



The City of Seattle

# Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 472/16

## MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting  
City Hall  
600 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room  
Wednesday, August 3, 2016 - 3:30 p.m.

### Board Members Present

Marjorie Anderson  
Deb Barker  
Robert Ketcherside  
Jordon Kiel  
Kristen Johnson  
Aaron Luoma, Chair  
Jeffrey Murdock  
Julianne Patterson  
Matthew Sneddon  
Mike Stanley

### Staff

Erin Doherty  
Melinda Bloom

### Absent

Kathleen Durham

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

**080316.1**

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

June 15, 2016

MM/SC/DB/RK

9:0:1 Minutes approved. Ms. Johnson abstained.

**080316.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

080316.21 University Branch Library  
5009 Roosevelt Way NE  
Proposed replacement of exterior doors

Matt Inpanbutr, SHKS, explained the proposal to replace two doors. He said the precedent for aluminum clad wood doors is there; the intent is for the wood finish to match at the interior. Responding to questions he said it is unclear whether or not the doors are originals. He said that accessibility and maintenance issues have prompted the change. He said they will remove the decorative metal screens, repaint and then reinstall them on new doors. He said the hardware will be restored and reinstalled except for hardware related to accessibility.

Mr. Murdock asked about the proposed grill color and if the grills were historic.

Mr. Inpanbutr said they will be dark bronze to match other entrances. He said he didn't think the grills were historic and noted that the similar circle motif for the rails was added in the 1980s.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Patterson disclosed that she used to work at SHKS but did not work on this project.

Ms. Doherty clarified the interior of the doors is a natural finish.

Ms. Barker said it is consistent with other replacement doors, recently approved by the Board.

Mr. Luoma said he had no major concerns.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed replacement of exterior doors at the University Library, 5009 Roosevelt Way NE, as submitted.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed exterior alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 121104 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

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

080316.22

Fremont Branch Library

731 North 35<sup>th</sup> Street

Proposed replacement of exterior doors, handrail, and chimney

Michael Housely, SHKS, explained the proposal to rebuild the existing unbraced chimney from the roof up; he said the chimney cap is not original but will be repainted and reinstalled. He said two doors will both be replaced with new aluminum clad wood, with exposed wood finish interior of doors. He said the hand rail is non-code-compliant and they propose to add a metal hand rail painted to match existing. He said the push plate post will be installed on an accessible pathway. It will be narrow to minimize visual impact and will not impact walkway.

Mr. Sneddon asked if the chimney is accurate compared to original drawings.

Mr. Housely said they will keep the ceramic tile; it is shown in original drawing but not installed until 1980s.

Mr. Inpanbutr said the stucco is in poor condition.

Mr. Housely said the cap is not original but they will reinstall it. He said the chimney is connected to the boiler and functions.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Luoma said ARC reviewed the application and had no major concerns.

Ms. Barker said it looks good.

Mr. Luoma said it is nice to see efforts to retain the character of the chimney. He said the approach is reasonable compared to the alternatives.

Mr. Sneddon agreed and said he was glad to see it kept and to see a decent proposal given the constraints.

Mr. Luoma said the chimney cap is from the 1980s and has gained some significance over time.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations at the Fremont Library, 1731 North 35<sup>th</sup> Street, as submitted.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed exterior alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 121103 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

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

080316.23

Pacific Science Center

200 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue North

Proposed rooftop communication equipment and shroud

Amanda Nations, Technology Associates, explained the proposal to reconfigure existing equipment behind shroud on roof and to add equipment to the northeast section that will be behind the same kind of shroud. She provide photo simulation and sight views noting the equipment is pretty obscured with screening, placement and vegetation.

Ms. Barker asked why more equipment is needed.

Ms. Nations said they are adding more capacity and to upgrade technology.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Sneddon asked if there are other additions there.

Ms. Nations said AT&T has equipment at the southeast corner and there is HVAC equipment up there as well.

Mr. Kiel said ARC appreciated the shroud and the placement. He said it is not very noticeable because of placement and vegetation / trees.

Mr. Murdock said that placement is set back and it is unlikely pedestrian will ever see the shroud.

Mr. Sneddon said it is reversible.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed rooftop equipment at the Pacific Science Center, 200 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue North, as submitted.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed rooftop equipment and shroud does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 124932 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

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

080316.24            Holyoke Building  
107 Spring Street  
Proposed business signage

In place of the absent applicant Ms. Doherty started to present the application and explained that ARC had reviewed different versions of the application a few times.

Board members determined they didn't have enough information to assess what was proposed and decided to table the application pending further information from the applicant.

Tabled.

080316.25            Space Needle  
219 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue North  
Proposed exterior building alterations

Mr. Stanley recused himself.

Ron Severt, CEO, provided an overview of the project.

Alan Maskin, Olson Kundig, presented via PowerPoint (details in DON file). He said over the course of the project they have met with many people – many in the preservation community – who support the project. He explained proposed changes would be made to observation deck, restaurant glazing, restaurant doors, soffit, and elevators. Material samples were provided.

He said they would remove the observation deck safety enclosure and replace with glazing. He said the proposed bench will not be continuous allowing for sitting or standing; it complements the existing structure. He said the restaurant glazing will have mullions per ARC comments; they will match existing. He said the divisions are aligned with existing truss system and the profile is identical. He said the downspouts will match existing and will address ongoing water infiltration issues. He said the new doors from the restaurant will be ADA compliant and will employ hardware consistent with what is used elsewhere on the Needle. He said the doors will be

counterbalanced egress doors which are easier to open. He said that insulated tinted mullion-less glass will be used at restaurant, and will match existing glass panel width as well.

Mr. Maskin said that they will replace the metal soffit with fritted glass that matches the basic profile. He said that upgrades to the elevators are needed as well as redundancy. He said the one single cab will be left for fire and emergency. He said the new cabs will match existing in geometry, color, and materials. He said interior ADA lifts were added as well.

Mr. Sevart said that different concepts presented in 2009-10 were met with a lukewarm reception, and that now they are presenting more holistically for the future. He noted the relevance of the Needle and said they want to be ready for the bicentennial. He said there is support for the various elements and they have an opportunity to fund it now and do mechanical, fire/life/safety and ADA upgrades. He said they have paid attention to quality and detail. He said it costs money to maintain an icon and they want it to be here for another 50 years.

Board Questions:

Ms. Barker asked about how the benches are anchored and said she didn't recall hearing that before.

Mr. Maskin said they are anchored to existing structure – to struts that hold up the aura. He said they floated the bench above and attached it to brace, and showed a detail of how the glass attaches with a steel pin.

Ms. Barker said that without the benches the foot / pin would be a trip hazard. She asked if the ground floor doors were original.

Mr. Sevart said those were added during the 1999-2000 remodel and the ground level was original open air.

Ms. Barker asked if there were any door themes from the original design.

Mr. Maskin said no, that they matched existing in building.

Ms. Barker asked the definition of 'nearly exactly' with regard to the fritted material soffit that is to match the corrugated decking.

Mr. Payson said that at one point there is less than a ¼" differentiation.

Mr. Sevart said that from 500' away it is negligible.

Mr. Sneddon asked what the character defining features of the Space Needle are.

Mr. Maskin said he believes it is the overall profile, roof profile, horizontal bands of glass and contrasting light and dark.

Mr. Ketcherside said he hadn't heard about the downspouts before.

Mr. Maskin said they are to deal with water infiltration issues; they are floating between mullions to be a consistent location relative to doors.

#### Public Comment:

Jessica Severance, elevator operator and shop steward at the Space Needle, said the proposed renovations are significant to workers who rely on their jobs. She said the workers need to know what the plan is for them during construction and what the impacts to them will be.

Knute Berger, said he was a consulting historian for the project. He noted the historic partnership that gave birth to the Space Needle – City and the private sector collaboration. He said it was experimental and was the first revolving restaurant built in a tower. He said it has adapted over the years to keep it working and this project takes a long term view – it is ambitious and thinks big – yet stays within the standards. He said the project will improve the environment, add sustainability, remove the cage, add exciting glass floor. He said there will be not change to the structure but they will open up the view. He supported the project.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, thanked the elevator operator for their service and stories. She said she would struggle with this proposal if she were on the board. She said the Needle has not been altered in the past; what is proposed maintains the character defining features and it will still look like the same structure. She said removing the cage is huge. She said the evolution of the project has been sensitive to ARC and board comments. She said the windows are a googie feature. She said the benches are functional. She said the proposal is sensitive.

Randy Coté said he works for the Space Needle in Marketing. He supported the project noting it is their mission to expose visitors to the beauty of the Pacific Northwest.

Gary Curtis is a structural engineer who worked on the original design and said he supported the project – ‘they haven't messed up any of my work’.

#### Board Discussion:

Mr. Sneddon said he has seen several briefings and ARC had requested lots of compromises from the applicant. He appreciated the adjustments they made to the design. He said the big issues for him are the glazing at the observation level and the mullions. He said it's important for the building to tell its story in a tangible way, and that the observation level is the most touchable part. He did not support the project because of the loss of historic fabric noting the connection to the past and original materials and design. He said it is short sighted to lose this aspect. He said the building represents history rather than views for visitors.

Mr. Ketcherside supported the proposal. He said the applicants incorporated board feedback. He said the observation deck wall and window provide strong conversation. He said what is proposed is in the spirit of the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation.

Ms. Barker thanked the applicants for listening to ARC and said the briefings were helpful to all. She said how they presented it was useful. She said she supported it as presented although she said the fritted glass soffit was a waste of money and not necessary. She supported the work as presented and said it has come a long way. She appreciated the reduction in benches but said it was late to learn about the tripping hazard with the trusses. She said the contrasts are maintained and she appreciated the mullioned glass at the observation level. She said the door replacement was ok and the elevator cabs maintain the spirit of the originals. She said they still have one single one to maintain authenticity. She said to be transparent with scheduling, and she hoped they can stay open while the work is being done.

Mr. Kiel thanked the team for their responsiveness and for reaching out to historians. He said they are a model example for how to make a presentation. He said he appreciated the letters of public comment and Mr. Ochsner's rigor. He said the SOI standards say to preserve as much as possible. He said he agreed with Mr. Sneddon that the soffit is not character defining. He said he was glad the applicant was revealing the structure at the perimeter of the observation level, and bringing equity to a landmark. He said now everyone can enjoy it.

Ms. Anderson said she was happy to see the progress of the design. She appreciated the alternating benches and noted they allow a moment to sit, take a picture, and have an experience on the observation deck. She said the mullions on the observation deck are the more character defining portion of that area. She said the windows frame a 1960s view and she was glad the mullions would be recreated. She said the soffit is high in the air and it is neither touchable nor accessible so the material change is a non-issue.

Mr. Murdock said the board's purview is design review as well as adherence to the SOI Standards for Rehabilitation, maintaining a landmark as a record of



its time and use. He said he appreciated the design – it is beautiful and elegant, and many experts have weighed in. He said that the standards convey an authenticity to a landmark and said 2, 3, 5 and 6 apply in this case. He said the chronic confusion of historic and new materials over time lessens authenticity and the ability of a landmark to convey its significance. He said it is hard to say which specific individual materials are implicit in a landmark's ability to convey a cohesive message of significance. He said that he thought that the materials all work together and it is not clear that you can pick and choose. He said the Space Needle is a highly visible symbol of the Century 21 World's Fair in 1962 and clearly conveys the style, material and technology of that era. He noted the proposed changes to soffit and restaurant floor and said that the applicant provided examples of where similar installations were done on the Eiffel Tower, Rockefeller Center, and the Sears Tower. He said that all are examples of state of the art technology of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century of glass being used in new ways. All of these examples are reversible installations; what is proposed for the Space Needle is not.

He said the window mullion detailing reinforces the rigorous nature of the radial structure as the original did. He liked that the cage is being removed because it is mitigating previous damage but he questioned if it would be visible as a 2016 change. He was uncertain about the soffit which he felt was the most difficult part.

Ms. Patterson supported the application. She noted the information and level of detail provided - the history of planning and construction of the building. She said she didn't want the continuous bench and noted now it is broken up. She was glad the mullions were proposed for to the observation level windows.

Ms. Johnson said the Space Needle and Mount Rainier are icons for Seattle and this is an iconic project. She said the dialogue had been enjoyable and thought-provoking; she thanked her fellow Board members. She noted the accessibility, safety, and economics issues being addressed while preserving historic character and structure. She said her interpretation is that the Space Needle is viewed from afar with contrast of light and dark, and the structural expression of significant elements. She said the proposed design is sensible and elegant.

Mr. Luoma said the design is beautiful and the presentation fabulous. He noted the input from historians and commended the applicants for working through design challenges. He said he has a philosophical difference of opinion, and was concerned about the desire to let the user experience guide decisions. He said that the Space Needle embodies materials that were available at the time to accommodate the speed of construction. He said it impacted what exists today and represents the era of its design. He said from a distance the profile or structure are not being changed. He said it is such a

public building that is experienced by so many and he noted that the closeness and interaction close up is just as important. He said that up close there is a big impact on how we experience these spaces. He said the cage is being removed but benches are being added. He said the removal of the wall is not necessary. He said that he would love to approve the proposal but noted that the changes were not sensitive to preserving the character defining features from the period of significance. He said it is a slippery slope to incorporate new technologies just because it's possible.

Mr. Murdock agreed with Mr. Luoma and said that technology is important to the expression of the building; proposed changes mean a significant loss. He said he was not sure that he could approve it.

Ms. Barker said that ARC heard that the focus was on enhancing the visitor experience but never heard push back from Board members on this driver. She appreciated the point that it is in conflict but said she wished it had been brought to the table earlier.

Mr. Ketcherside said he heard fellow Board members discuss it previously.

Mr. Luoma noted that he had discussed it at briefings.

Ms. Patterson said she heard about enhancing the experience and was against the changes but now she said she would support it. She said it is a young landmark and history is still actively being written. She said it will change the user experience. She said that how we experience things as humans is also actively changing and noted that now it is all about the 'selfie' but five years from now something different.

Mr. Sneddon said he thought it was Disneyland-esque.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations at the Space Needle, 219 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue North, as submitted.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed exterior alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 119428 as the proposed work is compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/JK/DB                      6:3:1    Motion carried. Messrs. Sneddon, Murdock and Luoma opposed. Mr. Stanley recused.

**080316.3 BRIEFINGS**

080316.31 Gas Works Park  
2101 N Northlake Way  
Proposed removal and replacement of comfort station

Redi Karameto, Seattle Parks and Recreation, explained that the existing restroom / comfort station was built in the early 1970s.

Presenters were Eric Baldwin and Sophie Gao from Patano Studio Architects, and Janice Chen and Alexis Zheng from Harrison Design Landscape Architecture.

Mr. Baldwin said it is too difficult to adapt the restrooms to comply with ADA standards, and so they propose to demolish it.

Ms. Gao said they propose to locate the new restroom nearby, and create a better public connection to the gathering space, picnic area, pavilion. She went over historic photos and explained that the material palette would reflect the history of the park. She said that the new all-gender restrooms will have natural ventilation which will help provide security via audio connection. She said they will provide five all gender facilities that are all accessible.

Mr. Baldwin said they propose a simple historical building form that will push back into the slope a bit.

Ms. Barker asked to see a larger site plan to fully understand the context of the park and also how the restroom is oriented to the parking lot.

Ms. Doherty said this site is directly north of the play barn. She indicated that the landmark controls include the site, and the exterior of all the buildings and structures.

Ms. Barker asked which hill.

Mr. Baldwin said it is only a slight bump up (not Kite Hill).

Mr. Kiel asked about the play barn.

Ms. Gao said it is much older and was a supporting structure for the original gas utility.

Mr. Stanley asked if the restroom was a Rich Haag design because it would make a difference.

Ms. Doherty said that Parks indicated it was not designed by Mr. Haag. Parks believes it was designed by local architect Gordon Walker, although his name is not on the drawings. She said the building is of the park era or shortly thereafter.

Ms. Barker suggested they contact Mr. Haag to discuss the original site plan and how the comfort station related to that.

Mr. Ketcherside said the Friends of Gasworks Park would be interested and noted that feedback from Mr. Haag and more information about connections to the park would be helpful.

Mr. Luoma said it is important that in future briefings to provide images of original design to understand the progression of when and why structures were added. He said it would be good to see it side by side.

Mr. Murdock wanted to know what exists in the park now regarding building cladding etc. and the family of architectural materials on site. He said the applicants are proposing to bring in a new language and they need to explain why.

Ms. Gao said the restroom is the only CMU in the park; the picnic area is wood, roofing is wood, there is metal at the restroom, and the play barn is a wood structure with a metal roof.

Mr. Murdock said the building is by an important local designer and more information is needed.

Mr. Ketcherside said it looks like a park bathroom and he questioned why they would not want the new building to look like a park bathroom. He said they should find a way to express what it meant to be a worker there and to go to the bathroom – that would be more interesting. He wondered if there was a boot brush at the door. He said that park restrooms have an institutional feel and get beat up.

Ms. Barker said that the park is a landmark and is treated differently from other parks. She said they can't slap a basic model onto a historic park – they need to think about them separately. She said the existing restroom is triangulated building and they are proposing a rectangle. She said they need to speak to and demonstrate history with existing form being an unusual shape. She said that what is proposed has no spirit of existing form or of Gasworks. She said they need to capture more of an amorphous form. She said she appreciates the materials and said they capture Gasworks.

Mr. Stanley said removing a designated structure requires a high bar and the board needs to understand the context of the proposal.

Mr. Luoma said they need to justify demolition; the board needs more information. He said they need review of massing of structure first and how the massing and materials are compatible with Gasworks as well as the 1970s structures.

Mr. Baldwin said they were unable to get the existing structure to meet ADA requirements without reducing the fixture count. He said this restroom has one of the highest uses in the City.

Mr. Luoma said there is flexibility to provide access and equity, but to make sure it doesn't exclude exploration of other options.

Mr. Ketcherside said he was surprised the railway lines are still in the pavement and noted it is a danger to cyclists.

Ms. Patterson said she would appreciate a more detailed site plan and noted there is a lot going on there. She wanted to know more about the park historically from a wholistic standpoint.

Mr. Luoma said good background information will be beneficial.

Board members requested more information: massing of the triangular building and how it stair steps, roof forms, documentation of designation language; talk more about the existing building, and do as much of a presentation about the existing building than just presume it as a blank slate.

*Mr. Stanley left at 6:15 pm.*

080316.32 Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, Seattle Branch  
1015 Second Avenue  
Briefing on proposed development

Jack McCullough said that they had met with Sarah Sodt, CHPO, and Alison Brooks, SHPO.

PowerPoint presentation available in DON file.

Bill Bain explained that his father was part of the design team; he provided history of the team and their backgrounds and provided detail of the design of the building which was designed for additional floors. He noted how the building relates to the plaza and other buildings around it.

John Bain, reported that the building is of another era and said it was extra reinforced for additional floors. He said that the vault and all mechanical equipment are below grade.

Susan Jones said the proposed addition is being designed conscious that it is a landmarked building; they have been in contact with SHPO. She described various massing studies that were explored early on and said they took care not to detract from the original. She said they are now exploring a 3-story “hyphen” set back 20’ from the front of the building, with another an additional six stories above the “hyphen”. She said it would provide continuity and difference. She said they will preserve all significant pieces of the Federal Reserve Bank interior and noted insertion of pilings to supplement existing pilings. She said they would add new elevators and said the structure will be extruded upward. She said the addition will be wrapped with a glassy, light curtain wall, and noted they will reference the pilasters on the exterior. She said their focus today is on the massing and they want clear direction from the board.

Mr. McCullough said that Dr. Brooks, was clear that the critical point in interpreting the National Register listing and the covenant was to provide a setback and use a vertical “hyphen” at least 36’ tall, separating the historic building from an addition above.

Ms. Jones said it was three stories at 12' per floor somewhere in the process, but the height changed to 13' per floor. The "hyphen" is now being shown 39'.

Mr. Murdock asked Mr. McCullough to describe the covenant.

Mr. McCullough said the owner needs approval of from the SHPO, and identified the building and the interior elements designated. He said that Dr. Brooks indicated she communicated with not just her staff but the National Park Service, and she thought they could support the alteration to roof in the back as long as there was adequate separation among other things.

In response a question, Ms. Doherty said it is her recollection that the covenant is related to the Federal conveyance of the property.

Mr. McCullough concurred and said Section 106 was engaged in the whole disposition by the GSA on behalf of the Federal Reserve. They did an EIS; it was part of NEPA, and in order to satisfy Section 106 it was necessary to apply the covenant in connection with the sale, to address adverse impacts.

Mr. Bain clarified that floor-to-floor heights in the existing building are 20', and the proposed three floors above that are 13'.

Responding to questions Mr. McCullough clarified that Dr. Brooks said she could support the addition with adequate separation of the 36' minimum "hyphen".

Ms. Jones said Dr. Brooks was pleased when they told her it was increased to 39'.

Ms. Barker asked if there were other dimensional requirements in the covenant.

Mr. McCullough confirmed "no".

Mr. Murdock asked about building context.

Ms. Jones described adjacent buildings – Hotel 1000, Holyoke, and Schoenfeld buildings - and explained how the proposed design relates to them, and to the 18' alley.

Mr. Bain said that it is set back 18' they want to make something more out of the plaza.

Ms. Jones showed the Board the model. Responding to questions she explained that six stories would be added with a one-story office penthouse and a mechanical penthouse above (7 floors plus mechanical). The building would still be diminutive in scale to surrounding buildings. She said that if they pursue the alternate massing, the plan will deflect toward open space; it is about the urban context and their desire to enhance it.

Mr. McCullough said one of the things they got out of their meeting with Ms. Sodi and Dr. Brooks is that it would be nice to have a slightly different mass above the hyphen to create differentiation between the two.

Ms. Barker asked if the alley will be maintained.

Mr. McCullough said it will remain open to the sky.

Ms. Jones said the alley will remain as is.

Public Comment:

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, said she appreciated the continuity of generations of the same family involved with this building. She said she understands they are trying to make the addition look lighter. She said she struggled with the addition and said she didn't know what the answer was. She said she wished the historic building could be adaptively reused as is rather than adding so many floors. She said the design is not there yet.

Ms. Jones said she thinks about all the tall buildings around this tiny building – that makes her feel calmer about the proposed addition.

Ms. Johnson said the massing is uncomfortable – not necessarily bad. She said the doppelganger effect Ms. Jones described has an almost duplicate hovering above the historic building. She said she tried to imagine how it would feel from the street and she thought it would be uncomfortable. She said she is struggling with the proportions, but the suggestion of vertical pillars on the addition is helpful because the historic building is very simple; there is not a lot to go on. She said she wished the addition were smaller. She said the “hyphen” feels too big.

Ms. Patterson agreed. She said she was not comfortable with the massing, size, or scale, and did not agree with the idea that the space was poorly defined due to low height. She said that at the designation meeting the board discussed the related significance of the building as a negative void in the cityscape. She said that is a substantial attribute of the landmark, and she preferred to see no addition. She said that the biggest issue with the massing is the “hyphen”. She said the existing building is low and horizontal and adding the “hyphen” gives the building a vertical orientation. She said the “hyphen” on its own is fine but she suggested getting rid of it. The addition above the “hyphen” makes it feel like its hanging over the building and that's a problem. She said to maintain a substantial setback from the historic building and keep it as low as possible.

Mr. Murdock agreed with his fellow board members. He said that during designation process and reviewing the building you can see it was designed for an addition. He said the “hyphen” concept is not an authentic addition, and this building would more readily accept an actual addition that respects the original building and takes advantage of fact that it is planned that way. He said he liked the scale of the model shown on the PowerPoint better – top row second in (page 10, image 6). He said the first six stories of the model option is proportionately appropriate and allows the landmarked building to get a prominent part of the site; the SOI speaks to that. He said the relationship to the building across the street – Henry Jackson Building - is important.

Ms. Anderson said she has a level of discomfort – not that it is necessarily a bad thing. She noted the proportion of the landmark building and its symmetrical nature,

and said the “hyphen” and massing above are not respectful. She said they should look more at symmetrical nature of the landmark and approach it in a gentler way. She said a “hyphen” may not be a bad thing and stepping back is visually interesting, but it still feels a little off. She agreed with Mr. Murdock about the image in the PowerPoint, and the image directly below it, and noted those ideas are closer to the direction they should go.

Mr. Kiel said the SHPO’s “hyphen” parameters are troublesome and it seemed that they may have been developed for the original proposal of a 400’ tower, and noted that a 36’ hyphen for a 400’ tower feels right. However, a 36’ hyphen for an addition approximately 62’ tall is peculiar. He said this is an interesting proposal, and suggested having a 20’ setback and continuing upward with the addition without using a “hyphen”; the cantilever is a problem. He said the proportion of the original building is important and how they are applying proportional planning would be helpful. He preferred less of a setback and lower massing; the proportions don’t feel right.

Mr. Bain said the original building is 62’ high and asked how Mr. Kiel would see the addition above.

Mr. Kiel said to match exactly or be distinctly different.

Ms. Barker agreed with her fellow board members. She said the addition is oppressive and overwhelming. She suggested no hyphen or have it be a void with just the elevator shafts or columns passing through it. She said the addition needs to be less hefty than the landmark. She said she likes the 6-story in the upper left hand corner of the mockup.

Mr. Ketcherside said what is jarring is that the geometry and mass of the existing building is the same as the addition. He said the internal geometry is different; the lines don’t match. He said the idea of doppelganger is interesting. He said that it could be more of a “fun house” mirror image; they are too much alike. He said the original plan was to add on to the building; when built it might have been the shortest thing in the area. He said now it is at odds with its surroundings. He said to explore the idea of adding mass.

Mr. Sneddon said the Secretary of Interior’s Standards say additions should not overwhelm the landmark and should preserve its features and historic integrity of the property and environment. It should be secondary to the landmark. He said the existing scale as built into the plaza is a unique part of city. He said he didn’t know how the SHPO came up with the required “hyphen” or who was involved in the conversation. Why define the height of it as 60% of the height of the historic building? He wondered how the board would work with the SHPO in the approval process. He said he appreciated the glass transparency as a way to distinguish yourself from the solidity of the neoclassicism, but he said if built it would be a lot more opaque than what is represented. He said the board has looked at a lot of projects involving landmark buildings where the scale of those projects seem to fit. He said at this point the scale doesn’t fit here. During designation there were comments made about the presence of this building on the corner and its low monumentality as a unique part of the city. He thought a three story addition might be okay, and the goal for transparency was a good one.



Mr. Luoma agreed with Mr. Sneddon's comment about the potential opaqueness of the glass. He said in concept he enjoys the idea of something floating if they can make it happen. He said right now the landmark is being shown in a subservient position, and he preferred that the landmark be the foundation and beginning point, with the addition feathering up to nothing. He said he loves the design – and if not on a landmark it could be great. He said to look at the landmark itself and we don't know what the future holds for surrounding blocks years from now. He said the proportions of the historic building are beautiful so the challenge is how not to disrupt that. He said that proportion is tricky. He said that what is proposed seems more of a mirror image in proportion and not a balance holistically. The proposed addition above the "hyphen" feels like a heavy cloud above. He said he likes the models at the top left of the PowerPoint as a better option. He said there are opportunities to differentiate that will come with materials and deflection.

Mr. Kiel said use pilaster or window as reference points.

Ms. Johnson asked how this dialogue will work with SHPO.

Mr. McCullough said it is the owner's job to negotiate that.

Ms. Jones said the clearest direction they got from SHPO so far was the 3-story "hyphen", and that it may be more appropriate for 400' tall building as noted by board members. She said she thought what SHPO was trying to do is say that whatever happens above "hyphen" is the addition and it is almost entirely different. She said she thought that is how the National Parks Service was able to look at that – 'as long as the "hyphen: creates that separation we can live with what's above'. She said that is her interpretation, but the direction they are going.

Ms. Barker asked if the SHPO or Parks Service put anything in writing.

Ms. Jones said they haven't seen anything.

Mr. McCullough said there is nothing in writing it has just been verbal, but Dr. Brooks will – she has been working with folks in DC. She said they haven't provided anything to her yet – or presented the idea of putting it on columns or stilts. Mr. McCullough said that may be a lesser dimension but more clear separation than no opacity at all. He said a total break is something that they may be able to take to Dr. Brooks because she really hasn't weighed in on that. She has looked at structure.

Mr. Sneddon said it seems odd that the NPS wouldn't care how tall the addition was as long as there is a 36' break.

Ms. Jones said it was just her interpretation.

Ms. Jones said there is a possibility of keeping the hyphen at three stories and bringing massing out to edge whether there is an extended cornice but it does break up that three-story. She said they were concerned with how this impacts the original building – it brings a classicism to it. She said they looked at pulling a story off to five. She said she appreciated the comments 'I'm uncomfortable with the massing but it might be a good thing'. She appreciated the comments that it 'should be exact or

different'. She said the five-story comes closer in a more precise way. She said board feedback is very important at this point. She showed the board the larger model of the alternate massing with the angled addition deflecting to the plaza. She said she thought it addressed the uncomfortable part of the doppelganger idea.

Mr. Bain said the reason it cranks is that as you come down 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue it unfolds into the plaza and speaks to Wells Fargo building as well. He said it enhances plaza space and could add more gross leasable area.

Mr. Ketcherside said he likes a shorter "hyphen" and same height.

Ms. Patterson said that she wouldn't provide a comment that is as black and white as a 36' "hyphen" but for her the proper height, massing, scale is smaller than the landmarked building.

Mr. McCullough said a lot of board members pointed to a different model image in the upper left.

Mr. Murdock said it is a smaller scale addition.

Ms. Doherty said she is hearing shorter is better, different is better, and the hyphen seems to be a problem for a number of reasons.

Mr. Luoma said if they came back with the top row first 2 and 3 images – explore variations there, as well as what occurs immediately adjacent to the historic building. Whether it is a "hyphen", no "hyphen", void space or solid addition. Explore alternatives there within the context of that proportion of the height.

Ms. Doherty said it would be helpful to see alternatives that are different from each other as a way of addressing the board comments.

Ms. Jones asked for feedback on materiality.

Board members said they weren't there yet.

Mr. Murdock said it would be interesting to see an homage to the rigorous classicism of historic building.

Ms. Barker suggested repeating the dignity of the landmark, and go calmer.

Martin Selig asked about the new model with the cranked addition.

Mr. Luoma suggested some deflection as an alternative, but in this case the addition is still too tall.

Mr. Murdock said the "hyphen" divorces it from the rigor of the landmark; the "hyphen" weakens the twist in the massing.

Mr. Selig said Dr. Brooks would go along with whatever the board said, as long as there is a "hyphen".

Mr. Bain said the cranked massing has been used elsewhere, but here it is not a cliché because it leads into a plaza space so there is justification for this gesture.

**080316.4 STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator