



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 521/16

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
City Hall
600 4th Avenue
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room
Wednesday, September 7, 2016 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Marjorie Anderson
Deb Barker
Kathleen Durham
Kristen Johnson
Aaron Luoma, Chair
Jeffrey Murdock
Julianne Patterson
Matthew Sneddon

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Robert Ketcherside
Jordon Kiel
Mike Stanley

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

090716.1

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

July 20, 2016

MM/SC/DB/JM

6:0:1 Minutes approved. Ms. Durham abstained.

August 3, 2016
MM/SC/JM/DB

6:0:1 Minutes approved. Ms. Durham abstained.

090716.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

090716.21 Frederick & Nelson Building/Nordstrom
500 Pine Street
Proposed signage

Shawn Bowen, TubeArt, explained that four signs will be replaced with new; existing attachments will be reused. He said that new cabinets with new LED lamps are spec'd; he provided material samples. He said the letters are routed out push-through with diffusers. He went over material details and said this will clean up the design.

Mr. Luoma asked if darker color will match the canopy.

Mr. Bowen said it will complement and not match exactly.

Ms. Sodt said these are Nordstrom's new branding colors.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker said ARC thought the new signage is a nice complement to new work and has cleaner lines. She said the LED lighting is more diffused and will be white not cream.

Mr. Luoma said the new signage cleans up the look and complements the new canopy.

Mr. Sneddon had no problem with what was proposed.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for signage at the Frederick & Nelson Building, 500 Pine Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed exterior alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 118716 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 7:0:0 Motion carried.

090716.22 Town Hall Seattle (Fourth Church of Christ, Scientist)
1119 8th Avenue
Proposed rehabilitation

Matt Aalfs provided new packets to board members and presented via PowerPoint (details in DON file). He explained they are inserting new infrastructure into interstitial spaces in the building. He went over areas of the building for which a Certificate of Approval is required. He explained that the front exterior ramp is non-compliant and extends into the right of way. He said they propose to remove the balustrade – and save it – to create an at-grade entry that meets ADA. He said the non-compliant ramp will go away and they will re-expose the granite steps. He said they will remove the elevator and keep the shaft for use as a box office. He said they will re-roof the gabled sections of the roof and repair or replace the copper cladding on the dome. He said unused attic space will be used to create a lowered well for equipment; it will be louvered and will be hidden by parapet.

Ms. Patterson arrived at 3:50 pm.

Mr. Aalfs said the Seneca entrance will be decommissioned and a new public entrance and plaza will be created on the west side. He said that banners will be installed: two vertical banners on the west façade; two banners to fit within architectural element on east façade; and two banners to fit within architectural elements on north façade. He said the banners will not attach to the terracotta and he explained the way the cabling will be carried down. He said concrete footing will be added where needed. He said that on the west façade they will create one large opening out of two windows; it will lead to downstairs. He said they will preserve the chimney even though it is not used. He said a steel sleeve fits down inside as a seismic retrofit so the chimney is not a hazard.

Mr. Aalfs went through window details noting that large stained glass windows will be preserved and will get custom-designed storm windows. He said that storm windows will not touch the terracotta. He said that some windows will be replaced with aluminum clad wood frame windows. The frames will be retained because they are embedded in terracotta. They will use a method called ‘panning’ that will cover over but keep the original frame in place. He said the stained glass storm windows will provide insulation, protect the stained glass, and add acoustic value to the space. He said aluminum clad wood windows will be put into punched openings. He said the storm windows are off white. He said a storefront system will be used for the new entry on the west side.

Mr. Aalfs explained proposed seismic retrofit. He said the building is unreinforced masonry with long span roof system with dome. He said they will use corner L-shaped concrete sheer walls and will use reinforced edge of floors to get lateral loads to corners. He said they will strengthen large walls in the great hall with structural steel – some of it will be visible. He said they will add a new elevator at the new entrance. He said they will infill the central stair. He said they will add acoustic reflector; theater lighting will be included in this armature. He said they will add light bars, speakers, and lights. He said seismic structure on the north and south walls will go around the stained glass windows; it will be visible. He said they will install new carpet and the acoustic reflector will be painted with a semi-opaque stain.

Ms. Sodt explained that some items can be reviewed administratively but she wanted the board to see what was proposed holistically. She said she will administratively review colors, removal of central stairs and removal of non-original elevator.

Mr. Murdock asked why the central stairs have administrative review.

Ms. Sodt explained the stair is not usable for fire code and there is no way to make them usable. She said signage is administratively reviewed but the board will review the strategy and installation.

Mr. Murdock asked how they are treating the vent / window above the stained glass window.

Mr. Aalfs said they aren't doing anything to it.

Mr. Murdock asked how the storm windows will be stained / finished and how many vents will be exposed on the interior windows?

Mr. Aalfs said they have to drill through and put metal grommets in so there is no condensation. He said they worked with Kawneer and stained glass restorer on the strategy.

Ms. Barker asked if Mr. Aalfs had pictures of panning.

Mr. Aalfs did not but noted they have worked closely with the manufacturer.

Ms. Barker asked if it would be noticeable.

Mr. Aalfs said up close it is but that from afar it is not. He said the existing window frames are in poor condition and removing them would cause damage to the terracotta; panning maintains the windows in place without damage to terracotta.

Ms. Barker asked about the slot diffuser as noted on page 32.

Mr. Aalfs said there are two in each vault.

Mr. Luoma asked Mr. Aalfs to describe the detail.

Mr. Aalfs said it is a painted slot diffuser; it will be painted the same color as the vault. He said the louvers are parallel to length. He said the rendering shows it stronger than it will actually be.

Mr. Luoma asked about exposed structural beams.

Mr. Aalfs said the painted steel structures are a finished quality product. He said it will look like a contemporary element and will be painted a different color. He said that they will move existing pews around to fill in as needed.

Mr. Sneddon asked why they are proposing aluminum clad rather than in-kind wood windows.

Mr. Aalfs said the south and west side original windows are in poor condition. He said they need total recondition or replacement. He said programmatically they need to improve acoustics and also they are thermally improving the envelope where they can. He said they are unable to insulate the building so are doing what they can where they can. He said that aluminum clad windows allow them to keep the original frames in place. He said the baked on finish lasts and allows for easier maintenance. He said they will have the same frame thickness and sightlines.

Mr. Luoma asked about opacity of storm windows.

Mr. Aalfs said they are insulated but the glass is clear for good transparency – much better than the plexiglass currently over the stained glass window.

Mr. Luoma asked about the alley sequence.

Mr. Aalfs said it is not part of this project and the 12 – 16' wide alley will be part of adjacent property project.

Mr. Luoma expressed concern that the adjacent property project may not work as well as they think.

Mr. Aalfs said they have been working with Town Hall and have assured they will leave an open space that is sensitive to the building. He said he is confident it will happen.

Ms. Barker asked about adjacent development.

Mr. Aalfs said that two high rises are planned in the south portion of the block with open space immediately next to Town Hall.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker said ARC reviewed the project and asked for more information on the extent of the window replacement. She said that nothing is out of proportion with what was presented previously.

Mr. Murdock said it shows there are other ways to do seismic reinforcement and this is an elegant solution with the steel beam added to the wall. He said ARC was supportive.

Ms. Barker noted the display awnings were reviewed at ARC.

Mr. Murdock said that the banners are reversible and work within the architectural quality, the scale and detail of the building.

Mr. Luoma noted the banners and change of use of the building and said that it seems to be the best in terms of attachment and scale.

Mr. Sneddon said a new entry is being created. He said he preferred replacement in-kind of window. He was sad to see the vomitorium go. He said the acoustic shield is a detriment to the architecture. He applauded the number of restorative efforts – the vestibule, roof, and the structural approach.

Mr. Luoma said that overall it is a good approach.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for the proposed interior and exterior alterations, as described in the application submittal and submitted plans. This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed exterior and interior alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 124993 as the proposed work does not irreversibly 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/JM 8:0:0 Motion carried.

090716.3 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

090716.31 Seattle City Light Power Control Center
157 Roy Street

Ms. Doherty went over the completed and signed agreement. She said there is no need for an extension request, and the Board will be reviewing it for recommendation.

Public Comment:

Leanne Olson, Queen Anne Historical Society, said she was happy to see this move along and that she was happy to see the metal fencing removal under administrative approval. She does not like the existing fence. (Clarification: the removal does not require review.)

Action: I move to approve Controls and Incentives for the Seattle City Light Power Control Center, 157 Roy Street.

MM/SC/JM/DB 8:0:0 Motion carried.

Jack McCullough reported that regarding the Mama’s Mexican Kitchen landmark nomination they have met with community members who have suggested incorporation of cool Belltown uses into development.

090716.32 Lloyd Building
601 Stewart Street
Request for an extension

Jack McCullough said they are working with the developer and they are committed to adaptive reuse.

Ms. Barker asked about potential partners.

Mr. McCullough said that HALA allows for increased height in downtown which is favorable but not for this building. He asked for an extension to the second meeting in January.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Lloyd Building, 601 Stewart Street, until the second meeting in January 2017.

MM/SC/DB/JM 8:0:0 Motion carried.

Mr. McCullough referenced the earlier discussed Town Hall building and said the rest of the block is owned by the Presbyterian Church. He said the project being developed includes two residential towers at the south end and the northwest corner will be open space; the Town Hall entry will be exposed.

090716.33

Seattle Times Building - 1947 Office Building Addition
1120 John Street
Request for an extension

Rich Hill reported that after the last meeting several board members wanted updated information from the owner. He noted the letter from Evan Lewis from ONNI (in DON file). He said a demolition permit was issued and they are in the process of hazardous waste abatement and they will be following up with the next steps. He said they are very interested in coming back to the board in September – October and are coordinating with Ms. Sodt in getting a new design package to her with designs for the ARC to consider. He said they are very aware of the input that ARC has provided about the design. He said he is expecting that the design alternatives will be responding to that input. He asked for a three month extension from today.

Ms. Sodt said that she has received no briefing packets from them and asked if Mr. Hill knew when she could anticipate that.

Mr. Hill said he knew that there was a meeting scheduled today with the architect and there was a snafu and the architect was unable to make it. He said there is a conference call next week so his guess is that it will be soon after next week – probably two weeks would be safe to expect she will get the packet.

Ms. Sodt noted that a briefing would not be possible until October.

Mr. Hill concurred.

Ms. Patterson suggested a one month extension and to be sure that by the next meeting or request for extension Ms. Sodt has received a briefing packet for ARC just so we know there are plans for the site moving forward.

Ms. Barker read minutes from July 20, 2016 meeting where an extension was requested: ‘Mr. Sneddon said that if at the end of the month we have heard nothing then Controls and Incentives should proceed. He said the demolition is emergency-related and Controls and Incentives is separate from that’. She said this is not a true emergency, nothing has been done. She said they came in for a four month extension and the board gave them a one month. She said that she would love to see the board say ‘no, let’s do Controls & Incentives – it has gone on long enough.’ She said we have lots of commentary about how this is just more delaying and stalling and nothing has come in.

Mr. Hill said there are legal issues with signing Controls and Incentives agreement and they typically recommend their clients get a Certificate of Approval for a project that is acceptable to the board.

Ms. Barker asked what he means by legal issues.

Mr. Hill said it has to do with the economic use standard. There is a different standard applied after Controls and Incentives are agreed to as opposed to before. He said they do recommend that with all their clients.

Mr. Luoma said he would support a one month extension to hear from you or others at a minimum on progress and to hear from Ms. Sodt as well to ensure that things are moving along.

Ms. Sodt said the most important thing is that there is a project that the board can approve.

Ms. Patterson said the project is going to be in the future no matter what but by granting only one month extensions the board at least can expect a monthly update. Whereas if Controls and Incentives agreements are forced through as much as she said she was for that last time she said she thought it was nice to have the check in at a very minimum.

Mr. Murdock agreed and said especially if the board can have some sense of what is going on from the design side as well.

Mr. Hill said he could carry that back to the client and let them know how eager the board is to see a design package and he said he thought that will help them see the importance of it.

Ms. Sodt said the office building has a Controls agreement and an Ordinance and it still didn't prevent them from getting a demo permit.

Ms. Barker said that is reassuring.

Ms. Sodt said that from her perspective the best effort is to get them to move on the project side.

Mr. Luoma said is the most beneficial thing we can do.

Mr. Murdock asked if it is no longer an emergency status. The reason it was taken out of the board's hands is because it was determined to be an emergency situation.

Mr. Hill said that is a question for the City. He said if you ask the City Attorney they would say 'yes' it is still considered emergency status.

Ms. Barker said this indicates that they are not starting demolition until December 20, 2016.

Mr. Hill said they need to do the other steps first. They are not allowed to begin demolition until all of the framing is up on the facades.

Ms. Barker read through Mr. Lewis's schedule

Mr. Hill said that hazardous waste has to be done first. Then the façade needs to be supported before the demolition.

Ms. Barker said she wished Mr. Ketcherside were there because his comments are so vivid in this documents. She said she is not interested in seeing this come before the board without a draft of Controls & Incentives agreement accompanying any sort of extension.

Ms. Patterson said that a draft is an interesting thing to throw out there. She said if it is just signing it that impacts the reasonable economic use is there really anything just halting just a draft.

Mr. Hill said the draft would reflect the proposed design that the board approves. He said they typically a Controls & Incentives after – for example schools – we typically have the Controls and Incentives agreement identified after the school project is approved and then that is what is reflected in the Controls and Incentives Agreement. He said that his recommendation to the board – and the board is the decision makers – if you can give us a month to get a design package to you it would be the best way to get the ball moving. He said he thought the Controls & Incentives are a major distraction at this point from the major focus that he would encourage on which is encouraging ONNI to get a project that complies with SOI.

Ms. Sodt asked if they have moved the towers in the most recent massing alternatives.

Mr. Hill said he knows that they have looked at moving the towers and he knows that they are putting together a design package with alternatives. He said he knows that they have listened to what you have said on many occasions. He said that until he actually has the design package in front of him he doesn't feel that he can tell what will be seen. He said he knows that's something that has been getting a lot of attention.

Ms. Sodt said that she hoped he would continue to relay to them that they should respond to the feedback that this board has given them many times. She said she knows he does.

Mr. Hill said he appreciated her recognition that he does.

Ms. Barker said that is the problem is that you take the information and pass it on - that is what we assume – and nothing happens. She said that because nothing happens from ONNI it just feels like more stalling techniques. She said we have a project that we can't approve and the only other mechanism is Controls and Incentives – that is all we can do.

Mr. Hill said that Controls & Incentives don't do anything other than what you have already done. He said because by virtue of landmarking the property nothing can be done without your approval.

Ms. Barker interjected except demolition.

Mr. Hill said that Controls and Incentives won't prevent that. He said he didn't mean to be argumentative because he knows Ms. Barker is speaking in good faith. He said he is just trying to share his perspective on it. He said there are two things that will be motivating: 1) the indication to see design package in one month; 2) the fact that they have an economic incentive to get a project approved. He said that incentive is there. He said that he felt comfortable with a one month extension if the board is and he can convey that. He said he knows that based on what they are sharing with him that is their intent – to get a design package to Ms. Sodt.

Mr. Luoma said he was OK with that. He said if they are investing this amount of time and energy into whatever they are doing they should hopefully should have incentive to listen and to respond to our feedback otherwise it will be drawn out longer which doesn't benefit anybody. He said debating Controls & Incentives seems a distraction even

though it is our mechanism of the current discussion. He said he would rather see a proposal that he could agree to or partially accept rather than debating controls and Incentives particular items when they get to that.

Ms. Patterson asked at what meeting that would be.

Ms. Sodt said it is October 5, 2016 and said it sounds like it is feasible for them to get her a briefing packet before then and perhaps by then we will know when it will be scheduled before either ARC or the full board. She asked if there is a preference for full board.

Ms. Durham and Mr. Sneddon said briefing should be brought to full board rather than ARC.

Mr. Hill said they would be happy either way whatever the board prefers.

Ms. Sodt said it is probably a good idea.

Ms. Barker said we look forward to appearing before the ARC in September or October 2016 with new design package.

Ms. Sodt said we can decide they are just going to come before the full board. She said she thinks it is in their best interest to hear from as many people as possible.

Mr. Luoma said it is a really large project in scale and detail.

Ms. Barker said the board has given clear directions.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls & Incentives for the Seattle Times Building – 1947 Office Building Addition, 1120 John Street, until October 5, 2016.

MM/SC/KJ/JM 7:1:0 Motion carried. Ms. Barker opposed.

090716.34 Seattle Times Building - Printing Plant
1120 John Street
Request for an extension

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls & Incentives for the Seattle Times Building – Printing Plant, 1120 John Street, until October 5, 2016.

MM/SC/KJ/JM 7:1:0 Motion carried. Ms. Barker opposed.

090716.5 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator