



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 42/19

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

600 4th Avenue

L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room

Wednesday January 16, 2019 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker
Manish Chalana
Russell Coney
Kathleen Durham
Rich Freitas
Alan Guo
Garrett Hodgins
Jordon Kiel
Kristen Johnson

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Steven Treffers

Vice Chair Deb Barker called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

011619.1 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

011619.11 Roosevelt High School

1410 NE 66th Street

Proposed change to timeline for approved portable classrooms

Paul Dorn, Rolluda Architects, explained they want to retain six existing portables.

Ms. Doherty said the recently approved installation of additional portables is on hold.

Mike Barrett, Seattle Public Schools, said they decided they don't need additional portables and just want to keep what they have for now.

Ms. Johnson arrived at 3:34 pm.

Mr. Cooney asked if there will be a new sunset date.

Ms. Doherty said staff encouraged the applicant not to put dates on these, to keep it more flexible for changing student populations.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the temporary portable classrooms at Roosevelt High School, 1410 NE 66th Street, as submitted.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed temporary installation of portable classrooms does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Report on Designation LPB 180/02.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

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

Mr. Kiel arrived at 3:37 pm.

011619.12

Cowen Park Bridge

15th Avenue NE crossing over Ravenna Park
Proposed seismic improvements

Vanessa Bacurin, SDOT, explained the project focus is to reduce seismic vulnerability; they determined they could make improvements instead of replacing the bridge. She said they are toward the end of design and want feedback on proposed retrofits. She said Section 106 is ongoing. She provided context of the site and said they are waiting concurrence from DAHP on their proposal.

Mr. Chalana arrived at 3:40 pm.

Ms. Bacurin proposed to strengthen existing arch via fiber wrap cross beams with concrete block, fill gap between columns with concrete, strengthen columns, reinforce interior columns. She provided before and after depictions of options:

1. Strengthen existing arch with carbon fiber reinforced polymer (CFRP) to strengthen; the reveal will be lost but it can be painted to match what is there.
2. Fill gaps in center of arch; infill wall with concrete – it will no longer have visibility through.
3. Strengthen columns with CFRP wrap the full length of column; the reveal will be lost; paint wrap to match others.

4. Strengthen cross beams, building concrete bolsters, two on either side of crossbeam, 24 total.
5. Reinforce interior columns at expansion piers. Columns and enclosure wall will look like a bigger pier; cut into concrete and construct a link beam; wrap with CFRP; reveal remains.

Mr. Freitas asked how they will install the fiber wrap.

Ms. Bacurin referred to page S203 which shows how it will be done. She said beams between arches will be wrapped as well; this is the least impactful solution.

Ms. Doherty said they looked at an alternative to use steel plate shrouds, but it didn't work with the shape of the concrete structural members.

Mr. Hodgins asked about structural functionality of the arch.

Joan Zhong-Brisbois, Parsons Brinckerhoff, structural engineer said they will make inner arches work together; it sort of glues it all together.

Mr. Chalana asked if there are any less intrusive alternatives.

Ms. Zhong said they explored several options – replace the whole bridge, connect columns to 'glue together', retrofit individual columns – the rebar inside is not robust enough to handle earthquake stress. She said this option is necessary to maintain the structure.

Mr. Chalana noted they are trying to recreate historic masonry; the materiality is the same.

Mr. Hodgins said that anything 12' or lower has been painted over a lot.

Mr. Kiel said ARC noted the apex of the arch is pretty hidden in the shadows.

Mr. Hodgins said when coming from Cowen you are at an elevation where you see that portion as a prominent feature.

Mr. Chalana said it is prominent; the open-ness, airy-ness is part of the design.

Mr. Freitas said that just one gap will be filed in; it is in the middle.

Mr. Hodgins said "painting on" a fake concrete reveal is futile because it will be painted over many times.

Ms. Barker asked when the environmental process ends.

Ms. Bacurin said SEPA just completed; they had to do SEPA and NEPA to get federal funding. She said there was a public comment period.

Ms. Doherty said Ms. Bacurin told her they were not triggering SEPA, that it was not required.

Ms. Bacurin said they are actually in the middle of SEPA review.

Ms. Doherty said the Landmarks Board cannot take action on the Certificate of Approval application if SEPA the determination is still in process. She said Ms. Bacurin told her there would be no SEPA because it is a repair project.

Ms. Bacurin said a determination of non-significance was issued.

Ms. Doherty said the Board cannot take action until the SEPA decision is noticed for the public. She said it sounds like SDOT's plan have changed.

Ms. Barker asked if the slide is inaccurate, she says it shows SEPA being done.

Ms. Doherty said notification to the public is needed. Keegan Johnson, SDOT, said he would call and check with his colleague.

Mr. Kiel said they discussed the introduction of new material with no back side to any columns.

Mr. Chalana suggested a steel structure that hides behind – that looks like a table with four legs that sits beneath bridge.

Ms. Zhong said with steel jacketing you can't have odd shapes. She said the CFRP is more passive.

Ms. Barker asked if the wrap practice has been done on historic bridges.

Ms. Zhong said the fiber wrap is commonly done. It is a Code requirement that CFRP is used only in secondary retrofit.

Mr. Johnson got off the phone and said the SEPA notice to the public was done December 20, 2018; public comment and appeal ended January 10, 2019. SEPA has been noticed and the decision issued.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed building seismic improvements to the Cowen Park Bridge, 15th Avenue NE crossing over Ravenna Park, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations have minimal impact to the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 110344, 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 applicant has proposed this method of structural reinforcement in lieu of other less compatible reinforcement methods.

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

MM/SC/KJ/RF 9:0:0 Motion carried.

011619.13

Daniel Bagley Elementary School

7821 Stone Avenue N

Proposed building rehabilitation, interior alterations, new two-story classroom addition, new gymnasium building, and site alterations

Mr. Kiel recused himself.

Presentation via PowerPoint (in DON file).

Ms. Doherty said the project review had gone well with ARC.

Brad Miller provided an overview of the school. He explained they will maintain historic entrance. He said they will remove interior URM partitions that have hollow clay tile inside and will reinforce exterior URM brick assemblage. He said they will reuse the boiler room and install new high efficiency boilers. He said new mechanical equipment includes new air handler units in the basement of classroom addition and on the mezzanine level of the new gym. He said the outdoor play area will be captured for the music and art classroom. He provided sight studies and views of additions. He went through materials and colors. He said the historic building has variegated brick, cast stone accent ornament; the addition will have variegated metal panel with a quieter panel attached to building to act as gasket. He said windows will be white frame with blue sash; they were originally buff colored windows.

He said a walkway separates the 1931 building from the new gym. He said they don't touch the original envelope of the original building. He proposed a native garden around the existing Cedar tree. He said the entrances were problematic; he proposed a single double door set with sidelights and said arched transom will be retained. He said this will accommodate ADA and creation of security vestibule. He went over window restoration and said that cast stone mullions have cracks and leakage and spalling; they will replace 25% of them. He said they will match the texture and color using precast concrete or GFRC. Smaller cracks will be filled with epoxy. He said the windows will be restored; they will install bronze weatherstripping at jambs of lower sash.

Mr. Miller said that the primary stairs will be retained. At the second floor landing a 42" guard rail will be installed with rail set inside existing construction and be attached at floor. He said there was no interior vestibule and there was an 18" grade change. He proposed pushing the steps back 18', creating a ramp to bring visitors up to the office; it meets ADA and helps in meeting energy code. He said the hallway walls will all be new. Inside alcove entrance to classroom will be sidelights; halls will include small group alcove and relite next to classroom. He said classrooms will retain historic classroom layout. Radiators will be replaced with new high efficiency hydronic system with bookshelves in front. He said teaching wall drops down. He said cubbies will be installed in hallway for storage, no lockers.

He said they will retain the dining room's large windows, wood beams, ornamental plaster, ceiling Art Deco set up, and re-use wood roll ups. He said at the stage they will add shear wall and foundations, expand platform into captured space, install moveable partition behind proscenium to allow use as music room, extend platform 18" and add egress steps. He said they will install a platform lift for ADA access. He said the proscenium will be preserved. He went through materials and color palette. He said the magnesite flooring will be cleaned

Mr. Miller presented demolition plan and said that exceptional trees have been identified and will be saved. He said only non-exceptional trees will come out at gym area. He indicated pavement replacement area and said trees in front have been limbed up. He said the main entry walk has been simplified and will provide universal access. He said they will add numerals, welcome sign, and bollards outside of entrance. He went over landscape plan and palette. He said the existing sign box will remain as will the existing cast stone over entrance. He said exterior welcome plaque will be mounted to right of door with fasteners into masonry joints. Dark bronze numerals sized per fire department requirements will be mounted to left of door with fasteners into masonry joints. He said two pedestrian light fixtures will be installed; he provided overview of light fixtures.

Mr. Hodgins asked about entrance development and said the new gym addition cuts public off from the playground.

Mr. Miller pointed out the gate and playground access; he said it is needed for security during daytime.

Ms. Durham asked for clarification on gym cladding.

Mr. Miller said the panels turn the corner and the concrete wraps the other side where a future student dining wing is intended.

Ms. Barker asked if there is any way to make it look less like a jersey barrier.

Mr. Miller said there will be foundation plantings that will grow up to where the metal panels start.

Ms. Durham asked about material above windows.

Mr. Miller said it is concrete.

Ms. Durham asked why they didn't use the metal there.

Mr. Miller said the scale and proportion feel better this way.

Ms. Johnson said she likes the windows and that the rhythm reflects what is happening in historic building. The height makes it seem more vertical.

Ms. Durham said it is larger in scale and the verticality makes it look taller.

Ms. Barker said it looks sloppy and unfinished.

Mr. Freitas noted two new palettes were introduced and asked if a hyphen is used at south.

Mr. Miller said it puts light into the main hallway.

Ms. Barker asked if the exceptional tree is visible.

Mr. Miller said it is.

Mr. Chalana asked what the terrazzo sample was for.

Mr. Miller said it is for the shared handwash sinks.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Deliberation:

Ms. Barker appreciated the direction and asked if ARC had any issues.

Ms. Johnson said no.

Ms. Doherty said ARC asked them to work on a blend of colors.

Ms. Barker said it is really successful.

Ms. Doherty said the gray concrete used to look darker in renderings.

Mr. Miller said it could be the PDF rendering. He said there was lots of discussion about the precast panels. He said there is good insulation; it provides a hard surface on gym side and it is a hardworking material. He said it could be darkened. He noted budget challenges related to material selection.

Ms. Johnson said it is a really nice school project compared to others they've seen. She said the material is so nice and matches the richness of the old brick. She said it is set back from the original building.

Mr. Hodgins said from the east side the breakup of material looks balanced; when you turn the corner to the north it seems that concrete is the majority surface.

Mr. Freitas said may be a good place for a mural.

Mr. Coney said the new differentiates from the old.

Mr. Freitas said the landscaping looks like they are minimally removing trees. He said it is a really nice rehabilitation project and that the mass, size, scale, are great; it is differentiated yet compatible.

Mr. Coney said he was impressed by the overall approach especially with budget constraints and the proposed window preservation. He said he wished other project teams could see this. He said removing hollow tile is good and the grade to front

entrance will provide security for all. He said it is a model project for Seattle Public Schools.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed building rehabilitation, alterations, additions, and selective demolition at the Daniel Bagley Elementary School, 7821 Stone Avenue North, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed selective demolition alters some of the interior designated features, but the applicants have demonstrated the need to remove these hollow clay tile walls to address seismic/safety concerns.
2. The remaining proposed alterations and additions do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Report on Designation (LPB 382/15) 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*.
3. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/RC/KJ 8:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel recused himself.

011619.2 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

011619.21 East Pine Substation
1501 23rd Avenue
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for extension noting Seattle City Light staff transition. She said briefings have been seen at ARC and they are planning to come back again in June.

MM/SC/RC/KJ 9:0:0 Motion carried.

011619.3 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator