



The City of Seattle

# Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 276/16

## MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

600 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue

L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room

Wednesday, May 4, 2016 - 3:30 p.m.

### Board Members Present

Deb Barker

Kathleen Durham

Robert Ketcherside

Jordon Kiel, Vice Chair

Kristen Johnson

Aaron Luoma, Chair

Jeffrey Murdock

Julianne Patterson

Matthew Sneddon

Mike Stanley

### Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Melinda Bloom

### Absent

Nick Carter

Marjorie Anderson

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

## **050416.1**

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

March 2, 2016

The Board deferred consideration of the minutes.

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

**050416.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

Reviewed out of agenda order.

050416.22 Sand Point Naval Air Station – Buildings 330, 331 & 332  
6524, 6610 & 6622 62<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE  
Proposed re-roofing, and selective window replacement

Roger Tucker, Environmental Works, explained that new cellular shades and interior storm windows would be installed on the first floor. He said some new egress windows would be installed at the basement level. He said replacements will match existing as close as possible, they will use Anderson wood composite. He said that the interior storms are a good alternative; they are a composite material, have stable frame with no rack and there is no need to paint. He said that screens obscure some detail around the perimeter.

He explained they are replacing the weathered roofing and per ARC comments have switched to Antique Brown color. He said exteriors will be painted white and entries will be painted pre-approved Sandpoint Naval Air Station colors, each different.

Ms. Patterson asked how many upper floor windows are being replaced.

Mr. Tucker said that all upper story windows; bathroom windows will be fixed and the tall stair windows will not be replaced.

Ms. Doherty noted the elevations are provided in the packet.

Ms. Barker said the photos were helpful.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Luoma said ARC reviewed twice and applicant has been responsive to questions and comments.

Ms. Barker said they came back with alternatives to window types and roofing color. She said all upper windows will be covered by screens. She said the dark brown roofing is more in keeping with what is there now.

Ms. Doherty said there was an alternative packet for wood windows but she heard support at ARC to present the alternative composite window material.

Mr. Luoma noted the large number of windows. He said that the character defining windows are the large ones on the first level; these others are more minor.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior building alterations at Buildings 330, 331 & 332, located at 6524, 6610 & 6622 62<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE.

The proposal as presented May 4, 2016 does not adversely affect the features or characteristics as specified in Ordinance No. 124850, and complies with the

Secretary of Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation, and Sand Point Naval Air Station Landmark District Design Guidelines as follows:

SOI Standards for Rehabilitation - #9

Relevant District Guidelines for:

Windows

- Retaining, preserving and in some cases restoring the original historic fenestration pattern (window placement pattern) should be a priority.
- An in-depth survey identifying the condition of the existing window frames and sash should be undertaken prior to any consideration of projects involving the replacement or alteration of window sash or window units.
- Wooden window sash, frames and trim should be repaired by patching, splicing, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing deteriorated features or components. Such repair may include the in-kind replacement of those parts that are missing or extensively deteriorated. Consideration may be given to the use of substitute materials based on technical and economic feasibility and visual impacts.
- Replacement of historic sash and frame members may be undertaken if it can be demonstrated that the window is too deteriorated to repair and all possible repair and upgrading options have been explored. Replacement sash, pane configuration and frame members should closely match the size and design of the historic sash and frame members. Consideration may be given to the use of compatible substitute materials based on technical and economic feasibility as long as the essential design and character of the window is replicated.
- In order to comply with current energy code requirements every effort should be made to develop design solutions that do not radically change, obscure or alter primary elevations, character-defining features or materials especially fenestration patterns and intact historic window units. Code compliant replacement sash, pane configuration and frame members should closely match the size, configuration and design of the historic sash and frame members. Consideration may be given to the use of compatible substitute materials based on technical and economic feasibility as long as the essential design and character of the window is replicated.

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

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

*Ms. Anderson arrived at 3:50pm.*

050416.23

Latona Elementary School

401 NE 42<sup>nd</sup> Street

Proposed site improvements and playground

Gretchen DeDecker, Seattle Public Schools, explained the play structure is enveloped by ramps and is not very usable. The PTSA was granted a grant for a conceptual plan to revise the playground.

Lucy Campbell explained they received a \$100,000 large project fund to replace the aging play equipment – as it has come to the end of its useful life. She said the ramps

and rails around are no longer needed to improve accessibility, remove low walls, add walkways, and add wood play chips. She said this area is not visible from the historic building. She said they will add artificial turf with sand infill in a limited area.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Luoma said the ARC reviewed the project and had no major objection. He said it is reasonable and not impactful to historic character of the building.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for playground and site improvements at Latona Elementary School, 401 NE 42<sup>nd</sup> Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed site alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Report on Designation 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/RK/MA 10:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel recused himself.

050416.21

Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center  
4000 NE 41<sup>st</sup> Street  
Retroactive proposal for selective tree removal

The applicant was not present. Ms. Doherty said the Certificate of Approval is retroactive, and understands that there was a miscommunication between the owner's representative and their property manager. She said that in February 2014 eight trees were removed without approval; the owner sought retroactive approval and provided documentation that all eight trees were dead, dying and were hazards. She said that in October 2014 the owner submitted an application for a Certificate of Approval in advance of removing two trees, and received the Board's approval. She said that this time she received an email from the Owner's Representative on Friday April 22, 2016 and read it the following Monday – and replied that a Certificate of Approval was required to remove the trees. On Wednesday April 27<sup>th</sup> Ms. Doherty received several complaints that the trees were in the process of being removed. She has since received complaints from the community that the property owner is not following the process. She said the property manager contacted SDCI who reviewed and approved removal of the trees without a permit. She said that SDCI did not refer the property manager to Landmarks for a Certificate of Approval.

Mr. Murdock said it is reasonable to forget about the process once but not twice; and noted that they've done it the right way before.

Mr. Luoma said an explanation is needed.

Mr. Ketcherside said it seems different – that SDCI actually told them to go ahead.

Ms. Doherty said SDCI should not issue a permit without board approval, but they determined a permit was not required. It appears that they forgot to refer them. She said that a complete survey of trees and condition has been prepared for the property and shown to the Board in the past. She said the owner was encouraged to create a landscape maintenance plan to identify what needs to happen and when. She said that was not done.

Ms. Barker said in February 2014 we asked them to do it – they have had knowledge of how to deal with the property in a more holistic way and it doesn't make sense to approve this without the applicant being present at the meeting. She said it should have been flagged before, difficult when done incrementally.

Mr. Ketcherside said he was sure there was no ill will but they set it up by not preparing for it. He said they need to show up to the meeting.

Mr. Kiel asked if there is a tree replacement plan.

Ms. Doherty said no, it is not required.

Mr. Luoma said SDCI process is good and valid but not the lens that historic preservation has – trees that are old, knotty and gnarly, may still be worth saving. He said they should be reminded in person of the process.

The Board deferred consideration of the application.

***The applicant arrived later during this meeting after the Controls and Incentives were reviewed, and the Board's discussion of this agenda item resumed.***

Ms. Doherty explained to the applicant that the board deferred action because they wanted the ownership present to hear their feedback.

Steve Goff, property manager, said they cut down two dangerous trees including one near buildings. He said the other one could have fallen across the road – half of it was lost last year. He said it was his fault that the work was done without the Board's approval – he booked the contractor for later in spring but learned that they had an opening in their schedule before the Certificate of Approval application was done. He said that Nathan Rimmer, the Owner's representative was not at fault.

Ms. Barker asked his title.

Mr. Goff said he works for Pistol Creek Property Management.

Ms. Barker said they have submitted previous applications for tree removal.

Mr. Goff said over the past five years they have been removing hazardous trees.

Ms. Barker said that between the applicant and Nathan Rimmer of the ownership both are aware of suggestions from staff about maintenance.

Mr. Goff said he tries to be above-board.

Mr. Ketcherside said this is the third tree change since the property was landmarked. He said the first tree removal was mismanaged and not approved; the second went through Certificate of Approval process and tree removal was approved; and now trees were removed without approval. He said they should do a full review of the health of all trees and from that get pre-approval or have a plan together. He said they know what needs to be done and they should plan around that.

Mr. Goff said they can only manage so many trees a year. Per their budget cycle – they can do two – three per year. He said this will be ongoing.

Mr. Ketcherside said that Mr. Goff and Mr. Rimmer need to get approval and noted that a Certificate of Approval is good for 18 months. He said they need to work in advance.

Ms. Barker said she was not interested in granting approval until the board gets a maintenance plan.

Ms. Doherty said that while they need to follow procedures for approval prior to start of work, and there is a more efficient approach, there is no requirement for minimum maintenance.

Mr. Luoma said that SDCI has processes in place but without a historic preservation lens or holistic lens. He said that the entire site is a landmark.

Mr. Stanley said they should bring the Board a comprehensive tree removal plan.

Ms. Barker said they should check in with Ms. Doherty as a resource. She said they need to take that step.

Mr. Goff said Ms. Doherty has been helpful.

Public Comment:

Michael Herschensohn, Queen Anne Historical Society, said they should understand what a sacred property this is in Seattle and it needs to be cared for as the gem it is. He said they need to preserve and conserve this landscape.

Mr. Ketcherside said they showed the need to remove both trees, but noted the timing and lack of Certificate of Approval.

Mr. Luoma was OK with approval. He recommended to not plant trees with split trunks to avoid this in the future.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the retroactive application for the removal of two trees at the Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center, 4000 NE 41<sup>st</sup> Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed tree removal does not adversely affect the site or building character as specified in the Report on Designation (LPB 742/13), and the applicant has demonstrated that the trees pose a safety concern.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/JM/KJ            10:1:0 Motion carried. Ms. Barker opposed.

050416.24

NW Rooms & International Fountain Pavilion

305 Harrison Street

Proposed alteration for breezeway and revisions to previous approval

Andrew Stewart, Schemata Workshop, explained the proposal to improve the breezeway. He said they will remove what was added, clean up and add lighting. He said that they received partial approval but the roof plan was not approved; board did not approve guard rails around the skylights. He said they also looked in to bird control. He said they previously proposed two skylights with guardrails but now propose skylights that will resist a fall; when doing maintenance they will put up temporary guardrails. He said the new skylight has a lower profile and is less visually obtrusive. He said that there are several open trusses; he said they will illuminate the bottom part of the trusses. He said that they will use bird wire – two wires at the bottom of the truss that discourage bird activity; spikes will be used on the utility line.

He explained they propose a change to the previous approval to use metal wall cladding, 12” width with seams rather than joints; this is the same product as used on KEXP above glass on courtyard side. They propose a heavy gauge steel to minimize oil canning. There will be a kick plate as well. He said that up to 4’ above the floor slab they will apply spray foam behind to help with rigidity. He said that the planter / bench will have a series of cast-in-place 1 ½” notches to prevent skateboarding. He said that LED strip lights are proposed and they have gone to a lower profile than those previously proposed – it will be less visually obtrusive. He said they propose to add accent lighting at the underside of the planter.

Mr. Luoma asked if a single or double wire is proposed for the bird deterrent.

Mr. Stewart said that they propose two wires – one on either side of the truss.

Public Comment:

Leanne Olson, Queen Anne Historical Society, said she was happy with the improvements. She said she likes the paneling better as it provides better vision and spirit of the world’s fair architecture, and Pacific Northwest Modernism.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker said it is great to see guardrails around skylight deleted from the proposal and noted this is a good solution. She said they worked through their challenges.

Mr. Murdock said that earlier concerns were addressed; he said it is a great solution.

Messrs. Luoma and Sneddon agreed.

Mr. Ketcherside said he appreciated that they looked at other similar solutions on campus.

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

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations, do not adversely affect the features or characteristics as 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/JM/DB 11:0:0 Motion carried.

### **050416.3 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

050416.31 University Heights School (Parks)  
5031 University Way NE

*Mr. Luoma recused himself.*

Ms. Doherty said the majority of the landmark property is owned by the community center and already has an agreement. She said the agreement being reviewed today is for a smaller portion owned by DOPAR at the southeast corner. She read through the agreement.

Ms. Barker asked about temporary installations.

Ms. Doherty said it allows for tents and special events – nothing bolted down.

Action: I move to approve Controls and Incentives for University Heights School (Parks), 5031 University Way NE.

MM/SC/DB/JM 10:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Luoma recused himself.

050416.32 Lincoln High School  
4400 Interlake Avenue North  
Request for an extension



*Mr. Kiel recused himself.*

Ms. Doherty explained the request for 18-month extension and noted the plans to rehabilitate the three oldest portions of the school. She said that SPS wants to start briefings soon.

Mr. Luoma said the request is reasonable given the complexity of the site and what is designated. He noted they are working with Ms. Doherty and he had no problem granting the extension.

Mr. Sneddon commented about the length of the extension.

Ms. Doherty said it was at their request and she had no problem with it. She said they will have to have everything reviewed by the Board until the Controls and Incentives agreement is signed.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for Lincoln High School, 4400 Interlake Avenue North, for eighteen months.

MM/SC/RK/JM 10:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel recused himself.

050416.33

Lloyd Building  
601 Stewart Street

Jack McCullough said that Susan Boyle, BOLA, went over the building. He said it is a small 6,000 square foot site and noted the building is in poor seismic condition. He said they are looking at an assemblage of properties and that it might be more attractive to renovate this one as part of a greater whole. He asked for an extension to September 7, 2016.

Mr. Murdock asked if it is a different owner.

Mr. McCullough said it is the same ownership. He said they want to see the right thing happen.

Mr. Murdock asked how long they have been asking for extensions.

Ms. McCullough said six years.

Ms. Sodt said they have been recently looking for development partners.

Ms. Barker asked if the building is occupied.

Mr. McCullough said it is. He said the elevators are a problem and there has been continued ongoing maintenance. He said there is no room for mechanical room.

Ms. Sodt said she is comfortable with the request.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Lloyd Building, 601 Stewart Street, until September 7, 2016 meeting.

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

**050416.4 NOMINATION**

050416.41 Seattle City Light Power Control Center / System Operation HQ  
157 Roy Street

Michael Herschensohn, Queen Anne Historical Society, prepared and presented the report (full report in DON file). He provided context of the building and site. He noted the counterbalance with powerlines on both sides of the street from two different companies. He noted the 1962 World's Fair and Century 21 campus. He said after WWII new style / shapes were being explored in both cars and architecture. He noted the nearby St. Paul Episcopal Church with its different shapes and the subject building which was originally an octagon. He noted the rejection of European traditions and the redefinition of thinking about space and architectural form taking place. He said the colorful panels on the side give it life and color. He said that in the 1985 addition the panels were added and window. He said it is a respectful addition but the pure octagonal building is now hexagonal. He noted that an original exterior wall remains. He noted the removal of some fencing along the driveway.

Mr. Herschensohn explained the 'Seattle electrical wars' 1900 – 2016: the story of electrical power and the companies that provided it, both private and municipal. He said it is an integral part of the neighborhood's historic context in general and a critical part of the history of the Seattle City Light's Power Control Center and its site.

He reiterated the exploration of new architectural vocabulary - new shapes and forms – and cited the Pacific Science Center, Monorail, and More Annex at University of Washington. He noted the use of concrete.

Mr. Ketcherside asked about City Lights presence at the World's Fair.

Mr. Herschensohn said they were converting everything to electric and getting power to this site at Seattle Center. He said they had to do it because of the freeway coming through.

Mr. Luoma asked if the building would fit into the typology of a command center.

Mr. Herschensohn said he had no answer but noted from the get go they had to be able to track where the electricity goes.

Ms. Barker noted that when the building was constructed the Hanson Baking Company was to the west.

Mr. Herschensohn said that when built, the north side was all apartment buildings but around the building were multiple building types and businesses – Puget Sound news, Hanson Baking, telephone building etc.

Mr. Murdock asked about the pin dot boards on the walls.

Mr. Herschensohn said they are all gone.

Mr. Murdock asked if the style of the design set precedent.

Mr. Herschensohn said he didn't know. He said that Docomomo Wewa discusses Pray's career but no mention of influences.

Mr. Sneddon asked about the body that tied the two electrical providers / systems together.

Mr. Herschensohn said by 1952 all remnants of PG&E were integrated into the system.

Mr. Sneddon said the purchase was approved in 1951 and noted it was hard to believe they completely abandoned the PSE system in a year. He said the site was a former PSE substation and asked if there was any significance to that. He asked if the aggregate panels are precast.

Mr. Herschensohn said they were all precast in Everett.

Mr. Sneddon asked if there were pre-stressed.

Mr. Herschensohn said the pre-stressed was happening later and he didn't think they were stressed on site.

Mr. Ketcherside said the drawings in the application indicate both pre-stressed and pre-cast.

Mr. Sneddon said they looked pretty big.

Mr. Herschensohn said the big pieces were trucked in.

Ms. Barker asked what was going on with the roof.

Mr. Herschensohn said that it was altered as part of the recent conversion to homeless shelter; it is a fabric and tar roof. He said the roof was rebuilt when made octagonal. He said the windows and spandrels are original; there were none in the octagon. He said the addition included a window. He said the doors have been replaced.

Maureen Barnes, Seattle City Light, supported the nomination and was glad that the building was being repurposed to shelter the homeless.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Nicole Demers-Changelo, Queen Anne Historical Society, thanked Mr. Herschensohn for his research. She supported nomination and noted criteria D and F. She said it is an opportunity to show mid-century modern building and its adaptive reuse.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, thanked Mr. Herschensohn and the Queen Anne Historical Society for their nomination. She spoke in support of nomination and designation. She said this is one of Harmon, Pray and Detrich's most significant buildings. She said the Puget Power building in Bellevue was demolished. She noted the subject building's unique form and character. She noted the association in context with Queen Anne, and the progress of light and power. She said the panels used on the fence are similar to those at the UW More Annex / Nuclear Reactor Building. She said she was glad for the adaptive reuse.

*Ms. Durham left at 5:45.*

Mr. Stanley supported nomination and noted the history of power and the battle of the power companies. He said that like the Seattle Center the building has a Jetson-like aura of embracing what they thought the future would be. He noted the optimism. He noted the precast construction and said this is a good example. He supported nomination and noted criteria E and F.

Mr. Sneddon supported nomination and noted the connection to history and SCL's ultimate control over electricity. He said the building is on top of a former PSE substation. He said the building is representative of change from private to municipal power. He noted the building is unusual, locally connected with the Century 21 space age style. He said there is not a lot of architecture left in Seattle representing this connection so well.

Ms. Patterson said this is one of her favorite buildings in Seattle. She said she is glad it was adaptively reused. She said it meets all the criteria except B and noted she loved its Googie-Brutal-Space Age style. She said the building was practical and built on a limited site. She said it was built when the auto was so important and was cantilevered to allow parking. She supported inclusion of the interior to see the ceiling in the octagon.

Mr. Murdock supported nomination and said he attended the Queen Anne Modernism tour which this building was a part of. He said the building is imminently huggable and digestible from all angles. He said it is brutalist in a way you can understand and conveys all the information it needs to. He supported inclusion of the fence as well, and said it is a beautiful cantilevered form. He said that Seattle Center information was translated to adjacent neighborhoods as it flowed out through the city in 1962. He said the building retains the space age culture of the time. He said the craft and concrete culture in Seattle Center is seen here. He supported inclusion of interiors; interested in command room ceiling shown in older photos.

Mr. Kiel supported nomination and said the building clearly embodies its style and it fits in with the Seattle Center. He said he wanted to know more about the architects – Harmon, Pray and Detrich – and the building's connection to the power wars.

Mr. Ketcherside supported nomination and said that it meets double significance of C. He said that public monopoly story is fantastic. He said in 1905 the City created the streetcar to compete with Stone and Webster. He noted the citizens' distaste for the private monopoly and wanted to break it up and make it public. He noted this building's connection back to that.

Mr. Herschensohn said one can see the history in the Georgetown Steam plant.

Mr. Ketcherside wanted more information on this connection. He noted the different angles and geometric shapes that inspired thoughts and said it was the analog space era and he noted the big control panel.

Mr. Herschensohn said now you can have all that on a laptop.

Mr. Ketcherside said he would like to include the ceiling and former exterior wall at the interior.

Maureen Barnes, SCL, said the ceiling panels and lighting are no longer there; it was removed in the 1980s.

Ms. Johnson supported nomination and noted the geometry and form that bled out into the neighborhood following the fair.

Ms. Barker supported nomination and said it looks like a space ship docking station. She said she had always thought it was a church – reverential, respectful – and the octagon was the sanctuary. She said the south wall is jarring to drive by. She said the building meets A, D, E and F. She supported inclusion of inside elements, the site, the west side and west side chevron panels.

Ms. Anderson said it is a great example of Modernism; she noted its playful form and the west side chevron panels.

Mr. Luoma supported nomination. He noted the typology of command centers that tend to be obscure and hidden, and said this is not like those. He said it reminds him of Apollo, NASA and he wants to know more about the command centers of this type. He said the building communicates that power and it could meet Criterion C because it controlled the City's power. He said it is hard to know the existing condition of the interior.

Board members agreed to include the interior so they could study it further.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Seattle City Light Power Control Center / Systems Operation Headquarters at 157 Roy 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, and the building interior and exterior; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for June 15, 2016; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/JP/RK 10:00 Motion carried.

*Mr. Stanley left at 6:10 pm.*

**050416.5 BRIEFING**

050416.51 Space Needle

219 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue North  
Briefing on proposed exterior alterations

PowerPoint presentation in DON file.

Ron Severt, CEO Space Needle, introduced the project.

Alan Maskin, Olson Kundig, provided an overview of the presentation that included feedback from their advisors, a review of Secretary of Interior Standards (SOIS), proposal approach. He said they identified what they thought were the defining characteristics using Preservation Brief #17 and noted the Needle is viewed from a distance with a different view at close range or at arm's length. He went through a checklist of defining characteristics as well as materials. He said they checked with advisors to help construct the list which included the roof profile, saucer profile, structural legs, mast, waist, voids, floating halo, horizontal bands of glass, exterior observation deck, cantilevered structural ribs, light and dark color scheme, views, Seattle Center, view corridor, plane of cladding, halo louvers. He said the horizontal bands of glass and exterior observation deck are impacted by their proposal. He said that Jeffrey Ochsner stated that the Space Needle's character defining features are seen only at a distance. He said they propose a new observation deck and safety enclosure, new elevator, new observation deck glazing, new soffit, and new doors and access lift.

He cited Preservation Brief 14 and said that questions were raised by the board about new observation safety enclosure changing the experience. He said they researched the original ability to look down and explored bench design alternatives. He said that angled louvers provide the least view disruption when looking down. He said their preferred option is to integrate the bench into safety enclosure with views down through.

Mr. Severt said this allows views and seating. He said the board asked for alternatives to the continuous bench on exterior and said an alternative is for occasional benches that from exterior provide an undulating profile or for a consistent profile have bench every other bay. He said they prefer the continuous bench.

Mr. Maskin said the board was receptive to earlier proposed elevator modifications. He said that the board questioned the removal of mullions on the new observation deck and restaurant glazing. He said the mullions don't add to that and they may have been included for wind load accommodation or long lead times on glass. He said their preference is for no mullions which is closer to the original design intent but they included alternative options that include mullions.

He said that they don't think of the soffit below the restaurant level as a character defining feature and want to replace the metal soffit with fritted glass; he said they also want to replace the turntable structure. He said the character defining aspect will be unchanged. The ribs are clearly distinguished with dark soffit material and it is impossible to determine from a distance what it is. He said the architect had the original engineer redraw the ribs multiple times with no mention of the soffit material. He said they will use fritted glass that is opaque but can be seen through from inside the restaurant (with a transparent floor). He provided a night rendering of

the Eiffel Tower with its glass floor. He said the board was OK with the observation deck doors and access lift so no alternatives were provided. He said they think what they have proposed is consistent with the SOIS.

Public Comment:

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, said the presentation was amazing. She said she met with the team and said she was impressed with the comprehensive reviews. She said what she was shown was sensitive to the original design. She said she loves the original windows but in this case this building is different and the windows are not so character defining – it is all about the view and she never paid attention to the mullions. She said removing the cage is huge and the glass floor with ability to look down is amazing. She thanked the presenters for their work.

Knute Berger said he consulted on the project and said he was excited about it. He said it is the best of both worlds. He said it opens up the views and re-excites people about 1962. He said the original engineering and the way it came together will be on view. He said the depth of research done to understand the structure is impressive.

Leanne Olson, Queen Anne Historic Society, thanked the Space Needle group for their due diligence; she said they have worn her down and it will be great. She said she deferred to board for their judgment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker said the comparison renderings were great. She noted Jeffrey Ochsner's comment about the focus being on the view, and if people are sitting on the benches you won't be able to see the view. She said that sloping the seats would allow people to view. She said she likes window Alternative 2 with mullions.

*Ms. Barker left at 6:50 pm.*

Mr. Kiel said he is a big supporter of the proposal. He said the color differentiation in materials is what is seen – it is highly articulated in white with glass being background. He said he reconsidered his criticism of the mullionless window and said that the band of material is the thing. He said to not be preoccupied with how the benches might be used rather focus on the material itself; he preferred Option 2. He said the soffit is not a defining feature – just connective tissue. He said the observation deck lower glass is important but modernization will keep it relevant and useful. He said it will offer a sense of delight to users.

Ms. Johnson echoed Mr. Kiel's comments. She said it is a singular project that won't be seen again and noted the original material. She said the mullions create scale but here that was not the purpose, which at the time was structural. She said the character defining element is the bands of dark and light and the lack of mullions doesn't bother her. She said she likes the bench but she wants a consistent read; she said the thrill is so important here and noted she would not consider it in other landmarks.

Mr. Murdock said it is one of the most important buildings in the City and on the west coast. He said that the renderings are beautiful but he questioned if the glass would be as transparent as shown. He said he appreciated their revisiting the SOIS. He said that removal of historic fabric when it is not at risk of failure and can be replaced in-kind contradicts the SOIS. He said the change of soffit from steel to glass is a significant change especially in profile as its curved shape relates to white fins that play off the darkness of the soffit; he said he wanted further evidence of what that will look like. He said he was not in favor of the benches because it pushes the form out and changes the sectional profile. He said that the ability to circumambulate the entire floor is relentless and he was not in favor of pushing the profile out. He said the materials and technology of 1962 are evidenced by this building and by how it impacts others in the neighborhood and it should be kept intact. He said that the board's purview is not about creating a new user experience; it is to protect the historic character of the building.

Mr. Kiel said the bench Alternative 2 doesn't push the bench out as much.

Mr. Murdock said the bench is taking away the opportunity to stand at the edge and would be a change.

Mr. Sneddon said he appreciated the work done. He said the Space Needle's original program was to increase visitors to the Fair and to bring them into the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. He said the building tells about that history in fabric and detail – and it is the Board's charge to preserve that story. He said the proposal is for visitors and is Disneyesque – it is not about preservation. He said that the mullions are part of the fabric of the Needle and tell the story about wind loads, glass shortage and budget limitations. He said the Board is looking at 100% removal of materials on the observation deck. He said the as-built drawings illustrate what they could build at the time and a crucial part of the Needle's story. He said he was glad the team referenced the SOIS and Preservation Briefs – the spirit of those documents are about replacing materials in-kind. He did not feel that the team was honoring this. He said it is a whole structure and not just pieces, and he was not convinced of the proposal. He said he respects Jeffrey Ochsner but disagreed with his comment about it being like a fire lookout, which is different from the Space Needle. Mr. Sneddon said he appreciates the building for what it is and was, and not what it might have been. He said to retain the mullions at least.

Ms. Patterson said she was OK with everything. She said the bench provides expansive views but said a continuous bench would prevent visitors from getting close to the edge. She preferred Alternative 2. She said to break it up more so someone could get up to edge. She said it should be a place to look outward rather than at the building.

Ms. Anderson said the mullion is an interesting iteration of space and creates a specific pattern within and on a building. She said the preferred option has everything – but separation with alternating bays and views provide a valuable way of looking out.

Mr. Ketcherside said it was a helpful presentation. He said he would approve all but said the mullions have no value at the restaurant level but the ones on the observation



level could have value but would be OK without them. He preferred sporadic benches rather than continuous.

Mr. Murdock said the railing gives a sense of safety and that is being taken away. He said it will create a greater sense of fear for the user than the original designers intended.

Mr. Kiel said that first and foremost is for the landmark to remain relevant and used.

Mr. Murdock questioned what ‘preservation’ means.

Mr. Kiel said the Board approves far greater alterations at other landmarks. He said this is an icon of the west.

Mr. Sneddon asked what is “more” than a 100% façadectomy.

Mr. Luoma said he agrees with Messrs. Murdock and Sneddon that focusing on the user experience is wrong. He did not think that the Space Needle needed to be changed to be better. He said that the elevator change and removal of cabling are not an issue and are minor changes. He said that the Needle wasn’t designed with benches around the entire perimeter and said it is not necessary. He said he echoed other board member comments on the reasons to keep the mullions because of the way they frame spaces and views. He said he wouldn’t approve this in other buildings either. He said it was the era of the design – they had to include them so why remove them now. He said the soffit is in the background so why bring attention to it by making it transparent. He said this is too much about a user experience. He said the experience is looking down at the edge. He said they don’t need as many changes as they are proposing. The elevator and cabling removal are good changes.

**050416.6      STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator