



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 178/15

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
Seattle Municipal Tower
700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor
Room 4060
Wednesday, March 18, 2015 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker
Robert Ketcherside
Jeffrey Murdock, Vice Chair
Valerie Porter
Sarah Shadid
Matthew Sneddon
Mike Stanley
Alison Walker Brems, Chair
Elaine Wine

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Rebecca Frestedt

Absent

Aaron Luoma
Nick Carter

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

31815.1 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
February 18, 2015
MM/SC/DB/JM 6:0:0 Minutes approved.

031815.2 **CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

031815.21 Columbia City Landmark District
Right-of-way adjacent to 4816 Rainier Ave. S.

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Proposed installation of a “real time information display” for transit information

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed installation of a real time information display sign, in the right of way to display transit information. She said the proposal includes relocation of existing newspaper boxes and installation of a handhold within the sidewalk. Exhibits included plans and photographs. She said that on March 3, 2015 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application and recommended approval of the proposal.

Applicant Comment:

Jonathan Dong, SDOT, said the real-time information display sign will be installed in the northbound direction next to the Subway restaurant. He explained that SDOT is installing a series of these signs along Rainier Ave. S. over the past year. He explained that ridership on the #7 bus is 5th highest citywide in this location. He said the area will be restored to existing conditions following installation. He said there will be no decorative finial on the post and noted that this will be the only sign of this type in the Columbia City Landmark District.

Ms. Wine arrived at 3:40 pm.

Ms. Barker asked for clarification on sign type.

Mr. Dong said that it is an SDOT sign – not Rapidride. The handhold – where electrical comes in – will allow for future Orca card scanning equipment as part of a separate application.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for street use located at 5000 Rainier Ave. S. This action is based on the following:

The proposed street use meets the following sections of the District ordinance and the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines:

Relevant Columbia City Design Guidelines:

Guidelines/Specific

7. Street Use. Any work that affects a street, alley, sidewalk, or other public right-of-way, shall be reviewed by the Review Committee and Board. Emphasis shall be placed on creating and maintaining pedestrian-oriented public spaces and rights-of-way. Street trees and other plant materials that add human enjoyment to the District shall be encouraged, decorative treatments within the sidewalk, including special paving patterns and building entryway tiling shall be preserved. The use of alleys for services and public-oriented activities shall be encouraged.

Secretary of the Interiors Standards #10

MM/SC/RK/DB 6:0:1 Motion carried. Ms. Wine abstained.

031815.22

Frederick & Nelson Building/Nordstrom

500 Pine Street

Proposed terra cotta replacement

Ms. Shadid arrived at 3:41 pm.

Ms. Porter arrived at 3:42 pm.

Stefan Hoffman provided an overview of the building, its history and its cladding and noted they discovered cracking while doing window maintenance. He said that they did a survey of the terracotta.

Andy Chronister went through the 2013 survey and explained its findings. He said they checked to see if they could salvage cracked terracotta but it is not possible because the condition is too poor and also because of the way the tiles are packed in. He said that they want to use GFRC for replacement of select pieces of terracotta for its performance. He said GFRC is proposed for replacement of about 10% of the tile; repair and tuck pointing will be done on 85%.

Mr. Hoffman explained the GRFC technology and how it is made in molds similar to the terracotta process. He said that with GFRC there is less likelihood of spalling and cracking; there is better seismic performance; and maintenance is easier. He noted the shrinkage of clay in the firing process versus using true size molds with GFRC.

Dan Evans represented Nordstrom and said they are doing necessary maintenance for the long term well-being of the building.

Ms. Wine asked if they would mimic the jointing.

Dave Talbot said they will.

Ms. Wine asked about weathering between the two materials – terracotta versus GFRC.

Dave Talbot said they don't think they will see that. He said the core material would weather the same but they think the alephatic urethane system will weather better. It is not a 100 year coating but it is likely 15 – 20 years before needing recoating. If they apply a clear coat they think the maintenance is easier.

Mr. Ketcherside asked how it would look at sunset noted the glow at sunset seen in the cream terracotta.

Ms. Walker Brems said that crazing of the terracotta can be beautiful and asked what happens to the GFRC – how does it age.

Mr. Talbot said that there is more color change in terracotta from crazing. He noted the ability to match sheen of existing terracotta. He said an applied coating will never have the durability of a vitreous glaze and that the finish will lose gloss over time but this comes very close.

Mr. Hoffman said that the GRFC will continue to match the terracotta and will not age differently.

Mr. Talbot said that there are pieces of terracotta on the building now that are whiter and that were likely replacement pieces from the 1990s.

Mike Peels noted the different planes and that all will weather the same. He said they will repoint mortar first.

Mr. Talbot said over time eventually it is a matter of gloss and noted the difficulty of putting new pieces in and matching flat to flat. He said that this installation will be more forgiving because they are not butting up against flat pieces and noted the shadows in ornate pieces. He said at some future time the next round of maintenance and spot cleaning they will look at how all the pieces relate.

Mr. Sneddon asked if any of the buildings mentioned in precedent studies were on the National Register.

Mr. Talbot said the building they did in Kansas is on the National Register and he noted one in Minneapolis was a tax credit project. He said that many of their projects are. He said they are doing the Oregon Supreme Court building and noted they are doing a cantilevered cornice that is in bad shape. He said the State Historic Preservation Officer directed them to do terracotta on the columns etc. but that GFRC for the cornice was okay.

Ms. Barker asked about alternatives to the GFRC.

Mr. Hoffman said they would do terracotta – it is entirely feasible but would have to redo the steel armature as required to support the terracotta.

Mr. Murdock asked if Gladding McBean still have any of the original terracotta molds.

Mr. Hoffman said they talked to Gladding McBean and they do not.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Sneddon said that ARC thought the applicants had made a good effort to match but it is better to use the original material.

Mr. Murdock said that Preservation Brief #7 acknowledges GFRC but that new resin finishes do not replicate terracotta blaze. He said ideally in-kind replacement is preferred. He said that the replacement with GFRC appears to not be a significant change to the building and may be a good solution.

Mr. Ketcherside said the GRFC looks better than the 1997 terracotta and that he is okay with its use here.

Ms. Barker said she is concerned about setting this precedent and that the aging finish is a concern.

Mr. Stanley said he is concerned about the finish and it is also a slippery slope for substitution products.

Mr. Sneddon said that changing the material does detract somewhat from its history.

Ms. Shadid said she is okay with GFRC.

Ms. Walker Brems said she remembers the proposal for new glass canopies to look up and see the beautiful historic terracotta and said she preferred new terracotta.

Ms. Wine said she is concerned with the loss of patina but thinks the GFRC is reasonable.

Ms. Porter said it may be okay.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed replacement of terra cotta cladding at areas between vertical pilasters at levels 2 through 5 on the east, west and south elevations with Glass Fiber Reinforced Concrete (GFRC), as per the application submittal, at the Frederick & Nelson Building, 500-524 Pine Street.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance #118716 as the proposed cladding replacement material (GFRC) will closely match the historic terra cotta in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities, as per Standard #6 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

Motion conditioned on return to ARC for final glazed finish.

MM/SC/EW/VP 5:4:0 Motion carried. Mmes. Walker Brems, Barker, and Messrs. Murdock and Sneddon opposed.

031815.3 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

031815.31 The Theodora
6559 35th Avenue NE
Request for an extension

Jessica Clawson (McCullough Hill Leary) explained the request for a three-month extension.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Theodora, 6559 35th Avenue NE, for three months.

MM/SC/DB/JM 9:0:0 Motion carried.

031815.32 Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center
4000 NE 41st Street
Request for an extension

Rich Hill (McCullough Hill Leary) and Nathan Rimmer (4000 Property LLC) explained the request for a three-month extension.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Battelle Memorial Institute/Talaris Conference Center, 4000 NE 41st Street, for three months.

MM/SC/JM/EW 9:0:0 Motion carried.

031815.33 Kelly-Springfield Motor Truck Co. Building
1525 11th Avenue

Jessica Clawson explained the request for a three-month extension.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Kelly-Springfield Motor Truck Co. Building, 1525 11th Avenue, for three months.

MM/SC/RK/DB 9:0:0 Motion carried.

031815.34 901 Harrison Street

Jessica Clawson explained the request for a two-month extension.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for 901 Harrison Street Building for two months.

MM/SC/DB/MSN 9:0:0 Motion carried.

031815.4 TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS

031815.41 Seattle National Bank Building
720 Second Avenue

Ms. Sodt explained the boards need to verify the eligibility of the Seattle National Bank Building at 720 Second Avenue for the transfer of development rights (TDR); the Board is also requested to approve the required covenant. She said that the code provisions require designation of the building(s) as a City of Seattle Landmark, pursuant to SMC 25.12; execution of a Controls and Incentive Agreement regarding the Landmark and recording of same against the property; receipt of a TDR authorization letter from DPD, which establishes the amount of TDRs available for transfer from the sending site; provisions of security to assure completion of any required rehabilitation and restoration of the landmark, unless such work has been completed. She explained that the owner must also execute and record an agreement in the form and content acceptable to the Landmarks Preservation Board providing for the maintenance of the historically significant features of the building, per SMC 23.49.014D(4). The owner has completed, and the City Historic Preservation Officer has approved, subject to final approval by the Board, a covenant that includes the commitment of the owner to maintain the Seattle National Bank Building consistent with Ordinance No. **124716**.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board makes the determination that the Seattle National Bank Building at 720 Second Avenue has fulfilled the requirements for transfer of Landmark TDR pursuant to SMC 23.49.014 and Ordinance No. 120443 – that the building is a designated Landmark with a Controls and Incentives Agreement pursuant to Ordinance No. **124716**; that an authorization letter from DPD has been received and has identified the number of transferable square feet to be 69,600 square feet; and, the building is not presently in need of rehabilitation, therefore no security is required.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

MM/SC/DB/RK 9:0:0 Motion carried.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approved the agreement entitled “COVENANTS FOR LANDMARK TRANSFERABLE DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS” as submitted to the Board as the legal agreement required as a condition to the transfer of development rights from the Seattle National Bank Building at 720 Second Avenue, per SMC 23.49.014D(4).

MM/SC/MST/JM 9:0:0 Motion carried.

031815.5 DESIGNATION

031815.51 Loyal Heights Elementary School
2501 NW 80th Street

Eric Becker, Seattle Public Schools, said that they plan to renovate the interior to meet education specifications, as well as seismic and accessibility upgrades.

Ellen Mirro (The Johnson Partnership) presented the PowerPoint (full report in DON file). She provided an overview of the exterior and previous alterations. She noted in particular the window replacement. When the additions were built in 1946 the gender separation was removed from the school's operations.

She said the building does not meet criteria A and B. She noted the school's association with its neighborhood but that it may not be significant and does not meet criterion C. She discussed other Seattle schools by Floyd Naramore. She said that Loyal Heights was built in 1932 concurrent with the Depression, and certain design elements were eliminated that would have been built in a similar school two years earlier. She said that the character and style are mostly economical and may not meet criterion D. She discussed Naramore's broader career and said that this school might not meet criterion E. She described the neighborhood views back to the site and that its occupation of the whole block may or may not meet criterion F.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker supported designation per the staff report, excluding the covered playcourts. She supported criteria C and D and said the economic story is important.

Mr. Ketcherside supported designation on criteria C, D, and possibly F. He said he thinks the economic story is important.

Mr. Murdock supported criteria C, and D and enjoyed the tour. He said the school is beloved by its community.

Ms. Porter supported designation based on Staff Recommendation. She said that it represents the time in which it was built.

Ms. Shadid supported designation on criteria C, D, and F and said that the kindergartens are important, as is the school's history in the neighborhood.

Mr. Sneddon supported designation on criteria C, D and F and said the school tells the story of how schools were designed at this time. He said that the economic story is important as well as the social aspects. He said the building is distinctive.

Mr. Stanley supported designation on criteria D and F and said the integrity is intact. He said that he didn't think the playcourts are important.

Ms. Wine said she wished she had seen the interior because she thinks they may be more compelling than the exterior.

Ms. Walker Brems supported designation on criteria C and D. She said that the covered playcourts could be addressed through negotiation of the Controls and Incentives Agreement.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Loyal Heights Elementary School at 2501 NW 80th Street 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 site; the exteriors of the 1932 building and 1946 addition; and the interior corridors, stairways, classrooms, and auditorium/lunchroom.

MM/SC/RK/DB 9:0:0 Motion carried.

031815.6 BRIEFINGS

Mr. Stanley left at 5:30 pm.

031815.61 First United Methodist Church
811 Fifth Avenue
Briefing on proposed interior and exterior alterations

Ron Wright and Kevin Daniels presented.

Mr. Daniels provided an overview of the adjacent development and proposed interventions of the church and seismic upgrades. He said they are planning to clean and restore most of the external envelop and anticipate replacement of terracotta. He said they will need to rebuild/replace the entire terracotta dome roof. He said they want to lower the west roof to be able to conceal new mechanical equipment.

Mr. Wright explained the church was built in 1907-10. He said the original design had stairs that came down on to 5th Avenue directly into the church; he said that 5th Avenue has been changed and there isn't a way to bring that back. He said an apartment building was on the adjacent lot and on the south end a two story structure was added in 1950. The 1950 structure has been demolished. He explained that there are four columns that hold up the dome and the rest of the building is unreinforced masonry – he said they will bring it up to code. He said that most of the terracotta is load bearing and there are places with cracks and fissures. He went over areas that have been redone.

He went through interior existing conditions and said there are about 4000 existing pipes that are contributing element to the building. He said the large dome space has a steel truss system that supports it. He went over the interior layout noting details of the basement, caretaker's apartment, main level. He said the four corners each have a circulation stair; south and north stairs are contributing elements along with the organ. He showed photo of the development next door and how the buildings will connect. He said there will be a narthex space that will create a three or four story space. In order to make this work they had to do some push/pull – save what they

could for the betterment of the whole. He said they would use southeast corner as a major circulation area and that is where one of the historic stairways is now. He said that the south stained glass window will remain intact. He showed the connection of hotel with service space and said the hotel will use the bottom portion of the high rise for rooms and amenities and the church space will be ball rooms and feature restaurant.

Mr. Wright showed existing stairs on 5th Avenue and current entry; their intent is to lower one part of the roof to put in mechanical equipment for the restaurant and add louvers. He said the west face of the building is problematic – terracotta has become load bearing and is under stress. He said they will do shotcrete walls on the four square sides and keep the corners intact if they can and create new walls inside walls. He said they hope to keep most of the openings but will be a blank wall. He said that part of the existing church will have a ramp installed from the ramp for exiting – garage is underneath the tower.

He said at the basement level (a two-story height space) they will have one large space and service space – restrooms, ramp and garage space. He said the wood frame construction gets in the way of structural needs and will be rebuilt to accommodate service areas. He showed proposed escalator to go in where other historic stair is. He provided schematics to show how the restaurant would fit into the sanctuary space. He said the in order to get the shotcrete in they will have to take the pipes out; they will keep a row of pipes to keep the existing flavor. He said the balcony spaces will be removed and rebuilt; they are sloped now and they will be put back as flat area for restaurant space.

He said they will change the front piece built in the 1950s and connect with new building. He said they may replace doors with glazing. He explained that they will clean and save as much terracotta as possible; less than 10% replacement. He said they will clean and restore all windows. He said the roof currently leaks; 60' diameter dome which comes together with horizontally placed terracotta. He noted some terracotta that had been removed in the 1990s because of safety concerns.

Ms. Wine asked how to enter main level of space – it was confusing.

Mr. Wright said the main level is located 8 – 10' above 5th Avenue; stairs are required. He said page 7 shows a main entry piece between the two buildings and an escalator system will be put in. Exterior doors remain. He explained entry to the building from 5th Avenue will remain.

Ms. Barker asked about the interior balcony changes.

Mr. Wright said that there are four stairs that all access the balconies; they will put them back to same bottom level plane.

Ms. Walker Brems asked about the guard rail.

Mr. Wright said they will come back with that but that will be more open visually with glass or stainless mesh.

Ms. Walker Brems asked about the organ pipes.

Mr. Wright said there is a cavity behind and that they will pull them out to put in shotcrete. They will use the cavity space for mechanical equipment. He said a large amount of the ventilation for the high rise impacts where they put equipment.

Mr. Ketcherside asked why the organ wouldn't be made functional again.

Mr. Daniels said it is expensive.

Ms. Sodt confirmed that only the pipes are included in controls.

Mr. Wright said they would keep the pipes in front. He said there are layers of pipes that go back 8 – 10' but they will use that space for mechanical equipment; they will bring back just the front row of pipes.

Ms. Walker Brems asked the square footage of new building.

Mr. Daniels said it is 700,000 FAR.

Ms. Walker Brems asked why the garage door will cut through.

Mr. Wright said it was part of 2007 construction and then work stopped.

Ms. Sodt said the building was designated in 2009 and the garage door had already been done.

Ms. Walker Brems said she had never seen these plans.

Mr. Ketcherside asked about the organ.

Mr. Daniels said the organ is from 1968 and it functions. He said the organ was built specifically for the volume of this church.

Ms. Walker Brems asked for clarification on what is controlled.

Ms. Sodt read from the document.

Ms. Shadid left at 6:10 pm.

Mr. Sneddon asked what types of other structural options there might be for seismic upgrade.

Mr. Wright clarified that shotcrete is the only reasonable method of keeping the masonry together. The shotcrete will be 6 – 8" thick. The existing finishes will be remounted and reinstalled. He said the building will be squeezed down about a 1' inside. He said the main floor has a slope to it and is all wood; it is not structurally viable so they will have horizontal element coming in at floor level.

Ms. Wine asked about HVAC units taking up the space and asked if there were other options.

Mr. Wright said they didn't want them on the roof so that is why they located them there. He said because of what they have to do anyway to support west wall it became the best option. He said the arch will be there but the cavity space will be filled in. He said seismic code has changed since 2007.

Mr. Murdock said it doesn't make sense to him that the buildings are being designed together but the board isn't able to comment on the new addition.

Mr. Wright said they are doing it together but separately.

Ms. Walker Brems said is the same property – same owner, joined, the buildings touch so it isn't two separate building in her opinion.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Wine said she would like to have a tour. She said she was concerned about the organ space and the alterations to the east stair.

Mr. Murdock said he would like a tour. He said he is concerned about the narthex up against the church and the tower on top.

Mr. Sneddon asked if there are methods other than shotcrete and said to minimize impacts to historic fabric.

Ms. Barker said she was concerned about impacts to the organ as well as cuts into the main volume. She said that 4,000 pipes is a lot and can't they can't maintain perception of the depth without those. She asked for more info on the south façade and the proposed openings – escalator, lower level into ballroom, and larger tunnel for service. She said to lessen impact to historic fabric.

Mr. Ketcherside said he wanted a tour. He said that he would like to see the other structural options that were ruled out so that he is confident that the shotcrete is best. He said he is concerned about the direct impacts to the organ. He asked what other options there were and is this the best they can do. He said that shotcrete is proposed on inside and asked if they looked at reinforcement on outside alleyway. He said he wants to know they are retaining as much as possible. He said the organ was purpose designed for this space and 4,000 pipes to the system is very elaborate. He questioned if this was the only choice they have.

Mr. Walker Brems said she is greatly concerned about this proposal and said the scale of drawings is too small to be legible and doesn't make clear the massive changes proposed. She asked that they bring 11" x 17" drawings so can actually see what is proposed. She said the building was landmarked after the high-rise was designed. She said that they are ignoring the Controls. She said she would not support this. She said the way the high-rise meets the historic building is inelegant and awkward and detracts from one of more beautiful buildings in the City.

031815.62

Woodrow Wilson Junior High / Wilson-Pacific School

1330 N. 90th Street

Briefing on proposed commemorative space and interpretive exhibits

Johnpaul Jones (Jones & Jones) discussed the detailed concept for the Honor Circle. He said that Mahlum will continue to design the details. He showed the two school displays and the items from the school that have been donated for the displays. He said that the feedback at public meetings has been 100% positive.

Ms. Barker asked how the interpretive walls interface with the adjacent spaces and use of the walls.

Mr. Jones said the walls are isolated and given an individual space and will be highly visible in common areas.

Ms. Barker asked about lighting.

Mr. Jones said Mahlum will come back with more information.

Ms. Wine said to make sure there are no switches, outlets etc. on these display walls.

Mr. Ketcherside said it would be good to have some interpretive information about pronunciation of Salish words. He said he thought the exhibit elements are very positive.

Public Comment:

Jud Lawson said he is a taxpayer and he is concerned about losing the buildings when they could be renovated before spending all of this money. He doesn't want to see these interpretive / commemorative elements lost if the project budget is problematic.

Blaine Parce, parent and former student at Indian Heritage, said she is concerned about the murals being rooted to this site alone, and said they should be reinstalled where the Native American programs are located. She is concerned that some of the proposed exhibit items are property of the Eaglestaff family and should be returned to them. Ms. Parce said there needs to be more outreach from the design team, and that some people feel excluded.

Cindy Palmer, special education instructor, said she likes the existing school better than the proposed new school. She said she is also concerned about digging on this site, and disturbing archaeological artifacts.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker said that she would like to see no large obstructions around the Honor Circle.

Mr. Sneddon said that they might want to consult with UW or other Native American historians for the exhibit content.

Mr. Murdock said he was concerned that the Honor Circle is too close to the Building wall.

Ms. Wine said she would like to see the Honor Circle location considered for light exposure.

Ms. Porter said to consider sightlines related to vegetation around the perimeter.

Ms. Walker Brems said she likes the interpretive exhibit location and thinks that the Honor Circle location is also good.

031815.7 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator