health and safety’ if that term is defined elsewhere in code or if there is legal precedent or where you are coming from in invoking health and safety for this building.

Ms. Sugimura said she is not an attorney but in terms of the kind of extreme – what we believe is the extreme nature of this in terms of what police and fire have seen, have had to do, what they have found in the building is not something that we have seen before. She said she has worked for the City for many years. She said that where the line is might be hard but in terms of the things that lay over here in her mind is this is a very extreme situation in terms of health and safety issues and the danger of leaving it there.

Mr. Ketcherside said you are going on a common definition of health and safety. He said when he read the law his immediate assumption about the law is that was intended to stop somebody from being injured after a major earthquake or a fire or some event that has changed the condition of the building into a health or safety risk. That the building is causing to the street, to the occupants or to other places that (*unintelligible*) the building and take action against it. He said in this case that is not what has happened at all. He said that people who come and go, they are not ever present in the environment; people have entered the situation and created what you are calling a health and safety risk so I’m glad to have that question answered. He said that is going to lead beyond it. He said that despite the assurances that this is not intended to be a precedent I think that by you broadening you absolutely are setting a precedent for what health and safety means. He said that now all that needs to happen to have a building destroyed is to create a health or safety situation which is now ill-defined. He said that you can’t go into it under the assumption that it is the building that is a risk – it could be any situation that is a risk. He said the health or safety could be – I don’t know – you have to get creative about what creates a health or safety risk if you are a building owner. He said he can think of other buildings like the school district warehouse just a few blocks away from this building that we were a split vote on whether it was a landmark or not and if it was – that is a huge, wide open building with tons of access that I can’t understand why it would be in a different situation than the Seattle Times Building. He said that you say that you have never seen sophisticated squatting like this – these people aren’t going to disappear. He said that we now have sophisticated squatters we are going to demolish this building they are going to flee like mice or rats to the next big landmark. He said that he was trying to figure out as a landmark board member what precedent this sets for him – if he should be extra cautious when declaring a large landmark? Should he declare a landmark knowing that somebody could come along afterwards while he is still on the board and determine what it means for that building to be a landmark ‘we know that building is not really a landmark – all we need to do is save a couple of facades and that is all anyone ever expected out of this building’. He said that personally it definitely sets a precedent for him and that it must set a

precedent for people who care about the law involved here. He said that if he were another bad acting developer who spends years on a project just trying to extract as much from the public as possible he would do the same thing. He said that most developers are great – we had a property owner in here earlier for the Hastings Building in Columbia City neighborhood – it is a historic non-contributing building but they are taking loving care of the building; they are not redeveloping it. They are changing it for the future. He said we have had other cases where buildings came before us where the owner was absolutely not a good steward of the building and their intentions were clearly to find whatever means to have it destroyed and removed from the City so they could move forward with their dreams of what the city should be. He said he strongly disagreed about the statement about this not setting a precedent. He said you can't control the precedent that you have created – it is out of your hands from this point on. Except, what changes will you propose to the Municipal Code to allow this to not happen again except in the very narrow circumstances that you think are appropriate in this case? Right now it is broad it is wide open. He said he thought there is clearly a need to narrow it down to for example the Fire Marshal – the head of the Fire Department –

Ms. Sugimura said there is a fire chief and a fire marshal.

Mr. Ketcherside said the some official of the Fire Department declares it a hazard for these specific reasons. Or the Building Inspector declares it a hazard for these specific reasons. He said there is a need to ratchet down the law so that a foul smell isn't considered to be a hazard. Or a mental health – it is bright lime green and it really affects my mental state every time I walk by and therefore I'm going to sue the City because they didn't invoke the health and safety clause. He said he really thinks it is necessary and clearly his question doesn't have an answer so he is going to challenge to leave and come up with that or maybe that is inappropriate and maybe this is the question he should ask – who is responsible for forming that law? Is this coming from Council or is it proposed by city staff and the mayor? He asked if he should be emailing the whole city council and asking them to fix this.

Ms. Sugimura said that council has to approve code changes. The mayor and or council can propose code changes.

Mr. Ketcherside challenged them to go fix the law to say what they think it should say because he thought they were setting a very raw precedent that can be exploited in imaginative and surprising ways in years to come.

Ms. Sugimura said she got it down.

Mr. Ketcherside said he wanted to make sure there weren't other points he wanted to make. He said he was completely caught off guard by this at the last meeting. He said as he told his fellow board members he came dressed in a new outfit so he

could be a new man and be a better person in this meeting than he was in the last one. He said he was shocked to find in the newspaper it was stated that we were very frustrated. He said that he had said he was pissed off but that he is a better man today and not even frustrated today.

Ms. Sugimura said the tie does it.

Mr. Ketcherside said the tie and the jacket. He said he didn't understand – there were two news cameras and a reporter here and he had no idea going into the last meeting. He said our preservation organizations had no idea; there was a tweet the next day by the Washington Trust and there was no mention in Historic Seattle's outreach in the next few weeks because they had probably no idea what to say. He said he really didn't understand the outreach around this issue. He said if the intention is to do the best thing for the building and there really is no choice which is clearly what your position is. He said he didn't understand the secret nature of the announcement and maybe only coming before the board because of that clause that says 'you must consult'. That is the end.

Mr. Kiel said that he has been recusing himself from conversations about this property but am not doing so today because he feels like it is such a broad precedent and he was so concerned about it. He said that he seconded Mr. Ketcherside's appeal to help define when this is appropriate and get that written into the rules. He said that also to add some teeth to the rules of governing the caretaking of landmarks and so that you make sure there is a really strong discouragement for anybody to follow this path ever again. He said he had the city code in front of him and wanted to clarify are you here today in order to “ the Director shall consult with the Landmarks Preservation Board and director of Department of Neighborhoods about alternatives to demolition. He said it feels like you guys have moved past that decision point which would leave me to believe that you think this is such an imminent danger to the health and safety as to preclude deliberation yet he said he has known about this as a board member for a month and you mention that it is a problem that has been going on for better part of a year so it doesn't seem like that is quite the thing. He said that (*unintelligible*) with the assumption that you are here to consult about alternative because it seems like you have gone from 'we have a problem' and he said that he thought everybody here doesn't want our fire fighters and police officers to be put at risk to the most extreme almost the extreme solution. He said the most extreme would complete level (*unintelligible*) and you decided to save the facades but we as a board struggle regularly with façadism and so you cut right to the chase and just gutted out everything about this building. He said that if you look around town there is nothing but shells of buildings – there are new buildings they are being put up but they are still just a whole bunch of floorplates, they've got kind of shoddy construction fences around them and they are well lit. He said they have had security systems that turn on various lights when motion detectors go off. He said there is a whole set of construction security stuff that happens. He wondered if they had considered just gutting the building instead of demolishing

it. He said he hears that one major area of concern is about the circuitous nature of the plan and that it has all these little hiding spots – he said he gets that would be a dangerous situation and he didn't envy the people doing the sweeps. He said what if the thing was gutted out and lit like a construction site – you A) would have taken control of the site for a duration of time to do that demolition which he thought that would resettle a few of the squatters and get them out of the way because they would feel that it is a construction site now because it is and then you would light it like every other construction site and he said he doesn't get how it was different at that point. He said he didn't get why the assertion that you can't have a horizontal surface here – he said we have horizontal surfaces – I just read an article – 60 cranes in the city right now. That is at least 60 sites that are like that condition so why can't we take a partial measure first and see if it works before taking the most drastic.

(unintelligible) and you can't say because the applicant doesn't want it – we want to know what you want.

Ms. Patterson said that one of the when Mr. Ketcherside was mentioning the definition of public health and safety one of the words that is tied to that in the Ordinance that hasn't really been discussed is 'imminent'. She said that this has been a problem for a really long time. She said she did a little permit research and saw that the property owner did file their demolition intake form last December so she knows that just recently it was brought to the Landmarks Preservation Board and she said she didn't really understand why it wasn't brought to the board sooner especially the words in the code that were just mentioned about consultation with Landmarks Preservation Board. She said her question was that if it is such an imminent health and safety danger why hasn't the city stepped in and taken responsibility to actually do the demolition or take over the building and secure it ourselves because in SMC.22.208.100 the Director has that authority. She said they can step in and repair, alter or improve the building. They can vacate it or they can demolish it. She said the fact that there still isn't a demolition permit for this building that is an imminent health and safety threat is kind of shocking to her. She asked if there has been a timeline set for the property owner – a deadline that this building must be demolished to meet the health and safety imminent threat that is out there before the city steps in. Has this been discussed?

Ms. Sugimura said that we have not set a demolition deadline but we gave them deadlines for when we needed to see things so that we could have the bracing plans, bring it to the board, those kinds of things.

Ms. Patterson said that so the property owner can drag their feet even though the police have said they will refuse to go into the building and this building can still be standing next year?

Mr. Torgelson said unless the city takes a different action.

Ms. Sugimura said that we are currently working with them on those deadlines that we have provided in terms of getting bracing plans in and those kinds of things.

Ms. Patterson said that just to address the precedent issue that Mr. Ketcherside brought up earlier we all agree that designating a landmark is we are putting a large responsibility on the property owner. We understand that it can be a financial burden, it can restrict their decisions that they make with the building and we understand that as a huge responsibility. She said that most of the property owners are able to comply with that. She said it is also a huge responsibility for us as the board to enforce the rules that are stipulated in the code for the landmarks Preservation Board and the entire program. She said the city has a responsibility and that if we are holding the property owner to a responsibility the City has to be willing to step up and meet the same responsibility.

Mr. Sneddon asked what the relevant code for securing the premises is – does it specify particular materials or approaches?

Ms. Sugimura said she was not aware – we have talked about a variety of security techniques working with police and the departments.

Mr. Sneddon said he was a little troubled in your narrative about the lack of specificity about the steps taken to secure the building; it sounded very vague and general. He said if the code was written such that the city could step in and take whatever measures were necessary to secure the premises that would discourage a lot of property owners from taking this approach because if you whatever expense is necessary to do that to a building like this they would probably step in and do it themselves. They clearly spent a lot of money on civil engineering aspects of bracing after the fact which could have been applied in the beginning to securing the premises you maybe would have been able to avoid this whole situation. He said he it is rather vague in terms of what code for securing the building and that might be part of the problem.

Mr. Torgelson said he believes the code requires securing the building up to 10’.

Mr. Sneddon asked what measures are needed beyond the height recognition.

Ms. Sugimura said she thinks there is a basic standard in terms of protecting it from weather and those kinds of things. It is limited.

Ms. Barker said with all Ms. Sugimura’s years here if she could share a situation where there has been something maybe it hasn’t been a full block site and maybe it hasn’t been really unique circumstances or very aggressive transients but when has there been a project that has had a problem with something that was deemed potentially life safety or definite life safety and the city worked with property

owner and came to something that worked out and didn't result in needing to come up with a forever wall support. Can you share how it typically works because you said it was 'unique circumstances' and asked about a typical.

Ms. Sugimura said with a historic building? She said the only historic building she could think of was the log house one in Alki. She said they had their folks go out there and look at it and made them fix things because it looked like it was starting to come down. That was no related to a development permit or anything. She said she didn't recall.

Ms. Barker said she thought there was something that is the typical way this is done not that you would want to have that in your back pocket per se. When you are doing this and when you are negotiating with the property owner you are saying 'I need XYZ by a certain date' and that is typically how you're proceeding with these? You are not saying 'we're done here by April 1 or we take over'. When does the city start to take over the securing of a dangerous property or has that ever happened? She said she could only think of Pang Warehouse.

Ms. Sugimura said she didn't know of a situation.

Mr. Kiel said gutting the interior of the building while you are waiting for them to get all the structural stuff in place for the façadectomy could be a great interim approach. It would clearly make the site active and get the squatters out of there in the short term so if you are claiming there is an immediate risk it would resolve the immediate risk. He said you could test it and see and may you would never need to pull the trigger on getting rid of everything else. Just thinking aloud but if you really are away from doing anything and you are claiming there is immediate risk there are some other things we could do to mitigate the immediate risk.

Mr. Torgelson said he guessed they would have to better understand if the building structurally could withstand that and the fact that there are multiple buildings. He said that and you would still have the facades which would provide shelter and a barrier for the public and public safety forces being able to see inside. He said it is different from a construction site in which you have a brand new building obviously you have an existing building.

Mr. Kiel said his understanding is it is a concrete frame structure and that you could just bobcat around inside and scoop everything out. It is pretty wide open and just stick your head in the door.

Ms. Sugimura said it is a two-story building.

Mr. Murdock said he wanted to convey this is his sixth year serving on the board and had also served on the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) for six years. He said he has some observations about this process and this project. He said we reviewed the project multiple times at ARC trying to come up with some

solutions that would meet Secretary of Interior Standards (SOI) for historic preservation and also meet the needs of the property owner to maximize his use of the site. We have seen a lot of complicated projects over the years and this is one of them. We have also had complicated projects that we could come to great make great progress at ARC quickly and this project we had multiple times just looking at very general site planning and massing studies that we never got past that point. He said he felt that the owner was not responsive to our requests so we were discussing those same issues over and over again. The issues with safety and sort of deterioration of the building also came up in our meetings and we asked them about how these were being addressed and we didn't have great answers at that time. So to have this come back at our last meeting and to hear that this was going to happen felt like - we know that. We've already tried to discuss these things with the owner and it felt like we got nowhere. So suddenly it feels like owners don't to respond to the Landmarks Board and they can just draw the process out as long as they need to until so much deterioration has happened or there is such an extreme lack of security on the site that they'll just declare an emergency and demolish the building. That is kind of the observation I have on this project because as I say we have done a lot of really amazing complicated and huge projects as a board and as a review committee and they did come out incredibly successfully and I think this project could have. I also wonder at what point the city felt that this was an imminent life safety hazard – that is kind of mirroring what Mr. Ketcherside was asking as well. It seemed to me like it was an issue all along and I think we even asked them about the possibility of removing the non-historic non-controlled parts of the building. It is a massive site. It is a relatively small proportion of historic buildings on the site – why not demolish everything and work on the controls and the Certificates of Approval for the historic part of the building rather than throwing it all out the window. That seemed like a good approach some months ago. I'm wondering why it couldn't be an approach now – it would certainly be much easier to patrol the site when the buildings are much smaller than they are now. He said that wasn't an approach or possible approach to go ahead and just demolish all the parts of the building that were not controlled?

Mr. Torgelson said we haven't looked at that

Ms. Sugimura asked which parts.

Mr. Murdock said there is the 1930s office building portion that is controlled.

Ms. Sodt said there is the 1970s office building to the west and then more industrial buildings to the northwest – none of that is controlled.

Ms. Barker said that pretty much everything on the west side is not controlled.

Ms. Sugimura said we are looking at saving this and this.

Mr. Torgelson said it is basically the east side of the block – the printing plant.

Ms. Sodt said that was the original demolition permit that they submitted was just for the west side of the block I believe.

Mr. Ketcherside said the problem that we have is that the facades are not the landmark – not the entirety of the landmarked buildings. There are structures where

Ms. Sugimura said I've got ya.

Ms. Durham said she agreed with what everyone has said. What I'm noticing is that there is just generally a lack of accountability – that the developer is not being accountable its actions. There's no teeth - no consequences to this behavior and the general concern is that it is just going to happen over and over again. My question at the last meeting was if there is a minimum maintenance requirement for landmarks which I was assured by Ms. Sodt that there was not and my question to whoever governs this is 'why'. Why do we not have that piece in the code to say that if there is a landmark building there is minimum maintenance requirement? It just seems to be ridiculous that we don't have that because what is the point of designating a landmark if anybody can just allow it to fall apart until it can be torn down. I have not been on the board very long and I haven't been with this project for the same amount of time as everyone else but it makes our time and the time of all the professionals involved in all these designations seem to be sort of worthless if we cannot guarantee that there is a minimum maintenance required of the landmark building. Further with respect to this project I'm just real disappointed that the City is not able to apply significant consequences to a developer to allow this situation to get to the point it is.

Mr. Luoma said he wanted to recognize that his responsibility – the board's responsibility – is the designation of historic buildings. The crisis that the city has regarding homelessness or transients is not our purview but we come at this project where these two items have intersected and certainly want to recognize that what is occurring is illegal and there is a grave concern for our first responders and emergency personnel. I certainly understand that. I think that what a lot of folks have said that it seems like it was put on too long to allow this to continue to occur. At the very first meetings or early on we saw this occurring and happening. I think while there may not be a building of this scale in terms of concrete and access and complexity in downtown there certainly are other buildings that could easily pose a similar risk if the aggressiveness and the nature of squatters continues. I don't think it is a question of scale or complexity – it could occur in any building – landmark or not. I think we are seeing that putting up fences is not enough or even the idea of fences is not always received well in keeping people out and the reason why construction sites or any building for that matter intends to discourage negative activities is because there is activity there. There is construction going on. There are people using buildings and so to allow

a building be vacant landmark or not for months or years on end is really inviting negative activities that unfortunately were resulting to deal with now. I challenge the city to come up with better ideas whether they be code or other incentives or enforcements to developers and property owners that encourages activity through the life of a project up until shovels are hitting the ground. Fences are not going to be enough. Security guard are not going to be enough. I think we are seeing that and more could be done that could be of benefit to the entire city to have more activated spaces than just leaving them empty. Thank you for coming today.

Ms. Barker asked what are the next steps – do we know those? Are you going to come back and share with us or...issue a permit? What is the next step?

The developer has to come in.

Mr. Torgelson said we need a demo permit and complete bracing plan. We are always happy to come back if invited for updates.

Mr. Kiel said your mind has been made up about the course forward.

Mr. Torgelson said our mind isn't made up until we issue a demo permit.

Public Comment:

Eugena Woo, Historic Seattle, thanked the board – everything you said I agree with and thank you for doing your homework on this. It is a difficult situation and I know especially how difficult it is to deal with partially and vacant buildings. I used to staff the International Special Review district and work directly with Diane on these issues still ongoing. She said there was a fire at the Louisa Building a few years ago – it was arson. But it was a totally different situation from this one. That one really was life safety – it was imminent danger. She said that most of the building is still there – some of it is gone but it is moving ahead and being mostly preserved. She said that from an advocate standpoint and from the general public and from a property owner, homeowner, this just looks like it was an irresponsible absentee owner taking no responsibility for their property. They are poised to make a lot of money from this project from this block to the block to the south with the up zone up to 40 stories and they can't spend the money to put proper security on this? And just put up our hands? This is the case of blaming the victim – in this case the victim is the building. It is a landmark building – do not blame it for all the entry points – oh they are going to figure out ways to get in. Yes it is unfortunate and it is really bad but my colleague and I went there yesterday. We walked around the buildings and there was a flag up there – if any of you saw Danny Westneat's article today in the paper. Squatters are inviting – they are asking for vacant homes and buildings to go into for their next place. It is going to happen again. Maybe it is going to be in an historic building maybe it's not going to be but either way it is bad. I just saw one security camera on the two main facades. One security camera on that

building. Even now. And the fact that they applied for a demo permit back in December? And now it is still standing. If it is so imminent why is it even still there? Historic Seattle owns eight historic properties. We have been saving buildings since 1974. At some point every one of our properties was vacant or dilapidated and we secured these properties. Some of these buildings had squatters in them. We took the responsibility. Our current building which is the biggest building – probably even bigger than this site – is the Good Shepherd Center – fully occupied. We have issues with burglaries and we take care of those issues and we are constantly figuring out – talking to security experts – what do we do to secure this property for our tenants for the public for the users, for ourselves. Basically the owners are getting away with this. Ultimately it is not fair to those of us who do take responsibility and do take care of our properties. The existing system has failed. There needs to be more than minimum maintenance because you put plywood over the windows and the doors. We dealt for five years with Alki Homestead, a landmark in Seattle. If it wasn't that it was sold last year to someone else the same thing could have happened. And that was a worry. Because there was no minimum maintenance. Nothing could be done other than what was finally done after years of asking to (*unintelligible*). This (*unintelligible*) building is demolition by neglect and that is just not acceptable. Something needs to be done. The Ordinance should be updated to include language actually strong language that has the teeth as one of the board members said regarding not allowing demolition by neglect happening. I know a lot of people feel this way - we were taken by surprise. I saw it on the agenda but knowing that this project was probably going to be another façadectomy I thought the partial demolition was based more on part of the project what they applicant was asking for. I had no idea that this part of the code was being invoked and I knew that existing but it is – but I wasn't aware of its being used before. I just want to ask the board to stay strong and keep doing what you are doing. Thank you. Diane and Nathan – please listen to everything that was said here and really take this to heart because it is not blaming you personally for any of this. I know you and your staff are doing the best that you can but we just have to do – because this is going to happen again.

030216.4 COVENANTS FOR TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS

030216.41 YWCA Building
1118 5th Avenue

Ms. Sodt explained she has worked with the property owner to draft the covenant. She said there is a signed Controls & Incentives agreement and a letter from SDCI; she said there is no need for rehabilitation.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board makes the determination that the YWCA Building at 1118 Fifth Avenue has fulfilled the requirements for transfer of Landmark TDR pursuant to SMC 23.49.014 and

Ordinance No. 120443 – that the building is a designated Landmark with a Controls and Incentives Agreement pursuant to Ordinance No. **124292**; that an authorization letter from DPD has been received and has identified the number of transferable square feet to be 86,838 square feet; and, the building is not presently in need of rehabilitation, therefore no security is required.

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

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approved the agreement entitled “COVENANTS FOR LANDMARK TRANSFERABLE DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS” as submitted to the Board as the legal agreement required as a condition to the transfer of development rights from the YWCA Building at 1118 Fifth Avenue, per SMC 23.49.014D(4).”

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

030216.5 DESIGNATION

030216.51 Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, Seattle Branch
1015 Second Avenue

Larry Johnson, Johnson Partnership, prepared and presented the report (full report in DON file). He provided context of the building and site. He said that the limestone on the simple rectilinear building has been cleaned. He noted the recessed central portion and eleven expressed columns and non-original tripartite windows. He said there is Montana granite beneath the windows, scribed concrete on the west side. He said that on the south façade the plinth of the basement abuts the property line; the top is a terrace.

Mr. Johnson went over interior areas that were nominated and said that the first floor elevator lobby elevator doors, marble panels, bronze entry doors are original. He said that the teller area screen was moved back after 911. He said that windows have been replaced with thicker profiles. He said that in 1991 the north terrace was altered to create ADA access but he noted the perimeter plantings are intact.

Mr. Johnson said that he didn't think the building met criteria A or B but that regarding C is casually associated with the west portion of the Central Business District and with the economic vitality of Seattle. With regards to Criterion D he said the building is a product of its time. He said the Nakamura Building is a true PDA Modern building as was the demolished Public Safety Building. He said that the typology of many Federal Reserve buildings is Beaux Arts. He said that what was built here was Scheme 1B which he called the 'fall back scheme' that was a more conservative approach than 1A which was more International Style. He said

that he didn't think the building met Criterion E because of the enormous portfolio of work by William Bain and NBBJ; he cited other buildings as better: Shoremont Apartments, Shaw Residence, Consulate Apartments, Envoy Apartments, Bel Roy Apartments, Yesler Housing, Boeing Plant, First Presbyterian Church, and NBBJ office building. He said the building is not real visible except right in front so he didn't think it met Criterion F.

Mr. Luoma asked if there was a bank of similar scale that exemplifies modern scale.

Ellen Mirro, Johnson Partnership, said the Stoddard Bank.

Mr. Johnson said the First National Banks and noted that suburban banks are smaller in scale.

Ms. Barker asked if the terraces were ponds.

Ms. Mirro said they were made into a water feature in 1991.

Mr. Johnson said that the level of the north terraces was brought up.

Mr. Kiel said the decision to move to the more conservative design may have been emblematic of the Cold War. He said that bankers are a conservative client. He said the building was more a bomb shelter than anything else.

Mr. Murdock said the building is listed on the National Register and asked what elements are listed.

Mr. Johnson said he didn't know.

Public Comment:

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, said the National Register information is available online. She said the building meets criteria A and C; it is associated with the permanent home of the Federal Reserve and she noted the role it played in growing the regional economy. She said that it is associated with post World War II architecture in downtown Seattle and with NBBJ. She said that she supported designation on C, D, and E. She said the building was constructed during a period of transition and exhibits a more restrained modernism. She said it is a significant building. She said she would like to see a meaning preservation project done.

Jennifer Mortens, Washington Trust, said she supported designation on criteria C, D, E and suggested consideration of F. She said this is a transitional building; it is significant because it has architectural expression of both what preceded and what followed which made it more complex. She said it strongly contrasts with what is around it and has a striking presence in the neighborhood.

Patty Gelenberg lives downtown and said she values the building. She said it gives a timeline of Seattle history. She said it is integrated in the community and is a valuable piece.

Kent Bush said it is an important building. He said he likes development but noted the importance of keeping different scale and mix in the area. He said the building should stay as it is.

Dave Van Skype said the building meets criteria C, D, and F. He said it is a transitional building and the transitional elements are interesting. He said noted the institutional pattern created by setback and the plaza effect that was created. He said the plaza is important and should be controlled. He said that although on the National Register local control is important regarding redevelopment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Sneddon supported designation based on criteria C, D, E, and F. He said the Federal Reserve was important especially in response to banking and the Depression and Seattle as part of the economy. He said it is related to war time and post war time growth and said not many cities get a Federal Reserve Branch. He said the building bears marks of the Cold War with its bunker style and vaults. He said that culturally it reflects the cultural currents and Modernism. He said that architects were becoming modern and the bank was rooted in neoclassicism. He said that the stripped down building was associated with fascism and the building was part of the conversation. He said that the building exhibits solidity and architecture was firmly moving in a new direction. He said that plans A and B shows movement and conversation with clients and remnants of an older style. He said that NBBJ considered this an important design and thought of the building as important. He said that the building is fairly unique and is a last example of large public building from this era. He supported Staff Recommendation.

Mr. Murdock supported designation and agreed with Mr. Sneddon on criteria C, D, E, and F. He said it was the only major building built in the period 1940 – 1952 and it is a unique component in the neighborhood. He said the building symbolized stability of American monetary system. He noted the contrast of siting and said the building was an anchor of the financial district. He agreed with the Staff Report.

Mr. Carter supported designation and said that when built it would have been recognizable; it is now because what is going on around it. He said it is still prominent. He agreed with Staff Recommendation and with inclusion of F.

Mr. Kiel supported designation although he said he had concerns about criteria E and F. He said there is lack of evidence about the economic heritage piece and

that it represents a coming of age for Seattle, He supported criteria C and D and noted the building is distinctive and transitional. He said he didn't think the building was an outstanding work by NBBJ; it was touted as an accomplishment at the time – it was a young company. He said that the building does contrast in scale and might contribute to the quality of the neighborhood.

Ms. Anderson supported designation on criteria C, D, E, and F.

Ms. Durham supported designation on criteria C, D, and F and said she would go along with E although she was not convinced it is an outstanding NBBJ building. She said it is a transitional building and noted the emerging Modernism and its significance as an early example. She noted the value of the bank here. She said it contrasts with what is around it. She agreed with the Staff Report.

Ms. Barker supported designation on criteria C, D, E and F. She said the bank represented strength, security, careful and the building symbolized those things. She noted the building's simplicity and said the photos don't do it justice. She said the marble is amazing and she noted the intricacy and craftsmanship of the back hallway. She noted the fluted bronze doors and bathrooms and said the building is a piece in time. She said the building was built close to banks and was a fortress. She supported designation of exterior, and interior lobby; she said she was less enthralled with the teller area because it had been changed but said it would make it feel incomplete now.

Mr. Ketcherside supported designation on criteria C, D, E, and F and said he agreed with the Staff Report. He said that 1909 Chamber of Commerce tour resulted in the Federal Reserve having a presence in Seattle and noted it came to fruition in 1950. He said this re-invigorated Seattle after WWII. He said the Port Commission was getting business back to area and said that trade in the Pacific with Japan was governed by the U.S. Military after the war. He said prior to ground breaking the Mayor of Seattle made a trip to Asia to ensure financial stability to make sure peace remains. He said two months after he came back there was a Japanese trade show here of which McArthur personally approved. He said that this building represents Cold War architecture – it was built right at the beginning.

Mr. Ketcherside talked about Plan A and why it wasn't chosen. He said he read through archives and that the Federal Reserve had a limited budget and had to go to Congress for money. He said that Warren Magnuson was on trade trip and had to be lobbying for money. He noted the juxtaposition of Portland and said the decision was already made. He said NBBJ listed the building as a prestigious work of theirs. He said that the building makes a different visual statement with regards to F in that it is stepping back rather than built to property line.

Ms. Johnson supported designation on C, D, and F. She said that the previous board didn't vote to nominate the building and noted that the building has since

been cleaned and more research has been done. She noted its place on the National Register. She said that the Public Safety Building was more outstanding but this building embodies its time and purpose. She said the plaza makes it unique. She supported the Staff Recommendation.

Mr. Luoma supported designation on C, D, E, and F. He said the post war building represents safety, security, and stability; there are not a lot of windows, there is a single entrance and the building is set back. He said that with security today we think of transparency. Regarding E he said you can see how the designers thought of the building. He said they pushed the envelope and the client; Plan A is what they wanted but ended up with something they could live with, Plan B. He said it was a conservative client. He said to include the teller area because it helps tell the story.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, Seattle at 1015 Second Avenue as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C, D, E and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the exterior of the building and the interior of the main entrance elevator lobby and the teller lobby area on the first floor.

MM/SC/RK/NC 9:1:1 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel opposed. Ms. Patterson recused herself.

030216.6 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator