



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 396/16

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

600 4th Avenue

L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room

Wednesday, July 6, 2016 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Marjorie Anderson

Deb Barker

Nick Carter

Kathleen Durham

Robert Ketcherside

Jordon Kiel

Kristen Johnson

Aaron Luoma, Chair

Jeffrey Murdock

Julianne Patterson

Matthew Sneddon

Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Rebecca Frestedt

Melinda Bloom

Absent

Mike Stanley

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

070616.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

May 18, 2016

MM/SC/DB/NC

8:0:1 Minutes approved. Mr. Murdock abstained.

June 1, 2016

MM/SC/JM/NC

8:0:1 Minutes approved as amended. Mr. Luoma abstained.

**Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods**

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Ms. Durham arrived at 3:34 pm.

070616.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

070616.21 Columbia City Landmark District
4908A Rainier Ave. S. – Weed Building
Proposed signage

Ms. Frestedt explained the application for proposed sign revisions to reflect the new name, Taproot Café & Bar. Signage includes new vinyl window decal, a new blade sign (using existing hardware) and a new wall sign. Exhibits reviewed included plans, photographs and samples. The Weed Building was constructed in 1909 and is a contributing building located within the Columbia City National Register District. The Landmarks Preservation Board approved a sidewalk café in 2015. The existing wall and window signs were approved in 2012. On June 7, 2016 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. Committee members supported the proposed colors and materials. There was a discussion about the size and proportions of the wall sign. Two of the Committee members stated that they didn't oppose the wall sign, but recommended exploring size options that would reduce the size of the sign and center the sign within the stucco bay. They stated that the exiting sign appears out of proportion with the sign area. Another member suggested exposing more of the stucco to "frame" the sign. The applicant submitted an alternative design for the wall sign on June 23rd. The applicant's preferred alternative is the version that was presented to the CCRC.

Applicant Comment:

Tiana Garrett, Jus Bar, said they have changed their name and logo and have made improvements. She said the dimensions and color are similar to what is there now. She said they didn't want to add new penetrations into the building by changing the proportions of the wall sign.

Mr. Luoma clarified that the applicant's initial proposal is the preferred alternative.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker said it is reasonable and good they are reusing existing holes. She asked if they were connected to Taproot Theater.

Ms. Garrett said no.

Mr. Ketcherside asked about sign in awning that hangs at angle.

Ms. Garrett said it drops down but the awning is angled.

It was noted that if the angle appeared askew, they could add another link to the chain to even it out.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signs located at 4908A Rainier Ave. S., for preferred size 78" x 36". This action is based on the following:

The proposed signs meet the following sections of the District ordinance, the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards:

Guidelines/Specific

11. Signs. All signs on or hanging from buildings or windows, or applied to windows, are subject to review and approval by the Review Committee and Board. Sign applications will be evaluated according to the overall impact, size, shape, texture, lettering style, method of attachment, color, and lighting in relation to the use of the building, the building and street where the sign will be located, and the other signs and other buildings in the District. The primary reference will be to the average pedestrian's eye-level view, although views into or down the street from adjacent buildings will be an integral feature of any review.

The intent of sign regulations is to ensure that signs relate physically and visually to their location; that signs reflect the character and unique nature of the business; that signs do not hide, damage, or obstruct the architectural elements of the building; that signs be oriented toward and promote a pedestrian environment; and that the products or services offered be the focus, rather than the signs.

- a. **Window Signs and Hanging Signs.** Generally, painted or vinyl letters in storefront windows and single-faced, flat surfaced painted wood signs are preferred. Extruded aluminum or plastics are discouraged and may not be allowed. Window signs shall not cover a large portion of the window so as to be out of scale with the window, storefront, or facade.
- b. **Blade Signs.** Blade signs (double-faced projecting signs hanging perpendicular to the building), that are consistent in design with District goals are encouraged. Blade signs shall be installed in a manner that is in keeping with other approved blade signs in the District. They shall not hide, damage, or obscure the architectural elements of the building. The size should be appropriately scaled for the building.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards #10

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

070616.22 Columbia City Landmark District
4901 Rainier Ave. S. – Hastings Building
Proposed signage, lighting and paint colors

Ms. Frestedt explained the application for proposed signage, exterior lighting and exterior paint colors. Exhibits included plans, photographs and samples. The Hastings Building was constructed in 1905. The building is considered an historic non-contributing building. The one-story building is clad in stucco on brick. The Landmarks Preservation Board approved Phase II of building renovations in March 2016. This included masonry, stucco repairs, seismic work, reconfiguration of storefronts, new door and window openings and the addition of a steel and glass canopy. In December

2015, the Board received a briefing that included discussion of paint colors and signage. On June 7, 2016 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application.

Ms. Frestedt said that Committee members supported the proposed paint colors and lighting. Discussion was mostly focused on the finish of the parapet-mounted light fixtures and signage, specifically the size and proposed PVC material for a wall sign on the north façade. The committee ultimately agreed that size of the sign for the north wall was appropriate, but the materials were not characteristic of the district. A recommendation was made to paint the sign onto the façade instead of adding a large plastic sign face. This was suggestion welcomed by the applicant.

The Committee made a unanimous recommendation to approve the application for paint colors, exterior lighting and signage, conditional on the finish of the parapet-mounted light fixtures being changed to black and painting the sign onto the north façade (rather than installing a vinyl-covered PVC sign face). The application materials reflect changes made in response to the Committee's recommendation.

Applicant Comment:

Richard Floisand, Floisand Studio, provided an overview of the project and noted that they had to upgrade the structural system along with the other planned work.

Ms. Anderson arrived at 3:40 pm.

Mr. Floisand went over lighting and colors. He summarized lighting styles over the past 80 years and chose lights that fit contextually in the neighborhood; they opted for a minimalist approach and size. He said lighting will allow the pilasters to be read throughout the night. He said that proposed signage is appropriate to the scale and use and is easily removable. He said the exterior color is a warm white – “Navaho White” with black trim and parapet. He went over signage details and locations per the sign plan – A3.1. He said Pagliacci logo will go on the parapet; vertical Pagliacci sign in window; custom fabricated brushed stainless letters will be front lit by small 2” x 2” luminary; cast aluminum letters 4” tall spell out Pagliacci with same as parapet lights shining down; and La Teranga will use existing blade signage on steel chain. Responding to questions he said the parapet lights are landscape lights that will be modified to work here.

Mr. Luoma asked if the column pilaster lights are dimmable.

Mr. Floisand said they could be but they are on a photo sensor to turn them on and off. He said it is subtle light that will highlight the structure; he said the lumens are small.

Mr. Luoma noted a preference for subtle lighting.

Mr. Murdock asked about finish on lights.

Mr. Floisand said the finish is a baked enamel; it is not an exact match to the paint but close enough.

Mr. Kiel asked what the CCRC board said about the vertical Pagliacci sign; he said it seems extraneous.

Ms. Frestedt said one Committee member echoed that sentiment but was ultimately supported by the Committee.

Mr. Floisand said the signage and lighting were designed for both pedestrian and vehicle traffic.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Sneddon said it is a non-contributing resource and what is proposed is reasonable.

Mr. Murdock agreed.

Mr. Luoma said the night renderings were helpful; the light is not over-glaring and it is subtle. He said he was glad the Committee recommended painting the logo on the façade – it is more compatible.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signs, lighting and paint colors located at 4901 Rainier Ave. S., as proposed. This action is based on the following:

The proposed exterior alterations meet the following sections of the District ordinance, the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards:

Relevant Columbia City Design Guidelines:

Guidelines/General

8. Emphasis should be given to maintaining the character of, and enhancing compatibility with, contributing buildings.

Guidelines/Specific

2. Building Materials and Fixtures. Integrity of structure, form and decoration should be respected. Building facades should be brick, wood, or other materials that are in keeping with the historic character of the District. Exterior light fixtures shall be in keeping with the historic character of the District.

3. Building Surface Treatments. Approved surface treatments shall be consistent with the historic qualities of the District. No paint shall be applied to unpainted masonry surfaces. Painted surfaces shall be:

- a. Repainted with the original historic color(s) of the building, provided that the business or property owner obtains a professional color analysis; or
- b. Repainted with subdued colors that are appropriate and consistent with the building and other buildings in the District. Local paint stores have an "historic colors" palette that may be useful as a guide. The Board Coordinator also has a palette of historic colors that may be used as reference.

11. Signs. All signs on or hanging from buildings or windows, or applied to windows, are subject to review and approval by the Review Committee and Board.

Sign applications will be evaluated according to the overall impact, size, shape, texture, lettering style, method of attachment, color, and lighting in relation to the use of the building, the building and street where the sign will be located, and the other signs and other buildings in the District. The primary reference will be to the average pedestrian's eye-level view, although views into or down the street from adjacent buildings will be an integral feature of any review.

The intent of sign regulations is to ensure that signs relate physically and visually to their location; that signs reflect the character and unique nature of the business; that signs do not hide, damage, or obstruct the architectural elements of the building; that signs be oriented toward and promote a pedestrian environment; and that the products or services offered be the focus, rather than the signs.

- c. **Window Signs and Hanging Signs.** Generally, painted or vinyl letters in storefront windows and single-faced, flat surfaced painted wood signs are preferred. Extruded aluminum or plastics are discouraged and may not be allowed. Window signs shall not cover a large portion of the window so as to be out of scale with the window, storefront, or facade.
- d. **Blade Signs.** Blade signs (double-faced projecting signs hanging perpendicular to the building), that are consistent in design with District goals are encouraged. Blade signs shall be installed in a manner that is in keeping with other approved blade signs in the District. They shall not hide, damage, or obscure the architectural elements of the building. The size should be appropriately scaled for the building.
- g. **Sign Lighting.** Sign lighting should be subdued and incandescent. Back-lit signs are prohibited. Signs that flash, blink, vary in intensity, revolve or are otherwise in motion or appear to be in motion shall not be permitted.
- h. **Neon Signs.** Neon may be permitted where judged appropriate on a case-by-case basis. Size, letter style, color, intensity and overall impact of the neon sign shall be evaluated for compatibility with the other signs and buildings in the District. If a plexiglass backing is proposed, it shall be clear and colorless. Neon signs should be designed to reflect the unique nature of the use within the building. Mass-produced neon signs are strongly discouraged.

The number of allowable neon signs shall be limited to one for each 10 linear feet of business frontage or portion thereof. Signs need not be spaced one per 10 feet, but may be clustered, provided the grouping does not obscure visibility into the business. Permitted neon signs may be located in transom windows. Neon is permitted only as signage and shall not be used as decorative trim.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards #9 and #10

MM/SC/DB/NC 11:0:0 Motion carried.

070616.23

Medical Dental Building

509 Olive Way

Proposed telecommunications equipment

Jennifer Taylor, AT&T, explained that two antennae would be replaced on Olive side of the building and two will be added on 5th street side. This will be an upgrade in technology for better coverage. She said they will be attached using L-shape bracket and two bolts and will be painted the same color as the building.

Ms. Sodt said that the antenna on the front has SHPO acknowledgement that there is no adverse effect.

Responding to clarifying questions Ms. Taylor said the antenna will mount to ceramic veneer terracotta tile that was installed in the 1950s. She explained the low placement on the building is to enable more coverage for street level. She said that antennae are specific to each carrier network and so there is no possibility for co-location with other carriers.

Ms. Sodt said that in this case antennae are already there.

Ms. Barker said the ones on 5th Avenue side are there – there is a slight acceleration of the number of antenna. She expressed concern that others will want the same.

Ms. Taylor said it depends on where the other carrier antennae are. J She said they have a room in the basement and in the middle of the building.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Murdock said ARC questioned the addition of more antennae.

Mr. Luoma said this is not precedent setting as things are reviewed on a case by case basis. He said they already have equipment there and his only question is why it was put on a historic building.

Ms. Sodt said there are federal laws about antenna location which makes it complicated. She said equipment is already there.

Mr. Murdock said the ground level material is not historic.

Mr. Ketcherside said the Olive façade has a lot of signs and the small boxes will never be notice – it isn't a huge issue.

Mr. Sneddon noted the altered nature of the lower pediment.

Ms. Barker said she supported the application; this is an existing carrier but that all bets are off for any new.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed installation of telecommunications equipment to the Medical Dental Building, 509 Olive Way, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed exterior alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 122316 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is compatible with the

massing, size and scale of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.

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

MM/SC/NC/JM 11:0:0 Motion carried.

070616.24 Holyoke Building
107 Spring Street
Proposed business signage alternatives

Tabled.

The following items were reviewed out of agenda order.

070616.3 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

070616.31 Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Exchange Building
1529 4th Avenue West

Ms. Doherty explained details of the signed agreement.

Action: I move to approve Controls & Incentives for the Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Exchange Building, 1529 4th Avenue West.

MM/SC/NC/DB 11:0:0 Motion carried.

Mr. Luoma left at 4:45.

070616.4 NOMINATION

070616.41 Seattle Public Utilities South Transfer Station
8100 2nd Avenue South

Kay Yesuwan (SPU) said the north and south transfer stations were reviewed by the Landmarks Board in 2008 but was not designated.

Beth Dodrill said the North Station was the same design and has since been demolished. She said the building was built in 1966. She provided context of South Park and the site in what is an industrial neighborhood with some residential and commercial. She said that in 1989 a ramp was added in response to changes in traffic patterns. She said the main entry was moved from the northeast to the southeast and the Scale House was relocated. She said the building is reinforced concrete with pre-stressed T-beams, structural members and beams. She said a compactor was added in 1991. She provided photos of the interior volume, compaction pit and tipping lanes.

She said the Scale House is a steel frame curtain wall with asbestos and glass panels. HVAC was added in 2003 and door vestibule was added in 2006. She said the Operations Building has a curtain wall system of structural steel and a small sliding

glass door was added later. She said the Service Garage is a utilitarian block concrete structure.

Ms. Dodrill said the site was a City landfill in 1936; it was located near shipping, rail, and highway systems. She said that South Park was originally settled as farming and lumber. She said that the dredging of the water way began in 1895. She noted industrial growth during the first and second world wars. Post war road transit was improved with the building of SR 99 and SR 509. She reported that Roy Morse was head of public works in the city at the time of construction; he was City Water Superintendent from 1949 – 57 and City Engineer from 1957 – 71. She explained that architects Durham Anderson and Freed were well known; they constructed over 200 churches, did campus planning, school buildings, residential, retirement homes, and Seattle Fire Station #5 and won awards.

She said that waste management and transfer stations provided transport link to move materials at a time when landfills were reaching capacity. She said that King County led the nation in plans to manage waste; the Cedar Hill disposal site was opened in 1960. She described the concrete structural systems – pre-stressing and post tensioning technologies - which allowed greater structural capacity. She said that precast structural components began to be integrated into building systems. She said the transfer station is outdated for the needs of today – technology has changed.

Ms. Patterson asked if construction was funded by the Waste Act.

Ms. Dodrill said she didn't know but it was likely.

Ms. Barker said she was struck by photos of existing building and how benign they look compared to how loud and chaotic it was inside. She asked about changes in methods now.

Jeff Neuner said that now there is no pit – just a flat floor. He said they use rubber tired equipment which is quieter and there is a bigger space with more room. He said they have a day and a half storage on site.

Ms. Barker asked about lighting.

Mr. Neuner said the new transfer facility is substantially better with skylights and natural lighting.

Mr. Murdock asked about alterations to the subject building.

Ms. Dodrill said there weren't any beyond the addition of a compactor on the east side; she said a hole was cut in the wall.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Durham said there wasn't enough about the utilitarian building to go on related to significance other than its brutalist architectural characteristics. She was not inclined to support nomination.

Ms. Johnson agreed. She said the building is a nice shed and not the best example of Durham Anderson and Freed’s work. She said she leaned toward ‘no’.

Mr. Carter did not support nomination. He said it was visually interesting but just a nice shed. He said there is no ability to interact with it – it was meant to be overlooked.

Ms. Patterson supported nomination and said standards are hard to apply to a utility building like this. She said it was built during a time of growth when they had to think about what to do with trash; giving it cultural interest.

Ms. Barker supported nomination and said she drove by the building a lot. She said it is not a solid and she noted the gaps between concrete. She said that form followed function.

Mr. Ketcherside did not support nomination; he said he’s been there and drove past it on his way to Seattle. He said he understood why people would support nomination, but that he did not think it had significance as a landmark. He noted the structure may have “dirty elegance”.

Mr. Murdock supported nomination and said that utilitarian architecture has a higher bar. He noted the legibility of use and said it was purpose built. He noted the strong use of concrete and structural expression, and the T-sections, and the way the columns are articulated as unique aspects. He said it is a massive space and the exterior tells its story.

Mr. Sneddon supported nomination and said the building was needed to support urban growth. He noted the environmental movement and milestones in the 1960s. He said this was a milestone for Seattle’s approach to garbage with a shift from landfills to transfer stations. He said the site can still articulate its purpose. He said a prominent, modern architectural firm was commissioned to design it.

Mr. Kiel did not support nomination. He said that his fellow Board members made some good points, but he does not see that it meets any of the standards.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Seattle Public Utilities South Transfer Station at 8100 2nd 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 of the transfer station, operations building and scale house; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for August 18, 2016; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/MSN/DB 4:6:0 Motion failed. Mmes. Anderson, Durham, Johnson, and Messrs. Carter, Ketcherside, Kiel opposed.

070616.5

BRIEFINGS

070616.51

Ainsworth & Dunn Warehouse
2815 Elliott Avenue

Briefing on proposed addition and associated new construction

Jessica Clawson, McCullough Hill Leary, said the adaptive reuse project has been to ARC twice and to one Design Review meeting.

Matt Aalfs, Weinstein AU, provide historic overview of the building and site. He explained the proposal to build a new mixed use building on the empty lot to the south and to integrate the landmark building into that. He showed early massing studies and went through them via PowerPoint (full PowerPoint in DON file). He said a penthouse is proposed on that will be occupiable on three sides. It will be set back one structural bay and have recess for mechanical and utilities. He said they propose dense residential units in new building and noted that the garage will connect both buildings. He noted a gasket and gallery with skylight, masonry clad frame with screened mechanical on top. He said they proposed to remove 1971 intervention where two windows were removed – they will return it to its original condition. He said on the west side two windows were replaced with large plate glass and they will return it to divided light.

Ms. Barker asked what they propose for street level on the north façade.

Mr. Aalfs said they propose to restore the façade and rehabilitate it with no intervention; he said it is not a public access at this point.

Ms. Barker asked if the mechanical penthouse on options A and D is visible from the right of way.

Mr. Aalfs said they don't have a fully developed design yet but noted that most mechanical will be within a niche they would create.

Ms. Barker also requested view study from Broad.

Mr. Murdock thanked the team for being responsive to ARC comments and noted that it has gotten better. He asked about the merging of the garages and if they will work within the existing structural system.

Mr. Aalfs said they will work with existing structural components and bays and height; construction in new building will be higher.

Mr. Kiel asked about their strategy for the south wall.

Mr. Aalfs said they will remove the big arch that was added later and create a large opening to connect the gallery to the first floor. He said there are no details yet but they may leave the brick exposed on the interior.

Ms. Patterson asked about the entrance.

Mr. Aalfs said the entry to the commercial space will be in the gasket on the water-facing side; he said the residential entry will be on the other side.

Mr. Murdock said the surface articulation between the two buildings seems really flat.

Mr. Sneddon said there is quite a bit of depth and an opportunity for dialog between the two; he said to develop it further.

Beth Hartwick, SDCI, said the design board didn't want to see the frame brick because you would never see it used that way. She said the board suggested they look at the buildings to the south for inspiration.

Mr. Murdock said to create a dialog between new and historic building. He asked the scale of the penthouse.

Mr. Aalfs said there is a lot of glass and the view to the northwest will be spectacular. He said there will be an overhang and they are looking at sunshade devices.

Ms. Johnson asked about the relation of the site to the sculpture park walkway.

Mr. Aalfs pointed it out and said it drops down a bit; they will bring views to next meeting.

Ms. Barker said she loves the route they are taking thus far. She said that wayfinding will be critical to figure out how to get to the entrance. She said they are dismissive of the eastern side of the block and to not ignore that. She suggested further refinements of the entrances. She said the west entrance is more successful but if you don't know it's there you are selling yourself short. She said most people will be coming from downtown and the east entrance seems tentative.

Mr. Ketcherside said the entrances are not clear.

Mr. Aalfs noted the challenge of the floor level and grade change.

Mr. Ketcherside said to be clear that the buildings are united.

Mr. Sneddon noted the masonry clad corner building and said he liked the homage to earlier commercial district.

Ms. Patterson noted entrances are not clear. She said the addition is sensitive. She said it won't be obvious that the buildings are joined. She said wayfinding is needed to signal entry.

Mr. Murdock said the gasket isn't clear that it is the entry.

Ms. Barker said the design could be bolder and cited the recent review of the Maritime Building. She said no gabion walls.

Mr. Sneddon left at 5:45 pm.

070616.52

SR520 / Montlake Lid

Consultation with WSDOT on conceptual design

Brianna Holan, LMN, Daniele Dunjic, WSDOT, and Connie Walker Gray presented via PowerPoint (full report in DON file).

Mr. Ketcherside said it is an interesting project and he said the context they provided was helpful.

Ms. Barker said this project is under the radar of people she has talked to and that people beyond the Montlake neighborhood need to know about it. She asked if pedestrian areas had shrunk and the applicant said they hadn't. She said that a lot of interpretative signage is needed at the edges because the erratic features would be lost on vehicular traffic. She said the 'nature meets city' theme is a concept not reflected in any of this.

Ms. Anderson said that canoeing, biking, walking through – the overall plan is interesting but she is trying to understand 'nature meets city'. She said that what will make or break this is the pedestrian and vehicle access, and how to convey that through plants and landscaping and the proposed stone erratic elements. She said to pull the arboretum into the plan; the rough landscape ideas are not as inclusive. She said the Lake Washington Boulevard pavilion area – how they will pull things in to middle part. She said the pathways are good. She said she hopes they will be more acknowledging and inclusive of the arboretum – it seems choppy.

Mr. Kiel said they are only creating one new place, and the rest is paths for movement. He noted the pavilion as edge defining element is better than before – they have done a nice job of shaping the earth for buffers from traffic. He asked about programming for that space.

Ms. Holan said a variety of activities – bikes, transit, families, and dog walking – flexible use. She said there will be open lawn space for a variety of activities.

Ms. Barker said that at Cal Anderson Park there is commercial and residential.

Mr. Ketcherside said this is like grass in the middle of a wide boulevard.

Ms. Sodt suggested that the Board focus on design that leads up from boulevard or neighborhood rather than the details of use. She said to look at how it touches the historic district and other historic fabric; look at materials; look at character defining elements rather than use.

Mr. Kiel said the historic benches are great but said it is odd that there are only two. He said that 'what would Olmsted do?' should be the mantra.

Ms. Sodt said that they received comments from Friends of Olmsted.

Mr. Murdock said the re-use of elements in the park is good; he said he likes the pipe.

Ms. Barker asked how they would convey that story.

Ms. Sodt said that Section 106 agreement talked specifically about interpretive signage being reviewed by the Board.

Connie Walker Gray said they are looking at if they want to tell the story or suggest it. She said they are not yet ready to discuss the interpretive signage.

Mr. Ketcherside said he liked the reuse of materials. He noted big concrete panels removed from an overpass elsewhere in the city that were used as retaining walls and were buttressed by street car rails. He liked the reuse of recognizable pieces as an homage.

Ms. Barker said that Salty's on Alki has pieces of bridge as art. She asked who will own / maintain all of this.

Ms. Dunjic said it will be a combination of Parks, WSDOT and City Light will be part of the discussion.

Mr. Kiel asked "what is the story we might want to tell?"

Mr. Ketcherside cited local author David B. Williams' "Too High and Too Steep" about the lowering of Lake Washington and the destruction of the ecosystem that used to be there. He said that marshes and edible plants disappeared and that had an impact on the Native American people who used them. He said he would like them to tell these stories through interpretation.

Ms. Johnson said that there are parts that are hidden by the berm and other places where the highway is visible.

Mr. Kiel said it is nice to see the original Lake Washington shorelines.

Mr. Ketcherside said that author David Williams is researching the area now and would be a good contact for the WSDOT team.

Ms. Doherty asked about funding for the other project elements.

Ms. Holan said that everything in the "rest of the west" is funded as noted on drawing.

Ms. Barker said they should amp up PR on this but noted it is exciting.

Mr. Murdock said the Montlake Bridge is sacrosanct and should be considered in concert with the planning be done now. He said they need to look at the location of the proposed new bridge span and how this will connect to it.

Ms. Sodt said she has been in conversations where they discussed hanging a new structure from the side of the Montlake Bridge and hoped that was no longer being pursued. She said how the new bridge will be used is still being talked about.

Mr. Ketcherside said it would be helpful for the team to speak preservation language – what was landmarked in neighborhoods and what the interface means. He said to consider the significance of the Montlake Bridge & Cut and how it relates to the project. He said to consider how the project preserves the Olmsted concepts and to integrate nature into the city - nature as the lungs and arteries is an Olmsted concept. He said to consider how it does not endanger the National Register District and that the project designers understand that.

Ms. Walker Gray said she has read it.

Ms. Doherty said there have been many conversations about where elements can be new and not faux historic and where historic elements are needed. She said the scale is huge and the story is hard to convey. She said to look at where and how the language should shift and to define elements and where they should go.

Mr. Kiel suggested all benches be new and have continuity come from the plantings.

Ms. Sodt said that feedback is important. She noted the light fixtures and that false historicism should be avoided and historic elements should not be located where they have never been. She said there had been talk of using the Chief Seattle light.

Ms. Holan said Domus, cobra head, and Marina Post top lighting are proposed in different areas. She said they would be painted black for continuity.

Ms. Sodt said that City Light is trying to get away from different fixtures; they have limited options.

Ms. Doherty said there used to be more ‘Olmsted-y’ elements in the proposal from Lyle Bicknell to the ARC, and asked them to confirm that they were shifting away from that approach.

Mr. Ketcherside said he wants to see that they have thought about the neighborhood and preservation and then show how they are going to go about it; frame the interventions and define the principles.

Ms. Dunjic said they have an online open house is up through Saturday. She said several hundred comments have been received.

070616.6 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator