



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 578/17

### MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting  
City Hall  
600 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room  
Wednesday, August 2, 2017 - 3:30 p.m.

#### Board Members Present

Deb Barker  
Russell Coney  
Kathleen Durham  
Garrett Hodgins  
Robert Ketcherside  
Jordon Kiel  
Kristen Johnson  
Steven Treffers  
Emily Vyhnaneck

#### Staff

Sarah Sodt  
Erin Doherty  
Melinda Bloom

#### Absent

Julianne Patterson  
Matthew Sneddon

Chair Jordan Kiel called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

#### **080217.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

June 7, 2017

Deferred.

**080217.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

080217.21 Camlin Hotel  
1619 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Proposed exterior lighting

Matt Griffin explained they propose exterior lighting that will be a public benefit as part of the convention center expansion/street vacation process. Light features will be installed on the Camlin Hotel and Paramount Theater.

Michael Lindsey, HLP Lighting, presented via PowerPoint (report in DON file). He provided examples of his firm's history and experience. He said that all fixtures proposed are the latest in LED technology; they will be able to control fixture intensity and direction to respect neighbors. He said they will distinguish the front crown with a soft wash of light to the balustrade. He said the lighting will be accessible for maintenance but will be out of public hands. He explained the cable routing and said where visible it will match the surface finish. He said fixture and wire will be affixed to a continuous metal piece to allow exact placement. He said that clips will secure cabling at mortar joints.

He said they propose to light the building shaft with narrow beam spotlights that will enhance the architecture. He said lighting will set off building finishes nicely. He said they will set a tight beam distribution. He said that the power feed will go up a gap / alley between buildings and be surface mounted the same way as the security camera conduit. He said they will keep the conduit discretely out of view. He said they will utilize the existing conduit planes. He said they will organize a smooth clean stone finish at the bottom and provide a softly washed light there. He said they will mount fixtures at four tree wells; they will bring power from basement power room and will chip concrete to the tree wells. He said they will use a slight glare shield to control glare. He said that at the base of the building the underside of the second-floor balcony will be highlighted, not the light fixtures.

Ms. Durham asked if light on vertical elements would wash evenly.

Mr. Lindsay said it will fade a little bit; near the light source it will be brighter. He said the glare shield will control it a bit but you will still get the line of light going up. He said the return of the building comes out and that will capture some light.

Ms. Vyhnanek asked about the sidewalk to the building.

Mr. Lindsay said the penetration is in the foundation.

Mr. Griffin said the design has been thoughtfully done and it will not impact the guest experience. He said they will continue to be good stewards to the building.

Mr. Coney asked if downlights at the top were considered.

Mr. Lindsay said they thought about that but the pedestrian experience would be that of looking up into a light source. Responding to clarifying questions he said that the new convention center will be 20' lower than the Camlin; it will be set back as it goes up to 100'.

Ms. Barker said ARC reviewed and she noted it is nice to have a break out.

Mr. Coney said it is a respectful installation.

Mr. Treffers supported the proposal and the installation will not be noticeable from the street.

Ms. Barker said there are no negative impacts to the building or its appearance.

Mr. Kiel said there are a lot of penetrations and it is important that the contractor know to go through mortar only – not historic fabric.

Ms. Barker said she supports A and B but noted she had doubts about corner quoining. She was concerned about façade base wall-washing and said there is already huge washing of that wall from the street light. She said she would support but this is not adequate to address the current bad wash.

Mr. Treffers said the lighting is not a physical alteration to the building and does not damage it. He supported the proposal.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations to the Camlin Hotel, 1619 Ninth Avenue, 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. 119470, 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/ST/RK 8:0:0 Motion carried.

080217.22 Paramount Theatre  
901 Pine Street  
Proposed exterior lighting

Michael Lindsay explained they will use the same approach here as they just presented on the Camlin Hotel. He said that they will light the crown, accent the window frames, ornate lobby windows, and stone carving elements at egress. He said the balustrade has openings; they won't have to drill through which will be helpful in routing cable. He said the lobby windows are prominent and the existing chandelier provides some light / glow through sheer shade. He said they will use LED ellipsoidal fixtures; the beam can be focused where you want it. He said two outer columns, and tree. He said they will use surface mount conduit that will not be visible to the public. He said they will light stair landings for egress; they will mount on the underside of the landing and will bathe the vestibule softly in light.

Mr. Hodgins said it seems to take care of the dark area within the stairs.

Ms. Barker disclosed she is the President of the Theater Labor Union which works out of the Paramount.

Board members had no issue with her participation.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Kiel said ARC reviewed this and was supportive.

Ms. Barker said the pieces seem consistent. She noted it is a shame there is not more response to clean the building.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior and interior alterations to the Paramount Theatre and Building, 901 Pine 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. 117507, 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*.

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

MM/SC/RK/EV 8:0:0 Motion carried.

080217.23

Seattle Asian Art Museum / Volunteer Park

1400 East Prospect Street

Proposed building rehabilitation and additions, including alterations to the building exterior and interior, and site improvements

**Summary of proposed changes:** A 3-story addition at the southeast corner of the museum, with a glass wrap-around lobby at the rear of the Garden Court on Level 3. New freight elevator addition and expansion of receiving area at the north end of the museum, with a reconfigured loading dock and exterior service area. Building envelope improvements to include selective re-cladding of the north, east and south sides of the museum, with selective exterior storm sashes at historic windows. Seismic improvements that include selective interior demolition at exhibit spaces that will be reconstructed in-kind. Selective interior alterations and system upgrades to exhibit spaces, garden court, lobbies, auditorium, library, and former Board of Trustees Room for improved accessibility, safety, user experience, and the protection of art collections and artifacts. Site improvements to the park that include new walkways/paths and selective realignment and regrading for improved building accessibility, park experience, and safety. Selective tree removal for proposed addition, and minor landscape plantings as related to building and site alterations.

Kim Rorschach, Director of Seattle Asian Art Museum (SAAM) read from a mission statement to accomplish their objectives (in DON file) which include climate control, seismic upgrades, ADA upgrades, mechanical systems, new spaces for freight, storage, conservation, events, and education. She said the museum was constructed in the park 80 years ago as a gift. She said the building and the park are interconnected and support each other; there is a public benefit to the museum's operation in the park. She said both the park and the building deserve to be treated thoughtfully.

Michael Shiosaki, DOPAR, said SAAM is an important part of the landscape. He said the project is sensitive to the landscape and parks and recreation use. He said the design team has been sensitive and has made adjustments; they are providing restoration to pathways and important mitigation.

Sam Miller, LMN, provided history of the project in the Olmsted Park and later Gould's museum. He said they will provide better connections to the east side of the park which have been lost over time. He went over historic spaces on each floor. He said they propose improvement to gallery, education space, improved meeting room space, improved loading, receiving to move art, insulated envelope, mechanical systems. He said they will not touch the

west façade or touch significant trees. He went over options explored and noted challenges with each. Design was constrained by significant trees. He said their preferred option D will maintain historic use of the space; it meets NPS preservation standards and is a tax credit project.

He said that on the Gould drawings expansion plans were ghosted in at the very beginning. He said they looked at under-building and under-forecourt expansion and neither was a viable option. He said the east side is the appropriate location. He said they will clean and seal the façade. They will demolish and take down the exit stair and chain-link enclosure. They will demolish elevator and the chimney which is not needed or usable. He said ARC was supportive of not replacing chimney. He said the addition will be clad in limestone plaster stucco. He said they will use precast concrete for the addition. He said they will add storm windows to the 1947 addition. He said some windows will be changed to louvers for equipment. He provided proposed and existing renderings for comparison. He said historic windows will get storm windows for protection. He said storm windows will sit back from re-clad building face with new insulation. He said the security cameras on the west side will not be attached to stone; on north and east it will be side mounted to limestone plaster stucco.

He provided renderings of existing loading dock and noted the significant tree and root complex, and rockery; he said they will try not to disturb that. He said they propose trash enclosure, generator and transfer access, accessible ramp and after hours building access. He went over the proposed elevated walkway and said the painted steel guardrail ties into existing guardrail. He said the new rockery below the structure will ground the ramp. He said they will replace the glazing at the west entry storefront system. He said it has been replaced over time and they will use clear glazing with low-E coating. He said if additional treatment is needed for shade they will come back to board for approval.

Mr. Miller went over demolition plans and proposed design of interior level 3 Garden Court and entry. He said they will keep all finishes, clean scagliola, floors, casework, and they will restore the fountain. He said in the 1989 Designation Report the non-sequential circulation plan is mentioned and they will keep that. He said that two openings at the east end of the Garden Court will be the height of existing openings to the north and south. He said it is a reversible change; they will salvage and store all removed scagliola. He said they will replace track lighting, re-lamp skylights. He said they will add mechanical diffusers, relocate ductwork. He said the lobby will provide views into the park and into the museum – both ways.

He said they will remove carpet in the galleries and install Masonite, the wainscot and ceiling details will be the same. He said in the Octagonal Galleries they will replace the mechanical grills. They will build light boxes

to illuminate 'daylight' the skylights; they will recreate light with LED. He said they will replace track lighting. He said they will leave historic guardrails in place at the entry; they will install new in select locations to meet ADA. He said on the second level, the Davis Gallery was renovated in the 1990's; they propose to remove materials keeping historic materials. He said they will open connection to circulation and restore the character of finishes. He said they will add ADA access ramp to auditorium. He said that they will keep the library as-is. The infilled window on the south side will be opened up as a relite. He said they will build casework to match, and restore finishes. He said they will lower ceiling and install sprinklers; they will recreate the decorative molding at the top.

Mr. Miller said that they will restore finishes in the Gardner Center. They will reuse loading dock window. He said they will infill at the loading dock on the second floor with CMU; it is reversible. He said the auditorium is historic space that has changed over time. They will remove seating and projection booth; add a ramp to stage, and replace seating with ADA compliant, reusing the end panels of the historic seating. He said the original seat manufacturer is still in business and they will use the same style of seats. He said they will replace finishes and improve acoustics.

Chris Jones, Walker Macy, said that Volunteer Park has been evolving since conception and noted the band shell, museum, Hoggson landscape. He said the density of trees is different from original Olmsted plan. He said that significant groves of trees bisected areas. He said museum must evolve to remain viable. He noted the engaged community and said they will improve existing pathways. He said they will restore some paths that were lost. He said the museum is a benefit to the neighborhood. He said they have heard from the community and have been working with them. He said that they will add ADA stalls and paths. He said an arborist was engaged by the museum to find the least impact to the trees. He said that three trees will be removed: two are in declining health and one is in poor health. He said they have a minor planting plan; they will transplant some boxwoods to screen off the generator room. He said plants are in accordance with Olmsted's plan. He said on the west terrace they will reset some of the existing blue stone to meet ADA slope. He said the largest change is that it will be raised 1/4". Pioneer Masonry will do the work. He went over loading dock planting palette.

Mr. Coney asked about accommodation of school groups.

Ms. Rorschach said they will be able to double what they did in 2016 when the changes are made. She noted the Saturday University series fills the auditorium. She said they do a film series, lectures, author events etc.

Mr. Coney asked about the desired kitchen space.

Ms. Rorschach said that they will use it for museum events, openings, First Saturdays, and rental events.

Mr. Coney asked if they have done efficiency studies to assess use of existing facilities.

Mr. Miller said they did as part of the initial programing and all are heavily used. He said they did rigorous testing to make sure they are adequately right-sizing the project.

Mr. Kiel asked about areas of program that could have multiple uses.

Mr. Miller said event spaces such as the auditorium spill out into other spaces.

Ms. Rorschach said the Garden Center space has multiple uses: operations, meeting room, study room etc.

Responding to questions about insulation Mr. Miller said there is already condensation on the interior building walls and they need to insulate. He said they don't want to touch the deeply coved plaster ceiling so they prefer to insulate from the exterior and then clean the exterior so all will be uniform.

Mr. Treffers asked if the community-requested terrace on the back is not being done.

Mr. Jones said that they received feedback from NPS, Volunteer Park Trust, Friends of Olmsted Parks, and DOPAR; no terrace; they are improving pathways, increasing ADA and providing more access.

Mr. Miller said on the north side they manipulated the loading dock and freight elevator multiple times.

Ms. Rorschach said that most of what they are doing is because of community feedback.

Ms. Vyhnanek asked about community engagement process.

Ms. Rorschach said they have held a series of open community meetings, and reached out to Volunteer Park Trust, and Friends of Olmsted Parks.

Ms. Barker asked for clarification on exterior alternate component.

Mr. Miller said it is the same material as on the southeast and the north – limestone plaster. He said they will reproduce the banding and joints at panels. He said they will make the exterior uniform.



Ms. Barker asked if they will salvage and restore materials from the Garden Court.

Mr. Miller said they will save the scagliola. He said they worked with a scagliola expert; the panels are small and are attached with wire. He said they think they can remove them intact but cutting the wires from behind. He said they would store them at the museum.

Ms. Barker asked what it will look like from the east.

Mr. Miller said they will remove the glass addition and repair the plaster stucco. He said it could be interwoven back in place.

Ms. Barker asked about the height of the opening.

Mr. Miller said they looked at various heights and width: 5'2" width; 12'3" height.

Ms. Barker said to clarify that they match.

Ms. Durham asked the depth of the park lobby.

Mr. Miller said 13'-4" and said by bringing openings down they were able to make the whole lobby smaller.

Public Comment:

Nancy Ianucci, Volunteer Park Trust, said the museum is an integral part of the park. She said they have been meeting with SAAM for about one year. She said their input has been incorporated into the design. She said that windows were added that makes it more inviting. She said the terrace was eliminated but replaced with lawn; three trees will soften the corner of the park. She noted improvements to pathways. She said the enhancements will improve user experience. She said they support SAAM's efforts to remain viable.

Jennifer Reece, Friends of Seattle Olmsted, said they support the project. She said they have worked with SAAM over the last year. She said that there are some improvements and impacts to the park but they have come up with a good solution – to work on paths. She said there were two areas of concern: protection of trees during process of construction. She said they need to protect the area around the mature trees. She said it is critical to protect the root area – not the drip line – and they should propose a formula based on the tree caliper extending to impact. She said the value placed on lost trees - \$2500 per tree is low. She said value is based on a combination of elements such as trunk area, species, condition and health.

Kathleen Herring, neighbor, said she uses the museum and the park and both are gifts to the community. She said that mechanical and structural updates are needed. She said the east side is a boggy, muddy area and renovation will rectify that. She supported the renovation.

Barbara Maloney, park neighbor, said she was a staunch supporter of parks and preservation. She supported the project and appreciated the renovation and landscape. She said most of the year the space is not good and this provides a better use of space. She said it creates a more open environment. The project has been thoughtfully reviewed and is a complement to the park.

Eliza Davidson said she wanted to correct Mr. Jones' statement. She said that the conservatory was not opposed by the Olmsteds; it was part of the original design. The Sunset Promenade was also part of the original design feature. She said the band shell was an original feature but in a different location. She wrote the vegetation management plan and noted the intent to reinstall Olmsted landscape features. She noted the intent to safeguard two treasured landmarks and said that SAAM is a tenant. She said they are justifying their program to make changes. She said the design is flawed. She asked why spaces like art conservation can't be housed elsewhere. She said Nordstrom has vacated space at Seattle Art Museum downtown and they would just have the expense of relocating. She noted damage to Beech, Sequoia, and Cedar. She said there is little regard for Olmsted park and users. She said the project will have an impact on the park.

John Colwell, said these are two landmarks and greenspace is proposed to be replaced with glass and concrete. He said expansion should have been underground or on roof. He said the park lobby creates a north facing dead zone and the community rejected it. He believes the underground option is viable. He said the building should be subordinate to the landscape.

Randy Urmston spoke against impact to the park and said they should look at more alternatives. He said Nordstrom's employees will move out of SAM by 2018 and the space could be subleased – only 14,000 square feet are needed for storage and conservancy. He said underground option was not adequately looked at; many museums around the world have done that. He said the capability is there and they could do it without impacting the park.

Charlie Rice, SAAM board member, said the improvements are important and will bring more people to the park. The museum and park are part of the same fabric. He said a vibrant program and maintenance in part would be good for the museum. He said the architectural design significantly affects how you experience the adjacent space. He said the existing east side of the building is not a welcoming and gracious space; this project will make for a better park and museum.

Margie Ellison, SAAM board member, said their board has been inclusive and she resents being called elitist. She was a school teacher. She said she socializes with Carl Gould's granddaughter who said she loves the project.

Stewart Landefeld, SAAM board member, said there are three Asian art museums in the United States. He said this is a special museum and the plan is thoughtful and respectful. The museum needs refreshing.

Kathleen Conner, DOPAR, said the end result meets the SOI Standards. She said more people will come to the park and people will see that southeast corner as an entrance to the park. She said that public involvement positively helped this project.

#### Board Discussion:

Mr. Treffers thanked the team and the community for their feedback. He said the three objectives – climate, seismic, and ADA – are reasonable. He said they are planning for the future; the city is growing, and this will ensure the museum and the park are used in the future. He said that over nine meetings they have discussed a lot of alternatives; there has been a lot of documentation and satisfies the question about alternatives. He said this is the most sensible area for the addition. He said there are two landmarks and they looked at impacts to the Olmsted design. He said the changes are consistent with rehabilitation of buildings and landscape. He said a little is being lost but as a whole we still have the character of the Olmsted design. He said there is limited destruction and compromises were made. He said paths will be repaired. He said he had concern about changes to the Garden Court; it is highly character defining and the feeling of the space will be lost by becoming a pathway. He said it is a compromise and it is reversible.

Ms. Vyhnanek appreciated the presentation and public comment; she appreciated the perspective and input in the process. She said SAAM and the park each contribute to the community and in a process like this it is hard to 'pick a favorite child'. She said she supported the project and there are no adverse impacts, but she had concerns about the Garden Court. She said to use care in removing the scagliola. She said new lighting will change the experience but it is reversible. She said the objectives are reasonable and the team has shown the rationale behind them. She said the SOI have been looked at from both lenses – the park and the museum. She said Olmstedian design is being bolstered and the museum will be activated.

Ms. Barker said a lot was determined before coming to the table. She supported additional restrictions on tree protection and said protection should cover the critical root area and not just the drip line. She said that \$2,500 is not a realistic value for tree replacement. She expressed concern about

Garden Court changes and cited SOI #2 “shall be avoided...”. She said the Garden Court is a place to pause and reflect; doorways eliminate the quality of this important feature. She said by not meeting SOI #2 she was inclined not to support. She said the actual cutting of the wall is not depicted on the plans. She said Gould created a place to pause, not to look outside but inside. She wasn’t supportive of the project.

Mr. Ketcherside supported the project and agreed with Mr. Treffer’s comments. He commented on the process of reviewing alternatives in keeping with the SOI. He appreciated public comments. He said it is a complicated project worthy of debate and the time spent on it. He said it is an illustration of the Seattle landmark process – to protect and improve. He said we can see uncontrolled changes that have made it worse in the past.

Mr. Coney appreciated public comment and said he read it all. He said this has been a long, iterative process. He said the changes don’t meet the SOI Standards; they are not mission critical needs, they just want them. He said there have been no efficiency studies. He said there are alternatives besides asphalt for paths. He said that a below-grade addition was not fully developed and he thinks there are still other alternatives. He said mission critical needs were not established. He said rehabilitation and upgrading heating is OK; the addition is not. Mr. Coney did not support the application.

Ms. Durham appreciated the public comment and the process. She appreciated the transformation of the design and said the team has been uniquely responsive. She said this is not without concerns and noted the Garden Court and the park lobby. She said the future of preservation is the continued use of buildings. This provides viable continued use. She said she was not insensitive to tree and landscape preservation. She said the east side viability will provide eyes on the park and will be an enhancement. She supported the project.

Mr. Hodgins appreciated public comment. He said the project is consistent with SOI and ties in unfortunate additions done over the years. He supported the project.

Mr. Kiel supported the project and said it was tricky. He said SOI #2 talks about changing character defining features. He said the area is not a character defining feature of the park. He said the addition of the building and trees is nice. He said near the Beech tree they created a new edge and are bringing back more open space. He said underground option was explored but it would have been in significant conflict with interior spaces and program. He said there were egress, mechanical venting issues. He said they have done careful documentation – windows, storm windows, sky lights, Masonite floors, new ADA access to stage, sprinklers, original seat manufacturer. He said the Garden Court is not ideal but it is consistent with the organization. He said

the SOI Standards have been met. He said that so much has been given back to the building it makes up for other issues. He appreciated the team's responsiveness to the board and public. He said it is notable that the NPS, Volunteer Park Trust, and Seattle Friends of Olmsted Parks support the project.

Mr. Treffers said he agreed with FSOP's tree valuation comments.

Ms. Sodt said board support is documented in the minutes.

Ms. Doherty said that tree protection is one of the administrative items still being reviewed.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application and issue a Certificate of Approval for the proposed building additions and alterations to the exterior and interior of the Seattle Asian Art Museum, and site improvements to Volunteer Park, at 1400 East Prospect Street, as per the attached submittal.

## **EXPLANATION AND FINDINGS**

This action is based on the following:

1. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 A, *the extent to which the proposed alteration or significant change would adversely affect the features or characteristics described in the Controls & Incentives Agreement LPB 279/17 for the museum, and Ordinance No. 125215 for the park.*
  - a. While the proposal includes a major addition to the southeast portion of the museum, the primary views of the building will remain unaffected. This portion of the original museum was previously altered by an addition in 1955. The elevator addition proposed for the north end of the museum is to an area previously altered by an addition in 1954. Both additions are no taller than the adjacent parapet, and will be clad with compatible materials. Most of the designated features of the exterior and interior of the building will be retained, renovated or reconstructed. Historic material is being removed for the two openings proposed at the east end of the Garden Court, but this is reversible if the addition is removed or altered in the future.
  - b. The proposed additions maintain the major axial orientation of the park, and do not disturb primary view-sheds, original vehicular or pedestrian paths, or other formal features. The southeast addition extends into the informal greensward on the east side of the park as does the original museum, but due to its siting will not require the removal of heritage trees, exceptional trees, or exceptional groves of trees. Regrading around the southeast addition is minimal. To accommodate improved accessible paths for visitor and museum staff, some alterations to the forecourt are

necessary, but have been minimized to be more compatible with the existing site features and materials.

2. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 B, *the reasonableness or lack thereof of the proposed alterations or significant change in light of other alternatives available to achieve the objectives of the owner and the applicant.*
  - a. The applicant has provided extensive information to the ARC and Landmarks Board throughout the development of the project. Their explorations included evaluation of the existing museum and park, options for locations of the proposed addition with the benefits and challenges of each, an overview and detailed breakdown of their programmatic requirements, changes to the design of the site improvements and southeast and north additions in response to feedback, and refinements to the proposed materials and details at the exterior and interior interventions in response to feedback. The applicants also investigated an alternative for building entirely below grade, as requested by members of the public. In addition to construction challenges and possible risk to the historic structure, the applicant demonstrated that the discontinuity of space would not meet their primary programmatic need for additional exhibit space.
  - b. Their informal briefings to the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) and Landmarks Preservation Board (LPB) were made at the following public meetings:
    - May 27, 2016 (ARC)
    - June 24, 2016 (ARC)
    - August 12, 2016 (ARC)
    - October 5, 2016 (LPB)
    - November 2, 2016 (LPB)
    - December 7, 2016 (LPB)
    - February 24, 2017 (ARC)
    - April 19, 2017 (LPB)
    - June 16, 2017 (ARC)
3. The factors of SMC 25.12 .750 C, SMC 25.12 .750 D and 25.12.750 E are not applicable.
4. The proposed work as presented is consistent with the following Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as listed below (or cite other applicable standards):

*Standard #5: Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.*

*Standard #6: Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a*

*distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*

*Standard #9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*

*Standard #10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*

5. The following scope of work is being reviewed administratively by the Landmarks Board coordinator and is not included in the Certificate of Approval: maintenance of tree health; in-kind replacement of material/finishes associated with seismic improvements; and restoration of steel and aluminum windows.
6. This Certificate of Approval is approved on the condition that the required Land Use Code amendment to allow the expansion of the museum, a non-conforming structure, will first be approved by the City Council prior to any development at the Project site.
7. The approval is made with the understanding that staff review continues for approval of the critical root zone and will take into consideration expanding that beyond the drip line and basing it on diameter of trunk. Replacement values placed on trees needs to be reconsidered, and increased.

MM/SC/RK/ST          6:2:1    Motion carried. Mr. Coney and Ms. Barker opposed. Ms. Johnson recused herself.

*Ms. Barker left at 6:45 pm.*

**080217.3          DESIGNATIONS**

080217.31          Bressi Garage / Pottery Northwest  
226-232 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue North

Katie Pratt, Northwest Vernacular, provided an overview of neighborhood development and types of buildings in the neighborhood. She said that all buildings on the west half of the block were removed for the World's Fair.

She said the subject building was built for Dominick Bressi in 1923; it's unclear when the second garage was built, but it was there by 1936. She said that M. C. Heinemann was the contractor. She said the building served as a parking garage; in the early years of automobile ownership people needed a place to park. The building was used for truck rental starting in 1946.

Spencer Howard, Northwest Vernacular, explained the building was built as a parking garage. He noted the brick, stepped parapet, large bay entry doors, wood sash windows, sliding wood door on rear façade. He provided a rendering of what has been changed. He said that more windows on the west façade have been changed, but replaced in a manner to look like the original windows. He said all the brick, and parapet, south windows remain. He said later when the Seattle Center maintenance facility occupied the north space the roll up fire door was added. He said the kiln shed was designed by H. S. Berglund per 1976 drawings.

Mr. Coney asked if it is original fabric behind the south façade shed.

Mr. Howard said the south façade was originally a party wall; up until the 1950s another building was there.

Ms. Pratt said before the auto, horses were used and livery stables were common; with the rise of auto use livery stables became less common – some became garages. She said by 1951 there were a variety of garages in the area. She said Bressi developed later into a transfer garage. She said that similar garages nearby are 113 Dexter, 508 Denny, and Fat City; she said that most have been demolished. She said that a 7.5-million-dollar bond passed and World's Fair organizers bought up property to create a more regular boundary; 16 owners (including Bressi) appealed. She said that 20 acres were eliminated from the planned site to save money and the appeal never made it to a lawsuit.

She said that Pottery Northwest has occupied the south building since the 1970's; before that the Seattle Clay Club occupied space in the Armory before. She said that notable artists associated with Pottery Northwest include Hain Bayliss, Paul Lewing, Jean Griffith, Tip Toland, and Jamie Walker.

Ms. Vyhnanek asked if it started as a class.

Ms. Pratt said the club outgrew the college environment.

Public Comment:

Leanne Olsen, Queen Anne Historical Society, supported designation on criteria A, C, D, and F.



Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle and Docomomo WeWa, supported designation on criteria C and D. She said it is significant as an early garage and Pacific Northwest property type. She said it is important to recognize vernacular buildings.

Maria Barrientos, Uptown Alliance Commercial Council, said they have a vision for growth in the neighborhood. She said they encourage preservation of buildings – especially brick ones – but as they grow to balance preservation with other goals and development. She supported nomination of the exterior only.

Ms. Doherty said she had recommended the exteriors of the garage buildings.

Mr. Coney said the interior is intact; he noted the truss work on the Pottery Northwest side. He said on the Seattle Center side the roof has been cut open.

Mr. Hodgins noted the exposed trusses and beams in Pottery Northwest portion and the Seattle Center side is cut up and altered. He appreciated the preservation of the building. He supported designation and said as an auto garage it reflects a moment in time where apartment dwellers needed parking for their cars. He supported interior of Pottery Northwest to include the trusses; he did not support inclusion of the kiln shed or the interior or Seattle Center portion. He supported criteria C and D.

Ms. Durham supported designation on criteria C and D for the connection to Seattle Center and for the hold out story / appeal. She agreed with Mr. Hodgins that the garage captures a moment in time. She said the Pottery Northwest connection is important and she supported inclusion of the interior.

Mr. Coney supported designation on criteria C and D. He said that Pottery Northwest is significant because it has been there many years and many artists have gone through this space. He said the building meets the physical character and style. He said the interior of the south half remains intact and he noted the trusses. He said the north half interior is altered and should be excluded. He said to exclude the kiln shed.

Mr. Ketcherside supported designation on criteria C and D. He noted the connection to Seattle Center and Pottery Northwest and said the building meets the architectural style of a garage building. He said to include the trusses of the south building and any redevelopment of the property needs to include retention of the trusses.

Ms. Johnson supported designation on criteria C and D. She noted the connection to Seattle Center and said the integrity is good. She noted the garage door openings, truss and ceiling decking, and exposed brick in the south half interior. She said the kiln shed is interesting.

Ms. Vyhnanek supported designation on criteria C and D but for A as well for the event and the building owners' appeal. She noted the significance of Pottery Northwest.

Mr. Treffers supported designation. He noted Criterion D and said it is a good example of auto-related property and it has integrity. He said it meets Criterion A because of its association with the World's Fair and for the appeal that shaped what is left. He said Pottery Northwest is significant but there is not enough context or info to decide on that. He said the kiln is part of that and tells that story. He supported inclusion of truss work which is evidence of auto use. He supported criteria D, C or A, the exterior and the truss.

Mr. Kiel supported designation and inclusion of truss. He asked board members about inclusion of standards C or A.

Ms. Durham supported either standard C or A for the World's Fair.

Mr. Coney said Pottery Northwest is significant. He said not to include the kiln – it is not attached to the building. He said A is significant; it would be different if the owners had not stood up and said 'no'. He supported inclusion of truss work and above for the south half.

Ms. Vyhnanek said Pottery Northwest, garage, World's Fair are not mutually exclusive – all are significant for different reasons. She supported criteria A and C.

Mr. Hodgins supported A but said it was one of many; he wouldn't vote against the motion if A were not included.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Bressi Garage at 226-232 1st Avenue North as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C and D; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the exteriors of the two former garage buildings, and the interior roof trusses and decking.

MM/SC/RK/RC 8:0:0 Motion carried.

080217.32 Century 21 Coliseum (Key Arena) / NASA Bldg / Blue Spruce Apts  
305 Harrison Street

Katie Pratt, Northwest Vernacular, provided an overview of the site and significant elements of the buildings. She noted the buildings addressed in this nomination include an ensemble of structures designed by Paul Thiry as part

of the 1962 Seattle World's Fair. They served as the western edge for the fair and now Seattle Center. The Coliseum / Arena anchors the ensemble, with surrounding buildings and open space arranged in a supporting manner around it. She noted the hyperbolic paraboloid roof, with massive abutments and piers, and 3,700 panels. The original cable-net portion of the roof structure was replaced by trusses in 1995; the leaky roof was replaced and the interior was gutted. The apex of the roof was crowned with a new monitor and "KeyArena" signage was installed at apex of roof. She said a glass curtain wall encloses the building.

She said the NASA building is a single-story, clear span structure with perimeter steel columns, corrugated metal decking, corrugated metal cladding with tilt-up concrete panels on the west and south facades. There have been extensive changes to the original plan, notably the removal of the east wing of the building. The interior is an open volume and used as storage space for Seattle Center.

She said the Blue Spruce Apartments were built in 1956 and occupy a U-shaped footprint on the north side of Thomas Street, just south of the Coliseum. This building has a typical Modern, multi-family residential form. The three-story, concrete block structure stands on a poured concrete foundation. Exterior doors at all floors in the south facade access the former apartment spaces, now offices.

Spencer Howard, Northwest Vernacular, explained that portions of the Thiry group, including the Northwest Rooms and the International Fountain Pavilion, have been designated landmarks. He explained that during nomination research they explored what was designed by Thiry, the functional relationships between buildings and how it transitioned to what is there today. The NASA building is no longer what it was historically; the north and east sides were originally corrugated metal with concrete panels just along 1<sup>st</sup> and Thomas. He compared a 1969 aerial photo to a 2012 aerial photo and noted the extent of changes made as part of the 1990's KeyArena work. The whole south plaza was intact in 1969; it was turned into private space that served functions of KeyArena. He said the panels were re-used; there was a loss of over 2/3 of the building.

He said the Blue Spruce Apartments did not have the same relationship to Seattle Center that the other buildings had. He said that Thiry worked to screen it from view. It is a typical mid-century apartment; it was screened but is now open to the service area. He said that there were multiple tenants over the years. In the 1980's there were more nonprofits: NW Folklife was there the longest. He said the style is a very common open corridor hotel style building of brick, concrete block walls. He said that post WWII it was an affordable and easy building to construct. He showed photos of other similar buildings in the area: Melrose, Price Manor, Ray Ann, among others.

#### Public Comment:

Leanne Olson, Queen Anne Historical Society, supported designation. She said that the Thiry pre-cast concrete panels at the NASA Building can be reused and they should be saved. She said the corner mirrors 1<sup>st</sup> and Republican.

Margo Rose Hancock noted Thiry's biography and said he was born in Nome, Alaska. She said that Johnpaul Jones, a distinctive architect and designer of the American Indian Museum noted the Native influence on the design that dominated the design. She said the form of the Coliseum was based on a Pacific Northwest Native American hat, and the panels show a strong Native American influence. She said it deserves acknowledgement.

Maria Barrientos, Uptown Council, said the area is Uptown Urban Center and not lower Queen Anne. She did not support designation of the NASA Building or the Blue Spruce Apartments, nor keeping the Thiry panels.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, Docomomo WeWa, supported designation of the Coliseum for all six standards. She did not support designation of the NASA Building or the Blue Spruce Apartments.

#### Board Discussion:

Mr. Treffers appreciated the additional information and graphics provided, and said it was helpful to understand the changes. He supported designation of the exterior of the Coliseum. He said the NASA building is significant but it cannot convey it due to the alterations. He encouraged retention of the Thiry panels and incorporating them in new design where possible. He did not support designation of the Blue Spruce Apartment which was shielded and not meant to be part of the ensemble. He said he doesn't write off 1950's apartment buildings, but this one is too altered and is not a landmark.

Mr. Coney said the NASA Building corner anchors the original Center grounds. He said there is not enough of it left. He encouraged retention of the Thiry panels as an homage to original Center grounds. He did not support designation of the Blue Spruce Apartments. He supported designation of the Coliseum on criteria A – F.

Mr. Ketcherside supported designation of the group, the Coliseum on criteria A – F. He did not support designation of the Blue Spruce Apartment and noted it had been screened off from the rest. He said that he supported designation of the NASA Building; he said it is part of the southern bracket of the Thiry group and is the only part of the southern bracket left. He spoke to the history and significance of NASA, the birth of the Soviet Space Museum,

and this being the first time authentic space artifacts were exhibited anywhere in the world. He said the building was of a scale to house these large artifacts. He noted the PR aspect of the space race. It was the first publicly displayed exhibit and the building was purpose built for a space exhibit. He said we have one piece left of the first space museum; despite the elimination of the right leg of the “L”. He said it is an awkward height but was for large scale artifacts. He said it is the last vestige of the southern bracket of Thiry’s plan.

Ms. Johnson supported designation of the Coliseum but not the Blue Spruce Apartments or NASA Building. She said the NASA Building can’t convey what it was. She wished she could designate a concept.

Ms. Durham supported designation of the Coliseum on criteria A – F. She did not support designation of the Blue Spruce Apartments. She said the NASA Building is tricky and she noted integrity issues. She said the building provides an opportunity to curate panels and pieces of history, if not they are lost. She said it is worth designating the small vestige of what was there.

Mr. Hodgins supported designation of the Coliseum on criteria A – F. He did not support designation of the Blue Spruce Apartments or the NASA Building. He said the history is in the NASA building but lots has been lost.

Ms. Vyhnanek supported designation of the Coliseum on criteria A – F. She did not support designation of the Blue Spruce Apartments. She said Mr. Ketcherside made a strong argument for the NASA Building but she noted it had lost its ability to convey that. She said there is a rich history there and that it is intriguing but it was not strong enough to sway her.

Mr. Kiel did not support designation of the Blue Spruce Apartments. He supported designation of the Coliseum on criteria A – F. He said the panels on the NASA Building might be able to convey if there were more.

Collectively there was not enough board support for inclusion of the NASA Building due to integrity issues.

Mr. Ketcherside hoped the panels will be reused.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Century 21 Coliseum / Key Arena at 305 Harrison Street as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards A, B, C, D, E and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the site and the exterior of the Century 21 Coliseum / Key Arena.

MM/SC/RC/RK      8:0:0    Motion carried.

**080217.4 STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator