



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649 Seattle WA 98124-4649
Street Address: 700 5th Ave Suite 1700

LPB 415/15

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Seattle Municipal Tower

700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor

Room 4060

Wednesday, July 1, 2015 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker

Robert Ketcherside

Aaron Luoma

Jeffrey Murdock, Vice Chair

Sarah Shadid

Mike Stanley

Alison Walker Brems, Chair

Elaine Wine

Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Melinda Bloom

Absent

Nick Carter

Matthew Sneddon

Chair Alison Walker Brems called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

070115.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES
May 20, 2015 and June 3, 2015

070115.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

070115.21 Space Needle
219 4th Avenue N.
Proposed expansion of glass entry canopy
Ms. Wine and Mr. Stanley recused themselves.

Howard Burton, Seattle Structural, explained the proposal to extend the existing covered walkway to provide weather protection to those waiting in line. He said it will match existing and will have minimal view blockage.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Murdock said that ARC reviewed the proposal and said that overall it is fine. He said that the design of the extension is the same as what is there now. He said that it will read as a continuation of the design. He said the only hesitation was the blockage of the legs of the Space Needle but this will allow better functionality.

Ms. Barker noted it matches what is there.

Ms. Walker Brems said you can see through it.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed canopy expansion at the Space Needle, 219 4th Avenue North, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed canopy expansion does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 119428, 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/AL/DB 6:0:2 Motion carried. Ms. Wine and Mr. Stanley abstained.

070115.22 Exchange Building
821 2nd Ave
Proposed signage and lighting

Courtney Kaler, McCullough Hill, explained the proposal to remove non original skylight over the doorway, add under canopy light, and add new identification signage on 1st Avenue.

Denise Fong, designer, explained they would demolish the area where the existing fan shape and the two sconces are; they will be taken out and the façade patched. She said that only one security camera is proposed now. She noted the area of work is sited on the drawings. She provided a PhotoShopped photo showing how the new letters for the Exchange Building will look; she

said it will be illuminated from the top of the canopy. She said the new letters will be painted metal edged in bronze, white on front face, 3-dimensional, and illuminated from below. She said they will power the lights from above, punch through canopy; canopy will hide electrical. She provided a photo of the pedestrian view and said it will be flat white and all repaired. She said it is dark under the canopy now and they want to get light there – they will use a variation on the existing fixture.

Ms. Fong said that there is a hodge podge of retail signage now. She said they proposed to paint out the bottom of the windows black; letters will be back lit with translucent background. She said that the tenant signage will be black and white with gold trim; white will be the illuminated part. She said they will use a flat panel LED lamp.

Ms. Kaler said it is consistent with what was approved for the 2nd Avenue side.

Andy Wattula said they will clean up the building, lighten it up, and provide consistency in signage.

Ms. Barker asked about the depth of the security camera.

Ms. Fong said it is about 4”; she said it is smaller now than originally planned. She said they will keep the canopy as clean as possible so the camera can go where the existing light fixture is. She said they will paint it black so it will disappear. She said the goldish color will be bronze or brass – a warm color.

Ms. Walker Brems asked about the canopy materials and penetration through for lights.

Ms. Fong said that underneath is plaster so they will stay with that. She said that there is a metal pan deck 3 – 4” thick with concrete and then a membrane. She said they will run the conduit above that, core ¾” hole in center, patch and watertight; they will drill up four attachment points into the concrete. She said they plan to re-use existing conduit and holes.

Mr. Ketcherside asked about the strength of the canopy patch.

Mr. Fong said that it will have structural integrity.

Mr. Ketcherside said the font seems different and said it should be more complementary to the 2nd Avenue original lettering.

Ms. Kaler said the design intent is to be consistent and compatible but not to mimic exactly.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Wine said she was looking at historic photo and said that one is applied to the building and one is on the canopy and that they are very different applications.

Mr. Murdock said that ARC was favorable; he noted that it is not replicating but is complementary. He said the new is recognized as modern but pays homage to the Deco era. He said that ARC talked about removal of the skylight and the dark bands on the windows. He said they are creating a cohesive look to the building. He said the lights are appropriate in terms of color, shape, style. He noted the holistic look of the building.

Ms. Sodt said that ARC asked for clarification on the camera because it seemed overly large; the applicant team came up with a smaller camera.

Ms. Wine said they did a nice job of cleaning up the building. The lights are very different – they are a traditional yet modern approach.

Mr. Murdock said the white stucco provides a nicer pedestrian experience.

Mr. Ketcherside said they are great improvements.

Ms. Walker Brems said they have done a wonderful job on the signage and that she loves the font.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 115038, as the proposed exterior alterations are 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/EW/AL 8:0:0 Motion carried.

070115.3 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

070115.31 Lloyd Building
601 Stewart Street
Request for extension

Ms. Sodt explained that Jack McCullough mentioned hiring Susan Boyle to assist with the valuation; she is finalizing her work. Ms. Sodt said that they anticipate meeting with ARC in the next three months and design may include other parts of the block. She supported a 90-day extension. She said they have been good about checking in with progress.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Lloyd Building, 601 Stewart Street, for 90 (ninety) days.

MM/SC/DB/JM 8:0:0 Motion carried.

070115.32 Seattle Times Building - 1947 Office Building Addition
1120 John Street
Request for extension

Ms. Sodt explained the request for three-month extension. She said they will brief ARC on July 10 and that they have been actively moving forward working with her.

Mr. Ketcherside noted there was a lot of graffiti on the buildings.

Ms. Sodt said she had received public comment about it; SPU and the ownership were notified. She said it was a problem with the Troy Laundry as well.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Seattle Times Building – 1947 Office Building Addition, 1120 John Street, for 90 (ninety) days.

MM/SC/RK/JM 8:0:0 Motion carried.

070115.33 Seattle Times Building - Printing Plant
1120 John Street
Request for extension

Ms. Sodt explained the request for three-month extension.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Seattle Times Building – Printing Plant, 1120 John Street, for 90 (ninety) days.

MM/SC/RK/JM 8:0:0 Motion carried.

070115.4 BRIEFINGS

070115.41 Terminal Sales Annex
1931 Second Avenue

Briefing on proposed new construction

David Heater, Moisin Architects, explained changes made based on previous board comments. He said the MUP is done and they are hoping to submit for approval. He showed what had been approved before by another board and showed that they are now matching floor lines. He said they propose to integrate the landmark into the podium construction which will be set back 23' from the landmark building. He said that the actual lobby for the hotel will be on the 16th floor via an express elevator. He said that the historic doors will remain operable and will lead into retail space. He said that a port cochere will house access to basement and electrical. He said that the volume in the lobby will be a two story space; behind the landmark it will keep the high volume. He said the compelling interior space is being preserved. He said that narrow rooms will match landmark window spacing. He said that above the 5th floor will be just the tower.

He said that there were Board comments that the frame draws too much attention to the landmark alterations. We went over three options: 1) take frame away and then just deepen mullion; clear glass proposed; subtle shadow line; 2) don't change glass; create inset reveal for shadow line; and 3) incorporate metal panel into window wall at the same plan. Preferred option is 1.

He said there were board comments about the side walls of the landmark. He said currently there is plaster, paint, and moisture and water intrusion which created a rough exposed concrete. He went over options: 1) rough textured strucco with rainscreen type to keep water out; 2) board form concrete – paint or clear coat concrete; and 3) pre cast concrete. He said they propose a sandblaster similar in color to terracotta.

He said there were board comments that the retail massing is too monumental. He proposed to break into major/minor piers to break up and change the scale. He said that four windows have all original components but all are failing and need to come out. He said that half of the leaded glass has been replaced. He said originally windows were wood operable but now are non-operable. He said they propose to replace windows with a true divided light in black frame, thicker than leaded glass, 7/8" mullion; or a wood option with a muntin on each side, not true divided light.

Ms. Wine asked if the existing alley is public and what the alley façade looks like.

Mr. Heater said it is. He said that there are fire escapes, loading dock that they propose to remove.

Ms. Wine said that what they are proposing saves just the 2nd Avenue façade.

Ms. Walker Brems asked how the ground floor of the landmark will work.

Mr. Heater said that once in the building there will be a step down; he said it is not traditional retail because the eyeline is higher. He said that grills are being replaced so there will be visibility to see inside.

Ms. Wine said that the whole building is a landmark and it is being presented as a façade only rather than the whole building.

Ms. Barker said that the original design was true façadism. She said the discussions had occurred earlier.

Ms. Sodt said that there was approval for design in 2007.

Mr. Murdock said the building was built to be party-wall condition. He said he likes the corner of 2nd and Virginia – the height, scale and pedestrian street and noted that this scale is rare anymore. He said he was hoping the proportion of this building would be repeated and moved down 2nd.

Ms. Wine expressed concern that the board is able to comment only on what is presented rather than the whole of the building.

Ms. Sodt said that the last full board meeting there were comments on how to preserve more of this building.

Ms. Wine said that alley sides have character and offer value; she said was concerned with what the board was asked to support.

Ms. Barker said she didn't remember seeing alley facades and that it was never part of the discussion. She said that the city wouldn't allow more curb cuts.

Ms. Wine said that they have gone so far and she wondered if any more preservation of the building had been discussed.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wine noted this was just preservation of the façade. Of what was presented she preferred Option 2 gasket. She said the most minimal frame makes it feels like the building's verticality is not diminished; she preferred no frame, no inset. She said she preferred the more monolithic pattern on the sides.

Mr. Luoma agreed and said he preferred Option 2 gasket on page 12 for the same reasons stated by Ms. Wine. He said the more monolithic is simple and more appropriate. He said he had no strong opinion on the retail. He noted efforts to make the landmark more prominent by stepping back on the not-developed sides. He said what is proposed may keep the scale and proportion even though the building is taller it still emphasizes scale. He said it is an older building from a different time and a different scale.

Mr. Murdock said that he did not agree with Ms. Wine. He said he didn't like the frame. He said he wanted to see variation in the new building throughout. He said this is an improvement over what had been approved by a former board. He noted the more detailed windows at the basement; solid with grills and no muntins. He said he preferred the south section – the 2nd version is more finely grained façade, more slender verticals. He said that 2nd and Virginia corner is nice.

Ms. Walker Brems asked for more information about existing building that Ms. Wine had raised. She questioned which aspects of the rear elevation from the alley should be

preserved. She noted the contrasts between the two: the new building from 16th floor up and the historic building pedestrian oriented. She noted how they were lining four new levels with existing in the landmark building. She said she was uncomfortable with the ground floor level – how you experience the volume and wondered what could be done. She said she liked Option 2. She said that maybe it is the way it is rendered but the southern massing primary and tertiary elements that work for pedestrians. She said the building was pulled out at street level, low massing and tower pulled back – the landmark as precious box. She said there is some awkwardness of new – finishes – and questioned if people will know they are in the historic building.

Mr. Stanley said it is better than what was approved earlier. He noted the set back and said it is complicated because we can't replicate or expand the jewel building. He said the terracotta was meant as a parti-wall building. He said that with the setback it does pop. He said that scale on the street front is low and feels in character. He prefers Option 1 for the gasket. He said that a massive building had been approved and now it is scaled down. He said he likes the design as it is – it celebrates the jewel box. He wanted to hear more about the sidewalls and preferred going back to rough original texture.

Ms. Barker said she preferred either Option 1 or 2 but didn't like Option 3. She said that she preferred board form concrete or stucco for the sidewalls. She said she liked the wood windows. She said they could go even further in breaking the new building down.

Mr. Ketcherside said this is a huge improvement. He said it is useful to have the thought process of what other options were thought of to get to this design. He said that he was glad they moved away from the frame. He said that he didn't like the metal panels. He preferred Option 2 for the gasket. Regarding the concrete sidewalls he said panels are distracting and compete with landmark façade. He said that board form concrete at a distance blends together. He said he preferred stucco.

Ms. Walker Brems said she wanted to know more about the windows.

Mr. Ketcherside said that four historic windows are there and he needs more justification about why they can't stay.

Ms. Walker Brems asked them to define 'component'.

Ms. Shadid said it is a huge improvement and said she was surprised it was originally approved. She said she likes the store front. She said she likes the stucco or board form sidewalls. She said the window survey is not as complete as she would like. She said she was ok with replacement with black aluminum.

Ms. Barker asked if the windows are leaded.

Mr. Ketcherside said that some have smaller lights replaced.

Jessica Clawson, McCullough Hill, said some leaded glass remains. She said the window survey was complete.

Mr. Murdock asked about the paperboy statues.

Ms. Clawson said they are trying to find them.

070115.42

First United Methodist Church

810 Fifth Avenue

Briefing on proposed alterations

Ron Wright presented changes since the last board presentation. Detailed drawing packet in DON file.

Ms. Sodt said she had not received drawings so was unable to provide to board members.

Mr. Wright explained that since the last board briefing they have made changes in response to board comments. He said they changed programming from full service restaurant to multi-purpose assembly / event center which reduces the mechanical systems required. He said the seismic shear wall requirements of 8" – 10" remain unchanged. He went over design changes to organ pipes, access, escalator, balconies, structural improvements and the main vestibule.

Board questions and comments:

Mr. Ketcherside asked about the pulpit area revision.

Mr. Wright explained that the new floor will cover the pulpit and kneeling rail. He said that mechanical equipment will be on the roof on the west / alley side; roof will be dropped down to bury them a little.

Mr. Luoma asked what the mechanical is for.

Mr. Wright said that there will be no need for all the kitchen hoods etc. with programming change. He said most of the equipment is HVAC per code requirements.

Ms. Walker Brems asked which pipes would move forward.

Mr. Wright said the visible ones – the first layer; he said there would be no layer behind. He said the screen obscures volume behind. He said originally they planned to bring the wall out 15' and now they have gained 9'6" back. He said they are losing 1/3 of the depth of the organ pipe space.

Ms. Walker Brems asked why the raised floor.

Mr. Wright responded it is to make it level – the floor isn't usable with slope to it.

Ms. Wine asked what happens in the pulpit space.

Mr. Wright said that the interstitial space is not usable.

Ms. Wine said that there may be more information when the program is more developed.

Mr. Wright said that the choir loft is not accessible – they have to take the pipes completely out to do structural but they are concealed and only the front row is seen. He said that there is no organ now.

Mr. Murdock said the organ was landmarked.

Ms. Sodt clarified that only the pipes were designated.

Jocelyn Schmidt, Ron Wright and Associates, said the program needs the kitchen to function.

Mr. Wright said the kitchen was moved and condensed; they need space for a hood and HVAC. He said that they will keep the visible pipes, the guts behind won't come back. He said they would have to start from scratch to put an organ back in. He said on the Marion side they will bring the roof back up and the equipment is pushed back far enough that equipment is not visible. He said the penthouse will be on the south side.

Ms. Barker preferred option 2 and said she can live with the roof.

Mr. Ketcherside said he preferred option 2 and said there is less sun blockage. He said moving the penthouse won't impact the sun coming through the roof.

Ms. Shadid said she had no problem with equipment on the roof. She said that moving historic elements is façadist. She said it is an improvement on the original and prefers option 2 although she didn't like either.

Mr. Luoma he said there has been lots of comments about not having enough space and then there is empty interstitial space; he said it is a waste.

Ms. Wine said performance or gathering space might be more useful that way. She said to keep the idea of a sanctuary rather than pretend that choir space no longer exists. She said she prefers more flexibility.

Ms. Barker said that the wall could evolve to be openable and usable. She said she appreciated the volume in option 2.

Ms. Wine asked if the study looked at entering from new building.

Mr. Wright said that it did but noted parking and slope issues.

Ms. Walker Brems asked if the addition to the church – the new building – has been built.

Mr. Wright said that it has been permitted.

Ms. Walker Brems said it doesn't exist and there are ways to revise the permit to make modifications.

Steve Savage noted the primary lateral system for the 45 story tower and said changing isn't possible.

Mr. Luoma asked if they were still planning to punch a hole in the southeast corner wall.

Mr. Luoma questioned if escalator is required.

Mr. Wright said they commissioned a study and were told it is required.

Ms. Wine preferred option 1; it preserves historic circulation pattern. She asked to see results of the study.

Ms. Barker preferred option 1 and retention of northwest staircase. She commented that 3 B with the awning is intriguing.

Mr. Ketcherside said that option 2 makes no sense and noted loss of the stair. He preferred 3A or 3B and noted preservation of symmetry of staircase and that it brings people to the front of the building.

Ms. Schmidt said there is still an interior stair in the corner and they are still removing the corner.

Mr. Ketcherside noted that the southeast stairs weren't preserved in any option.

Mr. Wright said they are required to create a barrier-free facility and this is the only corner that works.

Mr. Luoma asked why they are still moving the window.

Mr. Wright said it is at mid-landing height and with the elevator install spanning 3' over window there is no way to save.

Mr. Ketcherside suggested more exploration of option 3 and said he preferred it not impact the façade.

Mr. Murdock asked for planned occupancy.

Mr. Wright responded 1200 people.

Mr. Ketcherside said that stairs are used as overflow and here they are primary.

Mr. Murdock questioned the logic of needing huge insertion for the occasional big event.

Mr. Wright noted the Westin has this.

Mr. Luoma said that the church has held big services and events for 150 years.

Mr. Wright said this is in response to the programming.

Ms. Walker Brems said she doesn't have enough information and said there is a huge building adjacent that is related construction. She said it will be helpful to understand programming and to brainstorm places to put escalator. She said she didn't support any option presented.

Ms. Wine asked about loading – how and where.

Mr. Wright said originally in other back knuckle in southwest there is a freight elevator. He said there is service connection across all the way down to parking loading.

Ms. Wine said the idea of multi-function space seems more successful. She wants to see how the pulpit/choir area could develop. She supported flattening the floor to make it usable. She was supportive of flat balcony and preserve row of seating in front.

Ms. Barker said she supported the use and said it was more democratic and more usable.

Mr. Luoma said he had concerns about the escalator in the southwest corner. He asked to see the study for better understanding. He said that it isn't a big deal to go outside to come back into the building. He said he didn't get why the elevator requires removal of entire façade and window. He noted the ideas on how the glass touches the building have progressed well.

Mr. Murdock said the escalator doesn't belong. He said this should have been designed and better integrated with the new building; he said this is a slap in the face to the board. He said the board could have helped. He said this is not a good solution. He said the building has over 100 years of being used for events. He said the balcony is a better solution – it keeps the contours and shape and is much nicer. He said that the organ is a landmark and there might be people to use it. She said to try to find a place and maintain all the pipes. He wants to see sectional qualities of sheer walls.

Mr. Wright said they will be 12" around the entire building.

Mr. Ketcherside said he thought the goal was to save the southeast stairwell. He said if they can't save it and the façade then the priority is to save the façade. He said this is predicated on the impossibility of putting the elevator elsewhere and asked for evidence to show there is nowhere else to put it.

Ms. Walker Brems said to save that for another meeting.

Mr. Stanley said it is extraordinary effort to keep the building standing and said it is no small challenge. He said that if compromise is needed to make it work then he preferred a fully used building with escalator.

Ms. Shadid asked why they are carving away at the building when it could have worked into new. She said the balconies are an improvement. She did not support the escalator.

Ms. Walker Brems said the owners have given Mr. Wright a challenge and she applauded his efforts. She supported the change of use and raising the floor to level it. She said the balcony changes are good. She said that this is a historically significant landmark. She asked for more information about the addition to the south and the floor plate to understand how it relates to this building.

Ms. Barker wanted more information on proposed penetrations to the south and east elevations. She said that the tower has been permitted and she said she wants more information.

Ms. Walker Brems said the board could deny this application. She asked for them to share more information. She said she is not comfortable with the escalator – it doesn't belong. She said it is not worth sacrificing too much historic fabric. She said she is not comfortable with getting rid of the pipes. She said a lot has not changed.

Ms. Barker asked for pictures of the pipes.

Mr. Wright said he would work on that.

Ms. Wine said to preserve the experience of the main space and stair.

Mr. Wright said that the stair is also used to access the basement. He said there is access via the other stair in the back. He said the elevator goes all the way to the balcony. He still said there is still connection at four corners – three stairs, and one elevator.

Ms. Walker Brems – experientially is the way to approach sanctuary – not mechanical. It is really changing a religious building.

Ms. Wine asked about elevator overrun.

Mr. Wright said that there is room above and it gets worked in to that.

070115.5 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator