



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 99/19

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
City Hall
600 4th Avenue
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room
Wednesday February 20, 2019 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker
Manish Chalana
Russell Coney
Rich Freitas
Alan Guo
Garrett Hodgins
Jordon Kiel

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Kathleen Durham
Kristen Johnson
Steven Treffers

Vice Chair Deb Barker called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m.

022019.1

MEETING MINUTES

November 7, 2019; November 21, 2019; and December 5, 2019
Deferred.

022019.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

022019.21 Columbia City Landmark District
Multiple locations throughout the District
Proposed LED retrofit of the globe street lights

Tabled.

022019.22 Ingraham High School Gymnasium
1819 North 135th Street
Proposed roof alterations

Amy Vanderhorst, Integrus Architecture, went over photos and plans of existing buildings and context of site; she explained what they explored and why. Photos included auxiliary gym secondary entrance, view from east, connection to main gym and barrel vault roof; main gym, connector to Building 100, and fascia that will be matched on auxiliary gym; and interior of auxiliary gym. She provided supporting plan of auxiliary gym which, she said is not two gyms, it is one with a masonry wall in the center, separating boys' and girls' sections. She said the roof drains are within the masonry wall and go under the floor slab. She said the ceiling is glued directly to concrete roof structure; there is interstitial space for plumbing etc. If they lowered the ceiling, it would block the clerestory windows. She said they will have the roof slope to existing internal roof drains. The building was roofed in 1958 and hasn't been done since. She said adding 1" – 1 ¼" rigid insulation would provide minimal slope to roof drains. With R-38 insulation at minimum they would have 4' fascia with ½" slope; going to 3/8" slope they would have 3' fascia. She said they worked with SDCI and energy reviewer and using R-38 and overall averaging, they will start at roof drain at zero insulation and work up to fascia height of 2'. She said they looked at internal drains; new drains would have existing piping over wood floors and the pipes would be exposed. They looked at the slope outward to exterior walls; it would require downspouts and gutters. She said it was not an easy solution, but they chose to have 2'2" fascia around building; it is easily removable without altering structure. Responding to questions she said the roof should last 60 years; she noted the drains are currently working.

Mr. Chalana asked to see the section showing current conditions.

Ms. Vanderhorst said the current fascia is 6 ½".

Mr. Coney asked if they could get an energy code exception for the gymnasium or average insulation to do 60" on edges and 0" at drain.

Brian of Integrus Architecture, said it is based on roof slope.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Freitas said that ARC reviewed and noted a major impact to the character of the building. He said ARC pressed for exploration and got fascia reduced by half. He said it is a difficult situation.

Ms. Barker said it continues a theme that is already at the school. She said windows are important and covering them would be more impactful. She said she would reluctantly approve and that there was no other solution.

Mr. Coney said it is not a thin shelled concrete roof and that it should be re-done the same way. He said they can do an exception to the energy code.

Mr. Chalana agreed with Mr. Coney and asked if the energy code exception was explored.

Ms. Vanderhorst said they worked to reduce impacts.

Brad Tong, Seattle Public Schools, said they talked to Capital Projects and confirmed that it is a heated gym that is kept at 68°. He said they recognized the value of energy code so they came up with a compromise that would meet with standard operations.

Mr. Freitas was concerned over impact to character of the building. He said it wasn't designated under a 'method of construction' which is causing problem. He said it can convey its significance. He said it is an unfortunate necessity but is reversible. He said if the work is not done, damage could be worse to roof.

Mr. Hodgins asked the intent of the project – to re-roof or to insulate.

Brian said it is a complete tear-off and the substrate is likely in poor condition.

Mr. Guo supported the application and said it sounds like effort has been made to minimize impact.

Ms. Barker said she was initially dismayed and noted she always asked the School District to do maintenance. She said this is maintenance and that she prefers maintenance over a catastrophic failure. She said she reluctantly supported the project.

Mr. Coney said the fascia was a new item and now they are matching to an alteration.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed roof alterations at Ingraham High School gymnasium, 1819 North 135th Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed exterior alterations change some of the feature that characterize the property as specified in the Report on Designation (LPB709/17), but the applicant has demonstrated that there is no preferable method to provide this amount of roof insulation.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/RF/GH 4:2:0 Motion carried. Messrs. Chalana and Coney opposed.

Mr. Kiel arrived at 3:55 pm.

Controls and Incentives reviewed out of order.

022019.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

022019.41 Sheridan Apartments
2011 Fifth Avenue
Request for extension

Ian Morrison, McCullough, Hill, Leary, requested a four-month extension for the Sheridan Apartments and the Griffin Building.

Ms. Barker asked if there was any movement on negotiation with property owner to the north.

Mr. Morrison said they are working on it. He said SDCI wants to hear from this board on the evolution of the massing option.

Ms. Barker asked if both buildings were occupied.

Mr. Morrison said they are.

Mr. Chalana asked how far along are they on massing studies.

Mr. Morrison there have been further evolution of massing studies discussed at ARC. He said they will go back to ARC for feedback and then will bring to full board.

Mr. Kiel concurred and said that it will come to full board for feedback.

Mr. Chalana supported the request for extension.

Mr. Morrison said conversations are ongoing with the adjacent owner. They will get feedback and that will inform design.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Sheridan Apartments, 2011 Fifth Avenue, for four months.

MM/SC/DB/GH 7:0:0 Motion carried.

022019.42 Griffin Building
2005 Fifth Avenue
Request for extension

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Griffin Building, 2005 Fifth Avenue, for four months.

MM/SC/DB/RC 7:0:0 Motion carried.

022019.3 NOMINATION

022019.31 Turner-Koepf House / Beacon Hill Garden House
2336 15th Avenue South

Mr. Kiel explained the nomination process to the public.

Nominator Presentation:

Katie Pratt, Northwest Vernacular, and Betty Jean Williams, President of Beacon Arts, presented. Nomination report in DON file.

Ms. Williams reported that in 1912 women founded the Jefferson Park Ladies' Improvement Club and purchased the building for use as clubhouse. She said it was the first women-owned clubhouse. She said they lobbied the City and advocated for African-American golfers and against redlining. She said the house is on the National Register. She said the Washington State Federation of Garden Clubs removed the property covenant that had forbid use for commercial purposes, despite pleas from local garden club members, and sold the building. Ms. Pratt said while they lost ownership, they still use it. The house is used by many organizations for concerts, dances, movies, Pear-a-dise events. She said the community loves the property. She said the new owners emailed her today and thanked her for the nomination and said that no one wants to preserve the building more than they do.

Ms. Pratt provided context of the site and noted the house was built prior to platting the area. She said the house has been known by several names over the years including Turner, Koepf, Beacon Hill Headquarters, Garden Club; it was listed in the National Register in 1976. The house was built for Edward and Estelle Turner in the Italianate style Main house (two story). Elements of the style included were V groove horizontal siding, hip roof, canted bay at second story, window frames and second story west and south window openings, mahogany stairway. From 1906 – 1916, the alterations converting the house to the Queen Anne style includes dormers, rafter extensions, kitchen chimney relocation, front first story remodel to extend the living room, south porch, north porch addition, windows replaced, pear trees south of house (five remaining), rose off northeast corner of house, and east second story addition above the east kitchen addition. She noted the main meeting volume, enclosed porch and noted later addition in 2001 of crown molding and wainscot; the historic volume and beams remain.

Ms. Pratt reported that the four-acre site purchased by Estelle Turner from Cyrus Walker in 1883. In 1886 the main two-story portion of the house was constructed by J. D. Duncan. The Turners lived in the house briefly before selling to the Stacy family in 1886, who likely did not live in the house. The Gabel family owned the house by 1887-89 and sold it to the Koepf Family. The house was the Koepf Residence 1890-1921. The Jefferson Park Ladies' Improvement Club purchased the building in 1924 and remodeled it for clubhouse and community space. In 1977 the Jefferson Park Ladies' Improvement Club gave the building and all furnishings to the Washington State Federation of Garden Clubs. The club then began a series of improvements to the site and building. She said the parcel is one of the oldest on Beacon Hill and reflects the area prior to platting.

Ms. Pratt said that the Jefferson Park Ladies' Improvement Club was founded in 1912 and focused on Beacon Hill improvements. The club expanded the meeting room and added cloak rooms. From 1924-29 there were 129 members. The club hosted an annual two-day carnival, monthly dinners, dances, and parties. The house was listed to the National Register in 1976. In 1977 the Jefferson Park Ladies' Improvement Club gave the house to Washington State Federation of Garden Clubs (WSFGC) with covenants that the club would continue to meet there and that the house would remain in non-profit use. The WSFGC had the covenants nullified in 2016. Ms. Pratt said that this is the oldest remaining club house in the City and is one of seven that remain clubs.

Ms. Barker asked about the north façade and west edge and noted that it was a clumsy addition.

Spencer Howard said that as part of the Queen Anne conversion it was expanded with north porch getting enclosed and parapet added.

Ms. Williams said from the second floor windows you can step out.

Mr. Freitas asked about the period of significance in the National Register. He asked if the orchards occupied the entire lot.

Mr. Howard said that the orchard extended all the way out to 15th. He said the evergreen that was on the property has been removed.

Mr. Freitas asked what the north lawn was used for.

Ms. Williams said that it is a more formal garden.

Ms. Pratt said the garden club added a gazebo; there was an open porch until it was enclosed.

Ms. Williams said the yard was like a park. She said if kids mowed the lawn they could play there; Easter egg hunts were held there. Responding to questions she said that there is a variety of pear trees in the orchard including Bartlett and some imported from England.

Mr. Hodgins asked if there were any historic events associated with house.

Ms. Pratt said no.

Ms. Williams said it was the first female club ownership.

Ms. Pratt noted that the National Register nomination lists the construction date as 1883 rather than 1886.

Mr. Chalana asked about the restrictive covenants.

Ms. Williams said the state leadership wanted to sell. They knew the property had value and hired an attorney to remove the covenants based on the Jefferson Park Ladies' Improvement Club no longer being in existence. They did not invite participation of the community or the many legacy groups that are doing the work.

Mr. Chalana asked about current use.

Ms. Williams said that the rental income has been used to maintain the property.

Ms. Pratt said they viewed it as a benefit to the community.

Mr. Hodgins asked about the Turner family history.

Ms. Pratt said it was fairly early but nothing like the Dennys.

Owner Presentation:

Steve Gillespie, Foster Pepper PLLC, said the owners hope to partner with the community.

Ellen Mirro, The Johnson Partnership, thanked the community and Beacon Arts. She provided context of the site and said the owners are currently devising plans for the site. She said the owners support landmark designation of the house but not to the lot to allow flexibility of development. She said the building has integrity and has seen rehabilitation and adaptive reuse. She said the period of significance listed in the National Register is 1800 – 1899; now, the period would not be that broad. She said the period of significant should extend through the 1929 improvements.

Ms. Mirro said the house has good integrity. She noted non-original items including the north porch which was added in 2006, dormer window, north porch doors, enclosed porch, and replacement windows. She noted deferred maintenance issues including cracked concrete, siding issues, porch flooring. She said an arborist report was requested and she would provide it when she gets it; she said the trees are 45 years old, not 100. She said the wainscoting is MDF, not wood, and she noted the restroom vestibule was altered. Acoustical tile ceiling was a later addition in community room, the bench along windows is original. The soffit and wainscoting are not original, stained glass transom and front door are non-original, the north lawn was put in in 1982, pear trees are 45 years old, other plantings are from the 1980s.

Mr. Chalana asked the parcel zoning.

Mr. Gillespie it is LR-2.

Ms. Barker asked if it has been upzoned with MHA yet.

Mr. Chalana said it hasn't.

Mr. Kiel asked if it is three parcels now.

Mr. Gillespie said it is three separate platted lots, one parcel number, and one tax parcel.

Ms. Barker asked if the north porch is accessible.

Ms. Mirro said it has a ramp at the back.

Ms. Barker asked about chimney condition.

Ms. Mirro said it is part of the structural evaluation.

Mr. Chalana asked if the building would have to go through seismic upgrade.

Ms. Mirro said it would if substantial alteration was required.

Mr. Chalana asked if it will remain a community building.

Mr. Kiel said that is outside the Board's consideration.

Public Comment:

Chris Ziemnik, neighbor, said this house is one of the reasons she bought her home; she thought by being on National Register, it was protected. She reported she maintained a watchful eye on the property. She noted the uniqueness of the site and said she had invested herself in the property and it is precious.

Monique Jong said she has lived in area since 1998 and has restored homes. She said this house should be saved; it has served this community and is the only community club here. Preserve it.

Bob Baines said he worked on restoration of the historic orchards at Carkeek and noted the importance of the fruit trees and the significance of orchards in America. He has documents about historic orchards and how to save them; in Britain orchards are 200-300 years old and are important to wildlife, community; they provide edible landscapes, edible forests. He said there is not much appreciation about importance of fruit trees in urban landscapes. He said it should be preserved.

Susan Sherbina said the city has become boxes, and what is left of Beacon Hill is important. She said the pear trees go with the house and there are no others like them. The building is important.

Michael Sobel said the house is a welcoming beacon and landmark and he noted the value of the house and gardens to the community and to Seattle. He said there have been dramatic changes to the look and feel of the community. He noted the porches and greenery and the summer celebrations collecting pears. He said the house is centrally located and serves as preservation of cultural heritage and memory. He said the gardens and garden house go together; if sub-divided big boxes would be put in.

Dominic Barrera, Plant Amnesty, supported preservation of the entire property and said the entire ground make it special. He said the tree groves

provide benefit beyond the individual trees – storm water retention, wildlife habitat, continuous canopy. The property is a huge part of the house.

Katrina Perckrestenko said he is a member of the Beacon Hill Garden Club. She noted the Pear-a-dise harvest, music, arts, and the sharing of baked goods. She said there is historic significance to the property, history made up of smaller moments – weddings, graduations, and neighbor stories and experiences. She said both house and grounds should be left intact.

Gary Jones said it is a place where people for generations have practiced a sense of community; alterations are part of that. He said that the parcel has been intact for over 100 years and it is where people paid attention to gardens, houses, pears. People have met there for a shared purpose and it is a central reminder of who we are. He noted the value of keeping is all intact – the grounds and the house – and said groups have met there to sustain a sense of society.

Jeff Murdock, Historic Seattle, supported nomination based on criteria C, D, and F. He said the house has been listed on the National Register since 1976 noting architectural and social/cultural significance. He said it is associated with the earliest development of Beacon Hill. He said it is a hybrid of Queen Anne and Italianate. He said it has cultural significance for 95 years and noted the JPLIC starting in 1923 through 1977 when they gifted it to the WSFGC. He said the house and gardens have prominence and the exterior, site, and some interiors – entry and stair – should be nominated.

Sasha Anderson said the structure rises to the level of significance. She said the grounds are vital to the overall significance and can't be divided. She said the indoor and outdoor flow together. She said alterations were done in good faith with the design. The historic orchard and gardens and the way they feed into overall should be considered.

Susan Stocking, neighbor, said there is a shortage of open green space and noted this is the oldest building. She said this is an opportunity to keep something that is in short supply. She said the house is significant to the neighborhood and the whole thing should be nominated.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, said there are very few landmarks designated because of associate with women's history; here it is the JPLIC and Federation of Garden Clubs. She said the entire site should be designated and should not be cut up. She said the house and setting are special; it is the oldest resource in the neighborhood. She said chopping it up would be short-sighted. She said additions are allowed. She said designate the entire site; the orchard is significant as a matter of age. She noted Susan Doles report. She said there are heirloom apple trees – the only place in the City - at the landmarked Good Shepherd Center.

Jonis Davis said this is the only historic house in the area. She said it is a community institution where they enjoy music, arts, Pear-a-dise event. She said the whole place is important – the building and the land. It is there for everybody and the role it plays in the community.

Angela Castañeda, Director, Beacon Business Alliance, said the property is part of the commercial district and creates open green space and retains character in the neighborhood. She noted the loss of cultural arts space and the way in which the whole transition happened. She appreciated that the new owners are in attendance and she hoped they can work together to resonate with the community and keep it in community use.

Virginia Voorhees said she was former chair of the Landmarks Board. She said it is an intact building and it is important to save it. She said there are very few Victorian buildings left. She said it is a National Register landmark and should be a Seattle landmark; it meets several criteria.

Claudia Kienholz said the entire lot, all parcels, including house and grounds, should be nominated. She said it is a truly unique space that should be a landmark. She said it is easily identifiable and unique on Beacon Hill. She noted the rare combination of house, orchards, grounds are special. She said it has housed weddings, birthdays, community dinners, Pear-a-dise event. She said the flow of indoor to outdoor is irreplaceable. She said the grounds have been maintained to benefit local history and the City. She said to honor is will official designation.

Jessie McKenna, Rocket Space, said before Beacon Arts moved in she didn't know much about it. She appreciated the history. She said there are lots of events there – quinceñeras, parties. She said there are lots of white people here at the meeting, and she said she recognized a family of color purchased the property. She said she hoped all can work together and that it will matter to the owners. She read from a letter which stated “the house was gifted to the community and deeded to WFGC who sought legal action and then sold it for profit; it is a crying shame. It would have been great if a non-profit wanted to purchase it”.

Mr. Kiel said it matters to the board, too. He said it is uncommon to have this many people come to a meeting.

Ms. Barker supported nomination of the entire site, interior, exterior and said she looked forward to a tour. She said she appreciated the public speaking about what is important. She said the building's role past and presented is well-documented so include the entire site. She said the Battelle landmark was for the whole site; it was by a prominent landscaper. She said the house

was converted to clubhouse was sponsored by a women's garden group before they could even vote.

Mr. Chalana said it was not a silly garden club; it is about women's history and how it paved the way. He noted the clever way they created the garden club. He noted the a book about "improvement" as a non-threatening way for women to create paid professions for themselves. He said he is not fascinated by the house – it needs to be the entire site. He said the National Register listing probably is for the entire site. He wanted to hear more about women's history.

Mr. Freitas appreciated the public comments and said it means a lot. He said the site is integral to the significance of the property. He noted that the trees show signs of pre-WWII orchard management practices. He noted the early development of the neighborhood, club house and heritage of house. He said the period of significance should be considered 1886 through the present. He noted its continuous association with the neighborhood and its development and cited standards C, D, and F.

Mr. Hodgins appreciated the public comment. He said the site and structure are layered with history and he noted the multiple organizations involved and impact on community. He said Criterion C is obvious. He asked staff about Criterion A.

Ms. Doherty said she recommended Criterion A because it was the improvement club era and many events took place there.

Mr. Hodgins said the significance is more than the structure; it is the entire place. He noted the value to the community and its integrity. He supported nomination of the entire site.

Mr. Coney said it is nice to have community support. He supported nomination of entire site, interior and exterior and noted it is a community and cultural asset. He said the WSFGC did what they did and that can't be undone, but it would be nice to hear that story.

Mr. Guo asked about continued use.

Mr. Kiel said that Use is not in board purview but building something to support a use is. He said if the entire site is included, the board would have to review anything to happen there.

Mr. Guo supported nomination. He said the history of women's clubs was overlooked and he requested more information and noted the club's significant impact. He said the building/site is significant to the community. He supported nomination of building exterior and site.

Mr. Kiel appreciated public comments. He wanted more information about women’s history. He supported nomination based on Criterion C and said the whole site is important to convey significance.

Ms. Barker wanted more information including arborist report, Scionwood, DNA tree ring analysis, germoplastic analysis. She wanted more detailed arborist and engineer reports, information on the deed, and more information on women’s history.

Mr. Guo noted he also wanted more information on the women’s club involvement a in non-segregated Jefferson Park Golf Course.

Mr. Coney wanted more information on the original deeding and the decision to remove the covenant.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Turner-Koepf House / Beacon Hill Garden House at 2336 15th Avenue South for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the site; and the exterior and interior of the house, excluding the 2006 addition on the north side; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for April 3, 2019; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/GH/DB 7:0:0 Motion carried.

022019.5 BRIEFING

022019.51 Volunteer Park
1400 East Prospect Street
Briefing on proposed removal and replacement of the bandshell

Jennifer Ott, Volunteer Park Trust, provided a historical overview of the park and bandshell. She provided context of the area in the park as it relates to other elements including playground, spur road. She said she reviewed the Secretary of Interior Standards (SOI). She said she found the area to be a hybrid landscape, the product of Olmsted with Gould bandstand; a temporary bandstand and then the Haag structure. She noted the layering of different structures for the same use. She read from the description in the landmark nomination report and noted the concert grove was the only performance part of the Olmsted plan. She said the Olmsted path cross the great lawn. She said Olmsted was not supportive of a bandshell in the park and stated that ‘this is a landscape park’ and not one for a bandshell. He nixed a Bebb and Mendel design. She showed photos of the Gould design what was there from 1915 –

47; it was a wood structure that was removed in 1947. She noted it didn't have a large landscape impact nor was grading done. She said there have been much vegetation changes over the years. She said there was another bandshell from 1947 – 74.

Mr. Coney said it was plywood on a temporary metal stage; it was a 'temporary' structure.

Ms. Ott said the Rich Haag bandshell installed in 1974 still exists. The Volunteer Park Trust is looking at the park to ensure its future vitality and safety. She noted the reservoir would be decommissioned but may be kept as a water feature; they will work on plantings to keep the view. She said they are working on activation. She said they are looking at the current structure, how it is used and what are its issues. She said there is no backstage space. She said the restrooms are locked unless an event is going on. The structure is not functioning as intended or as needed: there is no roof which prevents usage and there is no ability to enter from the back. She said it is not ADA compliant from the concourse down.

She said in 2016 it was brought to the Landmarks Board for a briefing and recommendations were to restore Olmsted paths, view corridor as Olmsted intended. She said they explored the benefits of moving the bandshell or to demolish and rebuild at same location. If demolished they would keep other Haag elements: little folks' lawn, forecourt. She said the benefits would outweigh the loss of the bandshell. She said that Haag was not attached to the structure. She said a performance venue is important. She said they would retain Haag path; keep historic character of the site as Haag intended but it will work better. She said they looked at adding a swinging door as a backdrop which could then be closed for visibility. She said the materials would be graffiti-resistant and would blend into the landscape. She said that roof coverage would allow broader range of performance; infrastructure would allow lighting and sound.

Mr. Coney asked for a comparison between existing stage and what they propose.

Owen Richards, ORA, said the existing stage is 55' wide, a bit wider than what is being proposed which is 30' x 40'. He said that performers wanted depth and to be covered with roof. He said what is proposed is slightly smaller but has open back stage area and addresses the issues of the path feeling too narrow and restrictive. He said four bathrooms are proposed.

Mr. Hodgins asked what ARC thought of the proposal.

Mr. Kiel said that he was at ARC and the Board at the time was comfortable with this. He said at the more recent ARC there were concerns about the removal of the Haag structure.

Ms. Doherty said there were past briefings. The board showed support for the previous design sited further to the north, and supporting removal of the Haag bandshell. She said they have now come back with a change to the location. There are also new Board members adding to the discussion.

Mr. Chalana said he was not comfortable removing the bandshell and he noted Haag's layering and that he did things differently by design to contrast with Olmsted setting. He said he did it in a light brushstroke to keep a non-active component – by adding a very small stage. He said it blends with the Olmsted tradition of non-active use. He said he was not comfortable with just getting rid of Haag's work, the new structure is trying too hard. He said design cannot resolve homeless problems. He said the proposal is not sitting right with him.

Mr. Coney agreed, a lot to consider.

Mr. Chalana said Haag was purposefully minimalistic.

Public Comment:

Virginia Voorhees said she served on the planning committee. She said the project got caught between two serving boards. Noting Haag's plan, she said what is difficult is that it is not functional and is falling apart. She said it doesn't work for performers. She said there is no covering and can only be used with tents. The stage is hardly used; it is not functional space. The landmark is part of the entire park plan. She said she thinks it was a mistake.

Jennifer Rees, Seattle Friends of Olmsted Parks, said she has seen the project develop over the years and she is excited about having more functional space. She said they are revisiting the overall project and looking at the site work done by Haag, the grading and the re-routing of the path.

Mr. Coney said pure Olmsted would take it out and not put anything back.

Ms. Rees noted the path behind the structure and through the dark area. She said they want to introduce plantings to soften the structure. She said they are weighing options to relocate the amphitheater and path.

Mr. Freitas said he read the nomination. He said demolition could reinstate the Olmsted path.

Mr. Chalana said it doesn't restore the Olmsted plan.

Mr. Kiel said it is bad design, it does not function. The bandshell has no fundamental value to community. He said the performance space in the lawn has achieved significance in its own right.

Mr. Freitas said it doesn't have to be iconic to have value; it is not in the National Register nomination. He said there is an argument to be made that the bandshell is not contributing.

Ms. Ott said performance function is integral to the park character but the structure itself is not. She said it is not used; performers work around it.

Mr. Chalana said it is an important relaxing space, doing nothing. He said it is an unobtrusive structure; a canopy would be more jarring. He said he would be more comfortable with creating a stage elsewhere and getting rid of the bandshell and reinstating Olmsted's scheme.

Mr. Kiel asked Mr. Freitas about this not being a 'contributing feature'.

Mr. Freitas said he hasn't heard an argument for it. It is in the nomination and it is part of the landmark; it isn't up to him to decide. He asked why not add roof, expand it, improve bathrooms? He would prefer to see it rehabilitated.

Ms. Ott said there is no storage space behind, it is not accessible, no back of stage, they would have to remove wing-ramp because it is also not ADA compliant, the bathrooms open into path – it is very tight and not safe. She said that too much would have to be changed to make it functional.

Mr. Chalana asked why more restrooms? He suggested using restrooms as back of stage. He said other solutions have not been explored.

Mr. Kiel asked what if path was restored.

Mr. Hodgins said just because you can doesn't mean you should.

Ms. Barker said each show will know what they need and will set up what it needs. She said selective photos were shown.

Mr. Chalana said it is not meant for Beyonce; it is community theater.

Mr. Kiel said there is no back stage.

Mr. Chalana said that was by design.

Mr. Bradley said before, there was a massive structure there with roof.

Mr. Chalana said why not go back to early vocabulary.

Mr. Richards said Haag's way of sculpting the lawn was a successful modification; it works well. It is the stage that doesn't work.

Mr. Chalana said to think twice; the introduction of a piece takes away from Olmsted's concept, spirit of space.

Mr. Coney asked how many performances have happened there.

Ms. Ott said early there have been bands, plays, various kinds of rock, then back to more formal concerts.

Mr. Richards said most summer weekends there are 2-3 performances per day. He said there are all-day music festivals, Seattle Chamber.

Ms. Ott said DOPAR doesn't want more or bigger, just a better space.

Mr. Freitas said he didn't mind modern, if offset, and with mitigation to make up for demolition of the existing.

Ms. Ott said the goal is not to demolish. She said they are most excited to open up the path with curves and not right angles, and entire swath of landscape; it will change how people experience the space.

Ms. Barker said to maybe let go of the back area.

Mr. Freitas said he might support removal of some trees behind the bandshell; maybe it wasn't meant to be there originally.

Ms. Barker said in the 1950s there were not as many trees.

Mr. Richards said the costs and grading issues for other proposed location. He said the trees have grown up, some are gone. He said the photo make it look like a gentler slope than it actually is.

Mr. Chalana asked if cost is a factor in moving the bandshell.

Mr. Bradley said there are other issues – lots of grading to the path would create a challenge to the backside. He said DOPAR was concerned. He said there are other issues – solar exposure; one area has foliage behind that could shield western sun.

Mr. Freitas said to pull the Haag structure to the east and restore the path.

Mr. Hodgins asked about having the path in front of the stage.

Ms. Ott said that it would be closed during performances and they would end up with a social path behind it. She said if they move the structure back, they would have to remove trees. If they move it forward, they lose lawn.

Ms. Barker asked if they need loading.

Ms. Ott said if they do it, the structures become an overlay on landscape and increases built environment. She said she liked the freight approach to the museum. She said they want to keep the preferred path behind more opened up.

Ms. Doherty asked board members to speak about proposed structure.

Mr. Guo said it felt nautical.

Ms. Barker said it looks like a sail.

Mr. Richards asked in principal, is a roof objectionable or too prominent?

Mr. Guo said he wanted to see it be more minimalistic.

Mr. Hodgins said it feels massive.

Mr. Kiel said he likes the way they broke the programmatic pieces apart so you can see through the back wall. He noted the big door that swings open to become the back of stage and said it is effective.

Mr. Hodgins said the base blends with the landscape, but the roof does not.

Mr. Chalana said it takes away the experience of the great lawn. He said that Haag's is minimal enough to not distract from a calmer experience.

Ms. Ott said it looks graffitied and the weird gutter across the back is distracting.

Mr. Hodgins said with Haag's structure, the backdrop is trees.

Mr. Coney said the Haag structure fades away.

Ms. Barker asked if a roof could be added to existing structure.

Mr. Richards said there are two possibilities: 1) keep existing, modify to add a roof; 2) demolish and reintroduce structure close to Olmsted intent.

Mr. Freitas asked if it would be actual alignment rather than intent.

Mr. Richards said there was an option further north that was shown a couple years ago.

Mr. Kiel suggested putting the Gould building back.

Mr. Freitas said it is more intentional and you could make as compelling an argument for putting back the Gould building as constructing the proposed design.

Mr. Chalana said the Haag structure is on the same level of Olmsted in the 20th Century. He said don't take liberties with his work without exploring how it could be retrofitted. He said homelessness, graffiti, gay cruising – design won't fix any of those things. He said to try to make it functional. He said to see Haag's drawings to understand his thinking about it. He said it was purposefully minimalistic.

Mr. Guo left at 7:15 pm.

Mr. Bradley said what he is hearing from the board is to come back with analysis to convert existing or demolish it and how to offer mitigating improvement to Olmsted landscape.

Ms. Doherty said to study design options and rehabilitation .

Mr. Kiel noted Mr. Chalana's suggestion to improve it.

022019.5 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator