



The City of Seattle

# Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 316/18

## MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting  
City Hall  
600 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room  
Wednesday June 6, 2018 - 3:30 p.m.

### Board Members Present

Manish Chalana  
Russell Coney  
Kathleen Durham  
Rich Freitas  
Garrett Hodgins  
Jordon Kiel  
Kristen Johnson  
Nicole McKernan  
Julianne Patterson

### Staff

Sarah Sodt  
Erin Doherty  
Melinda Bloom

### Absent

Deb Barker  
Steven Treffers

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

### **060618.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

April 18, 2018

MM/SC/KJ/JP

abstained.

5:0:2 Minutes approved. Ms. Durham and Mr. Freitas

### **060618.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

060618.21 Roosevelt High School  
1410 NE 66<sup>th</sup> Street  
Proposed portable classrooms

Mr. Kiel recused himself.

Paul Dorn, Rolluda Architects, explained the need for two double portables and said they will be located in the northwest portion of the parking lot. He said there are six on site in the same area now, and the new will be painted to match what is there: light gray with green trim and charcoal black shingles.

Mr. Freitas asked why they are not grouped together in the same way as the others.

Mr. Dorn said they wanted to have the least impact on the parking lot and also provide safe passage between these and the other portables.

Ms. Patterson asked if all portables would be removed in 2019.

Mr. Dorn said yes.

Ms. Doherty noted that student enrollment numbers are always fluctuating, and that on some occasions the removal dates at other sites had been extended. She said this application has no deadline noted.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Doherty read Mr. Coney's comments from ARC meeting in which he said what is proposed is essentially short term, reasonable, and easily reversible.

Board Discussion:

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed portable classrooms at Roosevelt High School, 1410 NE 66<sup>th</sup> Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed portable classrooms do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Report on Designation (LPB 180/02) as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property and is easily removed in the future without impairment to the historic property, as per Standard #10 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/KJ/GH          6:0:1    Motion carried. Mr. Kiel recused himself.

*Mr. Chalana arrived at 3:40 pm.*

060618.22 Madison Middle School  
3429 45<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW  
Proposed portable classrooms

Mr. Kiel recused himself.

*Mr. Coney arrived at 3:43 pm.*

Paul Dorn, Rolluda Architects, explained the need for four single portables to accommodate increased enrollment. He said that two will go in flat section of grass area and two in the north parking lot. He said they are trying to mitigate the impact on the parking overall. They are taking advantage of one of the few level spots on the grassy area. Portables are tan with white trim. He was not sure of the length of time they will be needed.

Ms. Patterson asked about southwest section behind additional building.

Mr. Dorn said the additional building is the gym, beyond that is a steep slope. He said they considered the southeast site, but more parking stalls would be used.

Mr. Chalana asked about the timeline of the portables as it is not a permanent solution.

Mike Barrett, Seattle Public Schools, said another reason to not site them on the west is that there is planning underway as part of the BEX levy for a new addition there. If enrollment capacity doesn't decrease, that addition will be needed. The levy is a six-year time frame.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Johnson reported that ARC understood the grading challenges at this site.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed portable classrooms at Madison Middle School, 3429 45<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed portable classrooms do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Report on Designation (LPB 18/02) as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property and is easily removed in the future without impairment to the historic property, as per Standard #10 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/RC/GH            8:0:1    Motion carried. Mr. Kiel recused himself.

060618.23 Pacific-Ford McKay Buildings  
601 Westlake Avenue North  
Proposed signage

Ms. Sodt explained that bolts were anticipated as part of reconstruction and the proposed signage is making use of those existing attachment points.

Steve Zamberlin, National Sign, explained the proposed sign for the main anchor tenant. He indicated the placement on the building. He said the fabrication is reversed pan aluminum letters; the sign has a 3” depth. There will be exposed neon on face of letters. The sign will project out perpendicular. There will be exposed red neon; black aluminum fabrication. He explained that the building construction planned for commercial tenants and put in stud anchors underneath that ties into concrete structure. He said that panels come off in three places for installation.

Ms. Patterson asked how far off is the sign from the terra cotta trim.

Mr. Zamberlin said it is more flush at the fascia than appearing in photos. He said they are on the same plane.

Ms. Patterson asked if all three attachments are needed.

Mr. Zamberlin said they are.

Mr. Chalana asked about the character of the sign.

Mr. Zamberlin said the color and font is based on the tenant’s brand and logo.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Coney said it is reversible, planned for and not impactful to historic fabric.

Ms. Patterson expressed concern about coverage of architectural features. She suggested moving it up or down a few inches so centered.

Ms. McKernan and Mr. Hodgins agreed.

Ms. Sodt suggested having staff review to verify sign will be below corbelling.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed signage with dimensional refinements to staff for review and approval.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed signage does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Designation Report, as the proposed signage is compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/JP/NM 9:0:0 Motion carried.

060618.24 Chiarelli-Dore House  
843 NE 100<sup>th</sup> Street  
Proposed exterior alterations and addition

Craig McNary, owner, explained the proposed project in detail and noted the addition was needed to accommodate his growing family. He explained when he bought the house it was in disrepair; he found mold, decay and had to replace all electrical and plumbing.

Leah Martin, Allied 8, discussed the views to the house from various perspectives and the expansion alternatives explored. She explained the desire to build above to not impact the root zone of critical adjacent trees. The original house is 1,700 square feet; the addition is 450 square feet. Addition was added over family room toward back of house; it nestles into the trees and will have very low presence. She said the area is densely wooded and the experience of a second story is diminished. Overall ceiling heights will remain the same between new and old. She said they looked at a lateral addition but thought the second story addition is the best to preserve the house and land. She said that putting a cap on the house protects the experience of the land from within the house. The addition will be painted to match original house.

She said they created a stretch of wall that was slightly configuration; the door used to go out a different façade. There is a change of grade.

Mr. Chalana asked about the addition concept because it changes the historic typology. He asked if they considered design that would contrast from original house.

Ms. Martin said they wanted it to still feel like a low-slung house as seen from the street, and how you experience the entry.

Ms. Johnson said the house is modest as is the addition; differentiation of materials might call unwanted attention to it.

Mr. Freitas said the design should be commended for preserving the landscape; it is remarkable.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

ARC felt this was the best solution as recounted by Mr. Kiel.

Ms. Martin said the layout of windows may shift slightly depending on the manufacturer.

Ms. Patterson wished they could keep the lower window rather than the door to maintain as much historic fabric as possible.

Ms. Durham agreed.

Ms. Patterson thanked the owner for being such a great steward. She said it is the best solution from her perspective.

Mr. Kiel said the door change is OK to him.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed addition at the Chiarelli-Dore House, 843 NE 100<sup>th</sup> Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed addition does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 124425 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/GH/JP            9:0:0    Motion carried.

**060618.3            NOMINATION**

060618.31            First Evangelical Church & Parsonage / Re-evaluation Counseling  
165 Valley Street / 719 Second Avenue North

Ellen Mirro, The Johnson Partnership, presented via PowerPoint (full report in DON file). She said the owner wants to know the status of the building as they will be selling the property. She provided context of the building and site and conducted a virtual walk around the building interior and exterior. She discussed alterations to the church and parsonage buildings. She said John Bachmann was the builder on permit; the architect is unknown. She said that Van Horn and Van Horn Architects did the remodel when the building changed from a church to the space for Re-Evaluation Counseling. She provided context of the church typology and its development in Seattle. She noted the 'church row' on this avenue. She described the architectural style for the church and parsonage and provided other examples.

She provided a brief overview of Van Horne & Van Horne Architects. She didn't think that any of the designation standards applied.

Public Comment:

Michael Herschensohn, Queen Anne Historical Society, supported Staff Recommendation for criteria C and D. He thought some of Ms. Mirro's examples were not relevant or related to churches in Seattle of this era. He said the location is interesting and the site is distinct. He thought Criterion F may also apply. He said the church is definitely important to the community.

Leanne Olsen, Queen Anne Historical Society, supported nomination. She said she thinks of it as vernacular architecture and it is becoming rare to see these examples survive. She thought the alterations from the 1970s have their own significance for that era of preservation and adaptive reuse.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Coney supported nomination to have further assessment of exterior of both buildings. He said the building is prominent.

Mr. Hodgins did not support nomination and said the loss of the steeple is unfortunate. He said the parsonage has been significantly altered.

Ms. Patterson supported nomination and wanted to know more about the pattern book churches of which this is an example.

Mr. Freitas did not support nomination and didn't think it met the standards. He said Mr. Jackins' history is interesting under Criterion B.

Ms. Durham said she supports preservation of vernacular architecture but was concerned about integrity. She did not support nomination.

Ms. Johnson did not support nomination and said there were too many alterations.

Ms. McKernan did not support nomination and said it is not a good architectural example.

Mr. Chalana did not support nomination and noted it was a tough decision. He thought both buildings have lost integrity and the ability to convey significance.

Mr. Kiel did not support nomination.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the former First Evangelical Church & Parsonage at 165 Valley Street / 719 Second Avenue North 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 exteriors of the buildings; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for July 18, 2018; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/JP/RC                      2:7:0    Motion failed. Mmes. Durham, Johnson, McKernan, Messrs. Chalana, Freitas, Hodgins, Kiel opposed.

**060618.4**

**BRIEFING**

060618.41

Coliseum (Key Arena) / Bressi Garage  
305 Harrison Street / 226-232 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue North  
Briefing on proposed addition, alterations, and rehabilitation

Briefing materials in DON file. Following are board and public questions and comments.

Geoff Cheong, Populous Architects; Rico Quirindongo, DLR Group; and Gareth Loveridge, Swift Company presented.

Team provided a brief overview of the project site and the tunnel under the Bressi Garage.

Mr. Cheong explained the structural south pylon of the arena and the necessity for structural alterations, increasing the depth of bearing down through the new bowl level.

Mr. Cheong explained the need to remove most if not all of the arena curtain wall during construction. He said their current plan is to thoroughly document it, deconstruct it and store it during construction, and reconstruct the original framing, incorporating a new insulated glass assembly. He said they are still studying glass options.

Mr. Cheong described their Northeast intervention at the International Fountain Pavilion to incorporate mechanical exhaust and egress from the bowl below. He said they proposed to deconstruct 40' of the south end and reconstruct 30' of it with proposed alterations. They are trying to shift the egress doors north so that the area of exiting does not conflict with an existing large tree.

He said the Southeast and South (ticket office) interventions have not changed since the last briefing.

Mr. Cheong noted that the Southwest intervention had grown a bit. He explained the security need for locating all vents 12' above the walking surface. He said they are still studying cladding options and showed a warm gray concrete panel vs. a blue/silver metal panel.

Mr. Cheong explained that they are still looking at alternatives for the Northwest intervention at the south end of the Northwest Rooms (currently KEXP). Scheme A includes a separate volume for the egress and ventilation. Scheme B proposed to extend the building by 10' and have a smaller separate building which is shorter and narrower than Scheme A. Scheme C was still in flux, but they estimated a proposed 20-30' extension to the building, with no additional separate building.

Mr. Chalana asked if Scheme B addition could slide beneath the ramp.

Mr. Cheong said it would be in conflict with the concourse level below.

Mr. Loveridge showed the early concept for the courtyard north of the arena acknowledging that it will likely change as the discussion with Seattle Center continues.

Ms. Patterson and Mr. Chalana asked about deconstruction at the Fountain Pavilion and asked if there are other options.



Mr. Cheong said it is really necessary to build what is needed below but said they can continue to study how it is done.

Public Comment: there was no public comment.

Ms. Johnson likes to keep the end of Northwest Rooms (KEXP) clean.

The board members offered mixed feedback on Northwest options C, versus A and B. The majority said they should try to mitigate a separate addition in some way.

Ms. Johnson and Ms. Patterson – questioned the cladding materials, orientations, etc. for the new stand-alone (egress/ventilation) building interventions.

Mr. Kiel was concerned about the durability of metal panel cladding.

Mr. Kiel said they are not achieving the proposed “bracket effect” at the southwest corner. He thinks the tree grid should literally reinstate the former corner building.

Ms. Patterson was opposed to Northeast intervention. She did not think that they should shorten the International Fountain Pavilion and did not like storefront proposed for the west wall.

Ms. Johnson said she was OK with losing 10’ at the northeast but thinks the overall design proposal is awkward. She supported the big moves for the north courtyard.

Ms. McKernan expressed concerned about the height of the Southwest building. She would like to see more vines on the egress/ventilation buildings. She agreed with Ms. Patterson’s comments about cladding materials and orientation of the new building interventions and would like to see a more common language to the site guardrails (maybe not metal tube).

Mr. Chalana said they should maintain the original rhythm of the International Fountain pavilion structure. He did not like the proposed design intervention.

Mr. Coney said he is apprehensive about LED panels on the new buildings.

Mr. Hodgins and Ms. Johnson said they are OK with it.

Mr. Freitas said he liked the LED panels and metal panels. The vines might be OK as a backdrop.

Mr. Kiel said he thinks overall that the project is looking good.

**060618.5 STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator