



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 693/17

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

600 4th Avenue

L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room

Wednesday, September 20, 2017 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker

Russell Coney

Kathleen Durham

Garrett Hodgins

Robert Ketcherside

Jordon Kiel

Kristen Johnson

Nicole McKernan

Julianne Patterson

Steven Treffers

Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Melinda Bloom

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

092017.1

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

July 5, 2017

MM/SC/DB/JB

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

July 19, 2017

MM/SC/DB/RK

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

092017.2 SPECIAL TAX VALUATIONS

092017.21 Ballard Avenue Landmark District
5304-5310 Ballard Avenue NW

Ms. Sodt explained the incentive program. She said \$1,877,447.14 costs were submitted; none were disallowed. Description and photos of work performed were provided to board members for review. She said the work was performed in conformance with Certificate of Approval issued by the Ballard Avenue Landmark District Board.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker thanked the owner, Mike Peck, for doing the work.

Action: I move that the Ballard Avenue Landmark District Board recommend to the Landmarks Preservation Board to approve the following property for Special Tax Certification: 5304-5310 Ballard Ave NW. This action is based upon the criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; and based on the review and approval of the building exterior renovation by the Ballard Avenue Landmark District Board; that the property is a contributing building located in the Ballard Avenue Landmark District, and has not been altered in any way that adversely affects those features that identify its significance or contribution to the Ballard Avenue Landmark District; that the property has been issued Certificates of Approval as required in the Ballard Avenue Landmark District; and has substantially improved in the 24-month period prior to application, and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Local Review Board as required by Title 84 RCW, Chapter 449.

MM/SC/ST/RC 10:00 Motion carried.

092017.22 Ballard Avenue Landmark District
5333-5335 Ballard Avenue NW

Ms. Sodt said \$436,432.36 in costs were submitted; none were disallowed. Description and photos of work performed were provided to board members for review. She said the work was performed in conformance with Certificate of Approval issued by the Ballard Avenue Landmark District Board. She said that costs associated with new addition were not eligible.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Board members had enough information to make a decision.

Approval of Rehab Work: Work performed in conformance with Certificate of Approval issued by the Ballard Avenue Landmark District Board.

Action: I move that the Ballard Avenue Landmark District Board recommend to the Landmarks Preservation Board to approve the following property for Special Tax Certification: 5333-5335 Ballard Ave NW. This action is based upon the criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; and based on the review and approval of the building exterior renovation by the Ballard Avenue Landmark District Board; that the property is a contributing building located in the Ballard Avenue Landmark District, and has not been altered in any way that adversely affects those features that identify its significance or contribution to the Ballard Avenue Landmark District; that the property has been issued Certificates of Approval as required in the Ballard Avenue Landmark District; and has substantially improved in the 24-month period prior to application, and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Local Review Board as required by Title 84 RCW, Chapter 449.

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

092017.23

Fischer Studio Building
1519 Third Avenue

Ms. Sodt explained that much of the work was reviewed administratively; most was plumbing, elevator, stairs, mechanical overrun and interiors. She said \$2,726,746.36 in costs were submitted; none were disallowed. Work for designated portions of the property was performed in conformance with Certificates of Approval issued by the Landmarks Preservation Board.

Mr. Treffers asked about items not under control that were included.

Ms. Sodt said systems that are critical to keeping a building in good use; work is done in conformance with Certificate of Approval; and she has reviewed spreadsheets.

Megan Kruse, owner representative, said they were sporadically without plumbing during the work. She said it is a 104-year-old building.

Ms. Sodt said it is a nice building.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: the Fischer Studio Building, 1519 Third Avenue, that this action is based upon criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; that this property has been substantially improved in the 24-month period

prior to application; and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Landmarks Preservation Board and the owner.

MM/SC/RC/JP 10:00 Motion carried.

092017.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

092017.31 Harvard-Belmont Landmark District
1137 Harvard Ave E
Proposed landscape alterations

Garrett Devere explained that landscape would be removed to reveal the architecture of the house and they would put in what best replicates the era of 1910 landscape. He said they will remove features that were installed in 2000. He said five Flowering Cherry trees are diseased per arborist report and will be removed. He said that existing planter beds will be removed and replaced with lawn. He said that rhodies in planting beds will be replaced with Pierce Japonica which fits the era of the building. He said they will keep the boxwoods. He said the side yards are overgrown; they will keep the rhodies and remove some understory. He said the planting strip is barren and they will infill that.

Ms. Barker asked about the size of the Japonica.

Mr. Devere said they will be maintained at 3'.

Mr. Kiel asked how they decided on plantings.

Mr. Devere said the picked plants that were commonly used at the time.

Ms. Patterson did a site review and said you can't see the yard because of the hedge in front. She said everything proposed makes sense. She said the plantings now are covering the windows. She said they picked great replacement plants. She said the Harvard Belmont Committee was supportive.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Coney asked about owner.

Mr. Devere said the new owner has been there two years and has restored the interior.

Ms. Barker noted the great choices.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board issue a Certificate of Approval for Landscaping in the front yard including removal 5 diseased cherry trees and adding additional plants and removal of non-original brick edging at 1137 Harvard Ave E.

The proposed exterior alterations meet the following sections of the District ordinance and The Harvard Belmont District Guidelines:

District ordinance

The proposed landscaping plans as presented September 20, 2017 do not adversely affect the special features or characteristics of the district as specified in SMC 25.22.

The other factors of SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable

The Harvard Belmont District Guidelines

2. The Block

Guideline: Maintain yard space, especially that of front and side yards visible from the street.

Protect or add trees and landscaping to help reinforce yard edges.

Additional planting is proposed. Trees that are not diseased will remain. Existing plantings at the edge remain and additional planting is proposed.

3. Landscaping:

Guideline: Maintain existing landscaping, especially the mature trees.

Mature trees that are not diseased will remain.

Guideline: Keep the space between sidewalk and street as a green planting space maintaining the same width wherever possible. Ground covers may be used in place of grass. Do not use crushed rock, concrete or similar materials as the major surface material.

Street trees will remain and the underplanting will be supplemented with additional planting.

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

092017.32

University Library
5009 Roosevelt Way NE
Proposed tree removal

Ms. Doherty explained that dead tree needs to be removed; arborist report says they think it may be due to a mold. She said the Copper Beech is an

exceptional tree and it will remain; she pointed out the location of the tree proposed to be removed, and the location of the removal previously approved.

Mr. Kiel suggested not planting new until they figure out what is in the soil that may have contributed.

Ms. Johnson said the tree looks very unhealthy.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed tree removal at the University Library, 5009 Roosevelt Way NE, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed tree removal does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 121104, as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, 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/RC/KJ 10:0:0 Motion carried.

092017.33

Eitel Building

1501 Second Avenue

Proposed storefront design revisions

Matt Aalfs said they got a Certificate of Approval in March. He said there are now changes to the design due to SDCI permit review including proposed windows at storefront, height of sill, entry doors, sign, and glass and steel entry canopy details. He said some mechanical changes were necessary to make changes to ventilation system. He said on the south façade they changed the height of the door and the break-up of the sliding doors to four panels instead of three. He noted change in mullion detail and change from aluminum storefront to Pella wood aluminum clad. He said they raised the sill height to work with interior use. He provided side by side comparison of canopy changes; now there will be a smaller section frame with tension rods carried up higher and attach directly to canopy. He said attachment is via a rod drilled through faceplate and secure to steel angle inside. He said there will be limited impact to masonry façade. He said the sign will be smaller now. The non-original sheet metal band will be removed and the sign will be made smaller. They will use individual lit letters.

Mr. Hodgins asked about the curve over canopy.

Mr. Aalfs said there will be no change to historic material other than being cleaned and restored.

Mr. Coney asked if the interior of the restaurant is one level.

Mr. Aalfs said it is and the hotel lobby is up about 4'.

Mr. Coney said the new windows seem closer to historic ones.

Ms. Patterson asked if the profile of the window is similar to original.

Mr. Aalfs said it is a wood window and a little different.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Leanne Olson, Queen Anne Historical Society, liked the new fenestration but liked the old canopy treatment better.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Kiel said ARC noted the storefront changes are in keeping with the original proposal and talked about the canopy; it meets the standards and reduces sight planes. He supported the proposal and said it doesn't detract; it is clear, new, reversible, and emphasized it is a new insertion.

Mr. Treffers concurred and said it is worth crossing the cornice for what is gained.

Ms. Barker concurred.

Mr. Hodgins noted it is a reduction in rod size.

Ms. Sodt noted that during construction stairs were found.

Ms. Barker appreciated consulting with the restaurant regarding interior use which prompted window rework.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations, at the Eitel Building, 1501 Second Avenue.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Ordinance No. **123534** as the proposed work does not destroy

historic materials that characterize the property, and is compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.

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

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

Mr. Aalfs will send updated drawing and packet to Ms. Sodt.

092017.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

092017.41 Pacific Architect & Builder
1945 Yale Place East

Ms. Doherty read through the signed agreement.

Ms. Barker asked if TDR would be available.

Ms. Doherty said that TDR is not available at this location. She said it could apply if TDR is available in the future. She said the owner is making a substantial investment in the property now which they hope will be enough to meet the Special Tax Valuation requirement.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to approve Controls and Incentives for the Pacific Architect & Builder Building, 1945 Yale Place East.

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

092017.5 DESIGNATION

092017.51 Seven Gables Theatre
911 NE 50th Street

Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill, explained the presentation would respond to questions board members had at the nomination meeting.

David Peterson provided an opinion letter to board members and additional information (in DON file). He explained that the building was constructed for the American Legion in 1925; it was the first local post to develop its own building, others are tenants. He said that except for West Seattle, other early local post buildings have been demolished. He said the 1937 image is the earliest one he found and early renderings differ from what was built. He said that architect Eric Rising was a member of this post and this is one of his earliest architectural works.

Changes made to the building while the American Legion was still there included flattening of floor, shrunk windows, porch arrangement changed. Randy Finley purchased the building in 1975 and converted it to a theater. Alterations included reversal of space back to auditorium use, sloped floor was added, windows filled in and screen added. He said per 1980's images windows were switched out with upper aluminum frame windows dug into frame a bit to make them fit; the south elevation on the porch was filled in.

Mr. Peterson said that as originally designed and constructed, the subject building featured many of the identifying characteristics of the Tudor Revival style, but it has been altered over time. Remaining qualities in the subject building which reflect the style include the steeply pitched roof with clipped gables; the decorative bargeboard and half-timbering at the east elevation large gable; brick stair "tower" element with shaped parapet on the east elevation; and the brick and shingle cladding. He said that the style was popular from 1890 – 1930 and was used mostly for residential. He said that two storefronts are in original condition.

He said that primary access to the second or main floor of the building is through the recessed porch on the north elevation. The entry leads into a small vestibule retains original wainscoting on the wall opposite the ticket counter. The vestibule leads through an arched opening into a memorial hall. The concessions counter is where the dining room was. At the east end of the corridor is a flight of three steps giving access to a vaulted sitting lounge. The sitting lounge features a high ceiling, large windows. Beyond the south wall of this room are rooms used as office and storage space. The interior of the movie theater auditorium features a vaulted ceiling with original decorative ceiling beams, but the rest of the room dates to the 1975 remodel. The screen backdrop is a mural by David Russell, dated 1975.

Mr. Peterson said that Eric Rising came to Seattle in 1921 and worked for himself. He designed a couple apartment buildings and the Bergonian but his claim to fame was that he was an early employee of NBBJ and he became a partner in the 1960s.

Responding to board member requests for additional information, Mr. Peterson said he found nothing significant about this American Legion Post and noted it was absorbed into Post 1 due to declining membership. He said regarding early art house cinema history, in 1956 Ridgemont Theater (demolished) was owned by Jim Selvidge and was a non-Hollywood model that offered low budget movies. He said that foreign language and art house theaters were common in the 1950s and associated with films by Bergman, Truffaut and that more films were coming out of Europe. He said the Harvard Exit Theater, established in 1969 by Jim Osteen was leased space. When the theater left it reverted back to the Women's Century Club. He said that

building “use” becomes problematic in landmarking. He said the oldest art house theater is the Grand Illusion / The Movie House.

He said that Randy Finley, owner of Seven Gables Theaters, won his lawsuit about restraint of trade. He said that he couldn't find much information on Eric Rising's military service but noted he worked in Naval construction. He said there is a 1928 Tudor Revival building on Bainbridge Island that operates as a theater. He said that David Russell worked on major films including the Star Wars series. He does story boards now for movies; he did Moulin Rouge. He lives in Australia now.

Mr. Peterson said that all upper windows have been changed as have those in the commercial spaces. He said the building does not meet criteria A, B, D, E, or F. He said that it doesn't meet Criterion C because the building was constructed by the American Legion as a meeting hall. When altered to a theater in 1975 that integrity was lost. He said it is not the first or oldest art house theater.

Mr. McCullough said that it isn't a theater anymore – it closed. He said nothing tells the story of the American Legion; the building is a pastiche of styles. He said nothing conveys theater use and it won't be a theater again. He said the integrity is gone; the loss of windows is significant. He said it doesn't meet criteria A or B and, regarding E, Rising has better work.

Mr. Treffers appreciated the additional research but noted the building is the first purpose-built American Legion Hall in Seattle.

Ms. Barker concurred.

Mr. Kiel said people belonged to clubs and asked if the American Legion was a notable one.

Mr. Peters said no. He said that multiple groups are a subset of military veteran organizations such as the VFW, Masons, Shriners, Elks, Eagles, and Lions.

Mr. Treffers noted the American Legion was instrumental in the support of the GI Bill after WWII.

Mr. Peterson said that the national organization was behind the major initiatives for the GI Bill and anti-communism.

Public Comment:

Leanne Olson, Queen Anne Historical Society, said it is unique; it was built to fit in to the neighborhood. She said it was the first in Seattle, it was purpose-built and it is a cool design.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker thanked Mr. Peterson for the detail. She supported designation on criteria C and D and suggested F as well. She said it is distinctive at this corner and contrasts with adjacent buildings with different materials, textures, and roof form. She said that the building was the American Legion's first purpose-built hall to meet in. She said its second history as a theater is significant and the theater continued the community experience.

Mr. Hodgins said he was unsure but thought that it met Criterion C. He said the Seven Gables was the registered headquarters for the company which had an important impact on the film scene here. He said the Seven Gables was an independent art house theater that inspired film enthusiasts. He noted the theater, books, and Scarecrow Video, which is of national significance.

Ms. Durham supported designation on Criterion C. She said she couldn't argue for American Legion's affiliation with the building but that she could with the theater / art house film industry. She said SIFF is one of the largest in the country and has a thriving art house enthusiast group. She noted changes to the building and said its significance is post-1975.

Ms. Patterson supported designation on Criterion C. She said it's significance lies in its association with the first purpose-built American Legion Hall in Seattle even though it is no longer serving that purpose. She said that fraternal and community organizations are not as popular as they used to be. She said the creation of this building for this post in the University District is connected to veterans coming back and going to college. She said the interior is not as significant because of the changes.

Mr. Treffers supported designation based on Criterion C and said there are two levels of double significance. He said the American Legion was a significant organization within the history of the nation. He noted the effort to build a purpose-built structure and raising funds and building it was not easy. He said there have been changes to the interior but interiors change. He said the exterior looks the same as it did in 1925, 1975. He said the art house connection is significant as well. He noted the connection to the University District, counter culture, and how it inspired artists and musicians. He said it meets Criterion D in that it does embody its style; windows are not the key character defining element – the clipped gable roofs convey the style. He said it meets Criterion F.

Mr. Coney concurred. He said that he was unsure but leaning toward supporting designation. Regarding Criterion C, he said that a building doesn't have to scream American Legion and it is still the first purpose-built American Legion hall in Seattle. He said that the perpetuation of art house theaters is significant. He noted that had Finley not won the suit this would not have been an art house theater. He said lesser known Hollywood films were shown there as well. Art house theaters is a big part of establishment of SIFF. He said the distinct character of the style is evident. He said the building may meet Criterion F and said it doesn't really stand out, yet it is across from a historic library.

Mr. Ketcherside supported designation and said that the roof form is the most distinct feature of the building; the first thing you see is the geometry of the roofline. He said the theater and the company were named Seven Gables. He said the building met criteria C, D, and F. He said a landmark does not have to be the best or highest; it is significantly associated with a significant part of cultural aspect of the community. He said more than that at a regional level, the Seven Gables chain of art house cinema were significant to the community and to the City and state. He said it is a clear landmark as you move through the neighborhood; it stands out as a landmark.

Ms. Durham left at 5:25 pm.

Ms. McKernan did not support designation. She said while the American Legion association is significant, there are integrity issues. She said the interior has changed. She said criteria D and F are the strongest; this is not the best example of Tudor Revival. She noted the significance of the building to the neighborhood.

Ms. Johnson did not support designation although she said it feels like a landmark. She said the Seven Gables business was named after the roof. She said it would be a stretch to meet the criteria. She said the American Legion association is significant but there are others. She questioned if the building could convey its association as a purpose-built building for American Legion and / or its association as art house theater. She said it was built and continued as a gathering space; the interior conveyed that and has changed.

Mr. Kiel said it is a nice old building with a story like anything else of this vintage. He said American Legion was significant but being the first purpose-built post is not a big deal; other clubs existed as well. He said it doesn't rise to the level of significance. He said it is not the first, last or best art house theater.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Seven Gables Theatre at 911 NE 50th Street / 4753-4759 Roosevelt Way NE as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based

upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C, D and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the exterior of the building.

MM/SC/JP/DB 6:3:0 Motion carries. Mmes. Johnson, McKernan, and Mr. Kiel opposed.

092017.6 NOMINATION

092017.61 Broad Street Substation
319 6th Avenue North

Maureen Barnes, Seattle City Light (SCL), said they applied for street vacation for this active substation. She said they added more equipment and said the substation distributes electricity and is a major hub for the region.

Susan Boyle, BOLA, presented the report (full report in DON file). She provided context of the neighborhood. She said that there is an annex to the west; when the viaduct is down and the tunnel is in use, the streets will re-connect. She said SCL has a rich history and noted the public-private power struggle in the teens. She said that architecturally the earlier building was modeled on classical buildings; it was monumental and symbolically represented power. By mid-century, Modernism took hold with demonstrated cubic, raw concrete, and simple Moderne.

She said the site is at the far north part of the third regrade. It was once populated by small residences. She noted the post war changes, new development, World's Fair influence, and larger buildings in the 2000s. She said that lots of different development urges were not realized. She said that Aurora is the main thoroughfare. In the 1950s the area was inexpensive, with light industry.

Ms. Boyle said there is more underground at the substation than there is above ground. The crane tower is a three-part building with shops in curvilinear section; equipment was brought in to do repairs. She noted the changing architecture to Moderne with simple, direct, with small tendencies toward style, the way the concrete is scored.

She said Ivan Palmaw was the architect and was best known for two local Russian cathedrals, St. Spiridon and St. Nicholas. His most celebrated work, per DAHP's Michael Houser, is the early 1940s Streamline Moderne Renton Fire Station.

Ms. Boyle presented a 1991 site plan which is consistent with the original layout. She noted the more varied perimeter, the original switchyard and the perimeter walls. She said the Control Building is 4000 square feet with prominent entry on the east. She said that stairs lead up to the 2nd level. The building is concrete with bands on façade, cast fluting of columns that surround entry, and banded and singular windows. She described the faceting, heaviness, deep reveals, flat bar system of railing, heavy pattern doors with square pattern. She said the inside is utilitarian. She noted the tall volume of the Crane Tower and said it joins the shop area. She noted the curvilinear sectioned office and the lower height pump room. She noted the detailed grid on the building and said the East façade is simple with larger windows. She said the west façade has decorative elements,

“rustication” and raised square within grid. She said there are taller windows at the lower section. She said there has been some spalling and cracking on concrete. She noted the recessed door into the office space, east side small pump room, and quarter circular canopy. She provided surrounding context and noted many changes have taken place in the area. She said there was a fencing change – it is chain link and tubular steel public art. She noted the catwalks and crane-way.

She said that criteria C, D, E, and F were not met. The building is more typical of – rather than embodies - an operating station and switchyard. She said it is not a good example of Palmaw’s work which is better exemplified by the churches and fire stations. She said it would not meet F because it is a question if the circumstances of the moment make it visible and if it would remain so.

Mr. Hodgins asked about lot lines.

Ms. Boyle indicated such on the site plan.

Ms. Doherty provided a map and said the full legal parcel includes the part across the street. She explained the recommendation in the Staff Report.

Ms. Boyle said the nomination application was prompted by SEPA because of street use. She said the substation is still operating and will continue to operate; there are no plans to change anything.

Matt Voight said there is a project in development to pick up the northwest corner of land and to restore the lot to its natural boundary.

Ms. Doherty said the triangular pieced of land is not part of the current legal parcel.

Mr. Treffers said the crane tower seems unique...is it?

Ms. Boyle said it was made to repair large equipment components. It is unusual and is the only one like this in Seattle.

Mr. Voight said it is dated; the type of repairs it was built for you don’t do anymore.

Mr. Coney asked how it is used now.

Mr. Voight said it is used for storage and parking. He said transformers are oil filled and you needed to pump out the oil to work on them.

Ms. Barker asked about the size of transformers.

Mr. Voight said they are very large.

Ms. Johnson noted the Georgetown Steam Plant, and asked if this site is considered one that Seattle City Light is proud of.

Ms. Barnes said it is near and dear, but comparing the subject property to Georgetown is apples and oranges. She noted the innovation of the Georgetown Steam Plant, and said there are a number of others like Broad Street and they don’t have the same rich history.

They run under federal regulations and they change. She said it is a viable working substation and they have no plans to do anything.

Ms. Boyle said the Georgetown Steam Plant is a National Landmark.

Mr. Treffers asked if, regarding Criterion C, anything unique or innovative associated with this property.

Ms. Boyle said this is more about capacity and who it would serve. It seems to lose significance by being part of that time.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Patterson said she loves these buildings and noted Ms. Boyle's comment about visibility being circumstantial with so much going on right now. She said it looks like it is in a desert of its own. She supported nomination and noted criteria D and F; she said anything meeting Criterion F is bound to change.

Mr. Coney said it is a unique style and he has noticed it. He asked why it was being considered for nomination.

Ms. Doherty said the owner made the determination to nominate it.

Mr. Coney was ambivalent but said it meets the criteria. He said it is a unique style and noted Moderne and Brutalism.

Ms. Johnson supported nomination and said it is a good example of the style and she noted the beautiful work. She said you don't want to prevent the plant from doing work they need to do.

Mr. Hodgins said he wasn't convinced but noted the entry way could meet Criterion D. He commented on the Control Room, Crane Tower and shop room. He said that regarding Criterion F it tells the story of Broad Street which is no longer there.

Mr. Treffers supported nomination and noted Criterion D as relevant. He said it is a unique property and he wants to know more about the crane towers. He said the switchyard and lots are what tell the story; they all should be included and can be eliminated at designation.

Ms. Barker was uncertain; she said it is a mish-mash, but some individual buildings meet Criterion D. She wants to look at other stations. She said the fencing is off-putting.

Ms. Patterson said it is neither fair nor relevant to compare this site to Georgetown Steam Plant or Gas Works Park; they are different technologies.

Mr. Ketcherside that post-war architecture is not appreciated enough. He supported nomination and noted Criterion D.

Ms. McKernan supported nomination and noted Criterion D. She said that care was taken to design each elevation; she commented on the curved view into the station.

Mr. Kiel did not support nomination. He said it is an entry, an element, but doesn't embody anything. He said the substation technology is consistent with this era, but does not think the building is Streamline Moderne.

Ms. McKernan asked if the utility of the building is being limited by nomination.

Mr. Voight said it is all operating. The equipment is 65 years old and needs replacement. He said equipment now is different; if controlled it makes it difficult to operate.

Ms. Boyle said the buildings are more than adequate for what goes on there.

Mr. Voight said they are still working there and will as long as it can house and keep equipment dry. He said the crane was built as a piece of equipment to repair transformers that don't exist anymore.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Broad Street Substation at 319 6th 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: a portion of the site that includes Lots 1-4 and 9-12 on Block 66, and the vacated alley between these same lots; the exteriors of the Control and Crane Buildings; the switchyard tower directly west of the Crane Building and the trussed armature that connects this tower to the west face of the building; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for November 1, 2017; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/JP/RK 8:1:0 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel opposed.

092017.7 BRIEFING

092017.71 Coliseum (Key Arena) / Bressi Garage
319 6th Avenue North
Briefing on proposed addition, alterations, and rehabilitation

Briefing documents in DON file.

Ms. Sodt explained that the Seattle Design Commission will review the project as well. She said there are overlapping areas of interest and they will work with Staff.

Ms. Doherty went over areas designated: the Key Arena site and exterior of the building; the Northwest Rooms & International Fountain Pavilion are already landmarks and include their site and building exteriors; Bressi Garage building exterior, and the interior roof trusses and decking. The NASA Building, West Court Building, and Blue Spruce Apartments were not designated. She said that Thomas

Street divides the Key Arena from the Bressi Garage; the right of way is a green street and is not included in the landmark designations.

Rico Quirindongo, DLR Group, introduced the project and said they intent is to create a world class music, entertainment, sports, NBA, NHL facility.

Brian Surratt, Seattle Office of Economic Development, explained the RFP and selection process. He said they want to preserve the iconic status and both bidders presented ideas. He said they want to make sure the historic legacy is embedded in design while they double the size of the venue. He said they will integrate with the surrounding neighborhood and will create a pedestrian friendly, inviting space.

Jill Crary, Seattle Center, went over RFP, and explained the intent to create a world class center but meet Master Plan principles. She said the center will be for all ages, cultures, heritages. It will enliven all hours. They will preserve the international fountain and open spaces as the heart of the development; they will honor the historic character. She said it will be pedestrian friendly – now it is not; it will have legible pathways. She said the campus edges will be open to community; they will be inviting and festive. She said transportation planning is central to any development. She said Uptown is a growing urban center and they encourage diverse affordable housing. She said it will be a regional hub. They will value the history. Seattle Center is a vital part of the neighborhood. They need robust, multi-modal transportation, open space; it is an emerging arts and cultural district.

She explained how Key Arena was excavated and the floor lowered in the 1990s. They plan to restore it back to the original condition. The south plaza is now disconnected. The 1st Avenue N Parking garage, built as part of Key Arena renovation, will provide premium parking to support premium seats and suites.

Lance Lopes, Oak View Group, said they are committed to the preservation of the structure. The owners of the company renovated Madison Square Garden and The Forum to state of the art facilities.

Goeff Cheong, Populous, explained the general thinking behind the design and said today the square footage is 411,000 square feet; in 2020 that will be 680,000 square feet. He said the arena was originally designed around basketball. Their plan is start over beneath the existing roof, to revitalize the landmark; they will not compromise the design and will meet all professional standards. He said it will be a respectful transformation and humble next to the historic structure. He said they will honor the original design intent. It will be NHL and NBL compliant. It will have humble, low profile, integral, quiet character that it has today. He referenced a metaphor of a Hemlock tree.

He provided site analysis noting grade changes and said they will bring back the ability to interact with the building like one did originally. He said it meets 2008 Master Plan ideas and said they will open up pathways to make it more pedestrian accessible. Truck access is now off Thomas; they will move it out of sight, out of mind. He said Thomas will be reimagined as a pedestrian gateway; service side will be turned into new front door. The north side is a dark back alley and has no pedestrian connection into facility; it will be redesigned to be a transparent side of the

pavilion and bring in natural light. He said the north plaza will go right up to the glass of the building with views into the space.

Interior

He said the seating bowl will be longer to accommodate hockey geometry. He said they will reintroduce the 1962 design concept at the surface and expand below grade. He said queuing will be at the surface, entry. They will maintain access at the east and west, bring people into the lobby pavilion and then go underground; they took away the plaza gathering and event space. He said east and west will be left as is; they will move the entry lobby volume south to a new porous transparent front door on the south. The connection of the parking garage and arena is important for premium customers.

Atrium

The south edge will be pedestrian friend front door, maybe green space. They will continue to study how to minimize the roof to make it disappear. The loading dock and truck access will be at the south parcel, detached from arena site to support function area.

Ms. Cray said they will come back to discuss possible impacts to Bressi Garage and more details related to vehicle access.

Mr. Quirindongo said they are in concept design phase now and are looking for input from Landmarks Preservation Board and Design Commission members. He noted opportunity to work with Thomas Street Green Street. He said that design exploration has just started. He said that Oak View's intervention with existing buildings is much more respectful and it is an opportunity to move those ideas forward.

Public Comment:

Leanne Olson, Queen Anne Historical Society, said Uptown is within the Queen Ann area. She appreciated the leveling off and having access again. She urged caution with Atrium design and how it looks from other viewpoints. She likes the Thomas Street entry. She suggested re-using Thirty panels in entry.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Coney appreciated the light touch. He asked if there is enough square footage in the Atrium.

Mr. Cheong said there is.

Chris Carver, Populous, said they will try to shorten the atrium addition. They will take a hard look at how they work together; it is a big component of the design challenge. He said it is a new structure and they will look to how it relates to existing; they will minimize it as much as possible.

Mr. Coney said Thiry had his own design element regarding circulation. He said the 1995 changes were a detriment and he is glad they are restoring the original.

Mr. Hodgins asked how they are directing access.

Mr. Cheong said they are still evaluating that; they majority will go in through new civic foyer space.

Mr. Carver said they want it to work like performing art space where you come into the lobby. He explained proposed circulation routes.

Mr. Hodgins said the Atrium is important to connect the buildings and asked if they considered working with the form of the Northwest Rooms.

Mr. Carver said they will look at that. He said it is a small building – 130,000 square feet of the footprint. He said the south end will give a bit more help to get people in. He said they want a delicate, light touch.

Mr. Kiel said it is bracketed by the Northwest Rooms that redefines the northwest corner. He said they should be more assertive with glazing connection by Fisher Pavilion and noted it is a significant entry.

Ms. Barker asked what they mean by ‘revitalize the landmark’.

Mr. Lopes said they are working with the Department of the Interior to list the building on the National Register of Historic Places.

Mr. Cheong said in 1962 you entered through a turnstile. He said they want to transform the experience with façades that are approachable, like it used to be. It will be an approachable, pedestrian-friendly building.

Ms. Barker asked if they had looked at the southwest corner to understand what it has been, what it is and where it is going. She asked what analysis has been done. She said that Thomas is a dead street.

Mr. Cheong said they treated the southern plaza as a blank canvas. They are doing analysis as to what makes the most sense.

Ms. Barker asked where the light rail station is going.

Ms. Crary said it will be somewhere along Republican under the street right of way.

Mr. Treffers asked what is proposed on the north.

Mr. Carver said there are limits at the drip line of the building.

Mr. Lopes said lot line is right at the roof edge on the north side.

Ms. Crary said they kept the site at the roofline on the north end and they kept the north tunnel. She said they are still thinking about what the campus needs and how it will evolve.

Mr. Ketcherside said it looks reversible. She said at the Atrium there is a sense of loss – there is no Thiry “bracket” and the south end of the plaza. He said saving three facades may be enough.

Ms. Johnson said the original building has four sides. She asked what the mechanical exhaust will look like.

Mr. Carver said the “tripod” buttress on the south becomes a major element when you walk in. He said there is effort to express those inside the seat bowl.

Mr. Ketcherside said people will go straight in through the parking tunnel and will never experience the exterior of the Arena.

Ms. Barker said the City has a huge past with dirt; dirt in the wrong places, and moving dirt. She said that any other earth or dirt work shouldn’t be left off the table.

Gareth Loveridge, Swift Company, said there are subtle grading opportunities.

Ms. Patterson said she likes the raised ground plane and said it will allow interaction with the building. She asked if the Atrium will be where people funnel through and not experience the building. She said the worst case would be for people to go from car to parking garage to building with no experience of the building.

Mr. Cheong said it will be of benefit to provide flat, accessible plaza. He said this will allow dissipation of crowd in a gradual fashion. He said the stairs have been a limiting factor. He said from outside you can see into the seat bowl.

Mr. Loveridge said it is similar to how Occidental Mall works.

Mr. Cheong said the north end windows will bring daylight in.

Mr. Quirindongo said Susan Boyle is providing consultation on Federal Historic Tax Credits.

Ms. Doherty said today’s briefing was to test the waters for the siting and massing of an atrium addition and get Board input.

Mr. Treffers said they are on the right track.

Ms. Barker said the south area is a good idea. She asked if the Atrium will have a roof and how they propose to deal with Bressi Garage.

Mr. Coney asked about circulation on non-event days.

Mr. Cheong said it becomes open space. The east and west are open places and they are looking at how to create diverse experiences on the south and what does that become. He said they are looking at circulation around the site; they want to take down barriers and get people up close to the building.

092017.8 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator