



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 580/15

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Seattle Municipal Tower

700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor

Room 4060

Wednesday, September 16, 2015 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Marjorie Anderson

Deb Barker

Nick Carter

Robert Ketcherside

Aaron Luoma

Jeffrey Murdock, Vice Chair

Matthew Sneddon

Elaine Wine

Staff

Sarah Sodd

Erin Doherty

Rebecca Frestedt

Melinda Bloom

Absent

Mike Stanley

Alison Walker Brems

Vice Chair Jeffrey Murdock called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

091615.1 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

091615.11 Columbia City Landmark District

Sidewalk adjacent to 3610 S. Edmunds St.

Proposed installation of two bronze leaves within the right-of-way as part of the Homeless Remembrance Project.

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed installation of two bronze leaves as part of the Homeless Remembrance Project. She said that one Leaf of Remembrance and an Explanation Leaf are proposed to be relocated from the Seward Park PCC location. The leaf honors Real Change vendor, Robert Hansen. Exhibits included plans and

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

photographs. On September 1, 2015 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. The Committee recommended approval of the proposal.

Applicant Comment:

Carol Cameron provided an overview of WHEEL, the project and the importance of remembering the homeless.

Betsy Greenman explained that with the move of PCC to its new location in the district they will also relocate the leaf from their old location to the new in honor and remembrance of the Real Change vendor who operated at that site.

Doug Hobkirk explained that leaves are glued down with a good epoxy. He said the leaves are placed as if they fell from a tree. He said they are off to the side and to date they have had no problem with slipping or damage. He said they provide regular maintenance of the leaves.

Ms. Cameron said that one leaf contains website information - fallenleaf.org - that explains the project. She said they make sure they are up to code, have permits and insurance.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Murdock said it is a beautiful project.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for street use located in the right-of-way adjacent to 3610 S. Edmunds St. This action is based on the following:

The proposed street use meets 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/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 right-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/NC/AL 8:0:0 Motion carried.

091615.12 Columbia City Landmark District
3818 S. Edmunds St.

Proposed signage, site alterations and landscaping.

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed building signage consisting of painted acrylic letters to be installed on the south façade and the proposed installation of landscaping and a transparent 4'h mesh wire fence, with gabion (rock-filled wire baskets) posts and gate, to be located on the north edge of the existing parking area. Proposal includes restriping existing parking spaces and installation of handrails at the rear stairs. Exhibits included renderings, plans and specifications. She said the two-story wood frame building was constructed in 1962 and is a non-contributing building within the district. On September 1, 2015 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. A member of the community gave public comment in support of the proposal. The Committee recommended approval of the proposal.

Applicant Comment:

Don Olund, property owner, explained the proposal to do needed maintenance to landscape and appearance of property. He said the work will help to set boundaries and add to security.

Sara Gould, Johnson Sutherland, provided context of the site and an overview of existing conditions. She said that there is precedence in the neighborhood to use fences and other screenings. She said they propose a low fence to create ownership for the tenants; it will be constructed of gabion posts and plantings. She went over the plant palette and said the fence will be transparent. She noted the gabion will be autumn gold stone to match building. She said the proposed sign will be matte black. She said they want to clearly delineate property line and parking. Responding to questions she pointed out where the gabion will be.

Mr. Olund said that it will prevent non-tenant parking. He said there are existing 'no parking' signs. He said that the fence will be set back from the front edge of the parking area with plantings in front.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker said it is reasonable and attractive.

Messrs. Carter and Sneddon were supportive.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signage, landscaping and site design located 3818 S. Edmunds St. This action is based on the following:

The proposed signage, landscaping and site design meets 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/SPECIFIC

6. Landscaping. Landscaping is encouraged but not required. Approval of the use of landscaping, including window boxes and planters, shall be based on the applicant's desire and ability to maintain the landscaping.

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.

Secretary of the Interiors Standards #9 & #10

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

091615.13 Coleman Building/First Avenue Group
1103 First Avenue
Proposed exterior alterations

Mike Skidmore explained that the building had been remodeled in the 1980s; terracotta façade rebuild and windows were replaced. He explained that they proposed two new blade signs that will be attached to existing holes where planter boxes are now. He said that window graphics will be placed in three windows; he provided photo of signs with placement and color scheme. He said there is a concrete lintel above the entry and it will be adhered directly to concrete. He said that the 12' wide steel channel awning – black chase and awning will be through grout joints. He said the building awning stands 5' out from the building face and is 12' long. He said impact to terracotta is minimal and there are just two points of connection; detail 6 shows the holes in the grout. He said that signage will sit on top of powder coated black steel with the Heartwood sign in copper gilded steel. Blade signs are non-illuminated silkscreen copper leaf on black background attached to existing plate into existing hole. He said the sign will be viewed from the sidewalk on 1st. He said the sign art is hand drawn. He said there will be a tree logo on the door.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Sodt said that earlier proposed modifications to the building are not happening at this time.

Ms. Barker said they were going into grout and she had no problem with what was proposed.

Ms. Wine said it has been well coordinated. She said that there is enough transparency with the graphics on the window.

Mr. Sneddon said there is no impact to historic material.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations to the Coleman Building (First Avenue Group) located at 94-96 Spring Street.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed exterior alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 111058, as the 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/DB/NC 8:0:0 Motion carried.

091615.14

Eitel Building

1502 Second Avenue

Proposed signage

A representative from Berry Signs, explained three possible ways to run power to sign that will go on existing I-beam. Option 1 – preferred – has power coming out of existing tenant space and running parallel with existing standpipe. Conduit will run in corner of I-beam and will be unnoticeable. It will be painted the same color as the building. Option 2 has the existing conduit coming down I-beam; he said they don't know to where the conduit runs. Option 3 would be from existing electrical box and conduit that ends 1 ½' from box – again they don't know where it comes from. He said conduit would go up decorative corner.

Tracy Skiles, also from Berry Signs, directed board members to the last page of the packet and indicated where the Harley sign is proposed to go.

Board members were supportive of the proposed Option 1 and noted that it stays away from the decorative corner.

Mr. Murdock said he hopes the building will be rehabbed and that he is glad this use is coming in. He said he hoped for a long term stable tenant in the building.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board discussion:

Ms. Barker said that ARC reviewed the proposal and said it is the only signage proposed for this use other than hours on the door.

Ms. Wine said they are using sign from existing location and the scale is nice.

Mr. Murdock asked about other building signage.

Ms. Sodt said it was all installed prior to designation.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed signage Option 1, as per the application submittal, at the Eitel Building, 1501 Second Avenue.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 123534 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and 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.

091615.15

Frederick & Nelson Building/Nordstrom

500 Pine Street

Proposed signage

Dana Ryan, Nordstrom, explained the proposal to create a new espresso bar and noted it will be moved around the corner. She said they propose a new blade internally illuminated blade sign with internal power supply. She said the power plate will be attached to wall. She said the sign will mark the E-Bar's identity.

Mr. Murdock asked about cladding.

Ms. Sodt said that it is non historic modern terracotta and the terracotta will be reinstalled after the sign is attached to concrete.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Luoma said ARC had no comment and noted that it made sense because of the ongoing work on the building.

Ms. Sodt noted how the window was rendered and asked if it will be opaque glazing or vinyl film.

Ms. Ryan said she was not sure but there is typically a little gradation.

Ms. Wine said it is not a part of the proposal.

Ms. Sodt said to clarify with her and noted it was not part of the previous proposal.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for the proposed signage at the Frederick & Nelson Building at 500-524 Pine Street, as per the application submittal.

This action is based on the following:

3. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 118716 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and 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.
4. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

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

091615.16

Schillestad Building
2111 First Avenue
Proposed storefront paint colors

Ms. Sodt presented on behalf of the applicants. She explained the proposal to paint the storefront up to the end of the archway as they had done before even though it isn't shown that way. She said they are not affiliated with their neighbor Urban Hardwoods in the Guiry Building but that they coordinated the color to make sure it complemented that. She said that Guiry had received approval for their colors and she provided color samples.

Mr. Murdock said that the conduit for lights on 1st Avenue is unattractive.

Ms. Sodt said that came up at ARC and was likely part of the remodel when they did that entryway. She said they weren't going to touch them but she recalls that the applicant didn't care for them either.

Ms. Anderson asked for clarification on white trim.

Ms. Sodt said they will paint out all elements.

Ms. Barker asked if the arch goes up to the 2nd level.

Ms. Sodt said that it does. She said that there is a little bit of brick and that the gray and black will not be right up against each other.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board members determined they had enough information to make a decision.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed storefront paint colors, as per the application submittal, at the Schillestad Building, 2111 First Avenue.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 113460 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and 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/NC/DB 8:0:0 Motion carried.

091615.17

Pier 54

1001 Alaskan Way

Proposed design reviews to previously approved project

Matt Sullivan explained they had made changes to previously approved project and directed board members to pages 15, 17, and 19 of the packet. He said on the east side a doorway has shifted to the south; windows above will be configured to get shear walls in; and louvers in the transoms will be removed. He said that on the north an existing solid mad door will be replaced; gas meter niche will be covered with galvanized steel mesh gate; there will be a new set of windows at the end and Curiosity Shop will relocate; one column is gone and three louvers will be relocated. He said that on the west side the awning will be solid blue now; two doors will proved access to public area; window will be changed from a grouping of six evenly spaced windows to two main groupings of 3 to allow shear walls. He said that new updated copies of drawings were provided to Ms. Sodt.

Mr. Luoma said that ARC was comfortable with what was proposed. He said that overall there are more windows and more transparency to the building. He said the realignment overall makes more sense. He said the doors are all consistent.

Ms. Barker said it was good attention to detail to bring disparate pieces together. She said the solid awning is good.

Ms. Sodt said that getting rid of the louvers was recommended by ARC and noted that they will be gone.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Sneddon said shifting the windows because of a shear wall doesn't align too nicely but he would support.

Mr. Sullivan said they do align along the center.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations, at Pier 54, 1001 Alaskan Way.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 123859 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and 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/DB/AL 8:0:0 Motion carried.

091615.18

St. James Cathedral
804 9th Avenue
Proposed exterior lighting

Stephen Lee walked board members through the packet and said existing lights date to the 1950. He said they are failing and provide poor lighting. He said that they want to light the building and pedestrian walkways and that the scheme would emphasize architecture. He said they propose nine new light poles and said that all poles will be within the landscape. He said that a small fixture will be used in and on the building. He said that on the main stairs they will replace the existing 3" diameter handrail which is not to code. He said they will replace it with a light rail system which is detailed in the plans. He said that at the main and two side entrances in the tops of steps they will install in ground fixtures. He said they will drill a hole through the building to run conduit inside where it will wrap around behind statues (he showed plans showing the routing of conduit). He said they will take out concrete landing and replace it in-kind to get wiring to in-grade lights, handrails etc. He said that eight holes will be cut on tower and four into granite steps. He said at the top of the building they will attached unistrut to joints of terracotta to make sure they are stable. He said they will install a 1/4" thread stainless steel rod. He said that there are 3/8" wide joints and there will be limited damage to building. He said that the scale is so huge that is it almost impossible to see. Responding to questions he said that the finishes will be bronze but the fixtures higher up will be silvery gray to help them disappear.

Mr. Luoma asked about in-ground light vandalism or shadow play.

Mr. Lee said that the space is totally open with no security and you have to trust it will not be vandalized.

Linnet Henry said that the fixtures are double lensed and you would have to go through two lenses and louver. She said there will be no shadow play because they are so close to the building.

Mr. Murdock asked about the 13 historic lampposts.

Mr. Lee said existing lamps will remain; they will be relamped and connected to the system.

Ms. Henry said they will take them apart and then seal with silicone.

Mr. Ketcherside asked about Terry Ave. lighting.

Mr. Lee said there is a larger plan for that area.

Ms. Wine said that ARC responded favorably and she noted the enhancement to the architectural features. She had no problem with what was presented.

Ms. Barker agreed with Ms. Wine.

Ms. Sodt said that the proposal hasn't changed, but the details have now all been fleshed out.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed building and site lighting, as per the application submittal, at St. James Cathedral, 804 – 9th Avenue.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 111579 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and 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/AL/NC 8:0:0 Motion carried.

091615.19

First United Methodist Church

811 Fifth Avenue

Proposed exterior and interior alterations

Detailed information and drawings in DON file.

Kevin Daniels provided an overview of the project and working with the board.

Ron Wright went over exterior renovations. He said that clarification was needed on page 5: on the north elevation the bottom base of terracotta is in disrepair. They propose to replace the bottom band with terracotta panels with the same methodology as used on the south elevation. He said it is a precast material. He said that on the north side each piece will be measured and fabricated. He said on the east they will rebuild the southeast corner where existing stair removed. They will build corner back below in precast to match the south. He said there will be a thorough cleaning of the building. He said they will remove the roof and replace it again. He said they will pull it off, fix it and put it back on.

He said on the west (alley) side they will do structural / seismic work; it will be inside encased in concrete. He said the window will be removed; the detail will remain and will still be recessed but there will be no window. He said that there will be a new steel walkway exit for the stairwell. He said the south faces the new tower. He said that they modified the opening to move feature window intact to align with new vestibule. He said they have downscaled opening. He said that they will keep

the entire south façade. He went over the connector and how the glass piece will meet the building. He said that all intersections are glass. He said that the seismic is further back in the glass system; he said they only place where they need to cut the building is where the portion of cornice sticks out – a small piece up high. He said that it will be a simple touch of glass to brick. He said the roof over the entry doesn't extend to the building.

Mr. Wright went through review sheets for interior and detail for 6 – 10" shotcrete walls. He said that shotcrete will encase the building and strengthen exterior walls. He said that all architectural elements will be removed; shotcrete installed and architectural elements put back on. He said they have detailed all trim etc. He said they will bring back the first row of seats in the balconies and the remainder of the space will convert to go straight back. He said that they need the horizontal element for bracing. He said that the projecting piece will go back in on perimeter all the way through new concrete.

He said the location of existing organ pipe wall, choir loft and pulpit will be removed to accommodate mechanical systems; he said it is the only place to put them in that isn't protected. He said that the floor will be levelled and the front wall will go back in but higher; he said that future kitchen space will be behind this. He explained that just the front row of organ pipes will be put back in. He went over the proposed configuration of the screen wall and podium the design of which was driven by the mechanical units. He said that mechanical pieces on the roof will go back in the southwest corner which he said is the least visible place on the building.

Mr. Wright said that they will install an escalator to provide barrier free accessibility. He said they will take the vestibule completely apart and put it back; they will keep the wainscot panels.

Mr. Ketcherside asked what was at the bottom of the escalator.

Mr. Wright said it is wood trim and that from the sanctuary space the entire vestibule will be visible.

Mr. Carter asked if the existing ceiling will remain or if they will be cut in to tie to the roof diaphragm.

Mr. Wright said that along the perimeter where the arches are they will cut in about 4 – 6' as noted on page 62.

Mr. Carter asked about architectural elements.

Mr. Wright said that all plaster and some relief around the windows will be matched. He said that upstairs around the balcony is plaster and below that is wood trim – they will match that. He said that they will have a deeper jamb extension.

Mr. Sneddon asked if roofing changes will be done in-kind.

Mr. Wright said the dome will be done in-kind. He said it is in pretty good shape and that they plan to remove it piece by piece and then put it back. He said they might have to replace 25%. He said they will have to get the membrane on. He said that

there terracotta at the corner is multi-piece and is the weakest part; he said they will put top coat on to match so water will go across. He said that they are having issues in the grout joints.

Mr. Murdock asked about the organ pipes.

Mr. Wright said that all visible pipes (as shown on 33 – 35) will be kept. He said the rest are low scale behind and are not visible so they will not be kept.

Mr. Murdock asked if it is possible to keep them.

Mr. Wright said it is not that they need that space for the mechanical equipment. He said that the operation of the organ can't be recreated. He said that the organ went in in 1968.

Ms. Sodt said the intent is just to keep the visible pipes as a screen.

Mr. Daniels said the pipes can be curated and restored and they are exploring opportunities.

Mr. Luoma asked about a notation on page 27 about the understory of the balcony.

Mr. Wright said that they are meeting code to get air into the space.

Mr. Luoma asked if they couldn't do it with the curved portion.

Mr. Daniels said that air doesn't get out as well.

Ms. Barker asked about the grill in the proposed elevator.

Mr. Daniels said they hope it will not be visible.

Mr. Luoma asked about the space north of the passenger elevator that was part of the entrance sequence.

Mr. Wright said the elevator arrives at the alcove behind and enters into the sanctuary space.

Ms. Barker said the northwest stair is not designated and asked if it will be retained.

Mr. Wright said it will be; it is intact, in good shape with original finish.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board discussion:

Ms. Barker said she was supportive of the work. She said she participated in ARC and toured the building and said the minimum is being altered, changed and replaced.

Mr. Ketcherside said he wished it was structurally sound as is. He said that the changes need to happen. He said the board has pushed the applicant on every change

and they have done their best to meet requirements and compromise and maintain the landmark.

Mr. Luoma said it is a difficult project to find a re-use for the building and the way it was designed and intended as a church to make it compatible with hotel uses. He said there has been a lot of compromise and noted the positive is the building is being saved and parts restored. He said improvements are being made on roof, seismically, and restoration on north and east facades that will last for decades to come. He said it is not a balancing act of losses and gains and it isn't that easy of a decision. He said the way the new building wraps around and hugs the existing seems appropriate and allows quite a bit of the façade to be visible. He said that penetrations into the south façade have not troubled as much because it is quite a bit lower at foundation rather than at more ornate portions of facade. He said the -escalator is troubling – the amount that extends into the vestibule space – and how much it throws off the symmetry as you walk in. He said that he understands the elevator is needed for access and the need to level floors. He said that moving of material around the pulpit will retain enough of that layered effect. He said that knowing you will never hear the reverberation of the organ again is troubling. He said that because it is a prominent building in the city and has such weighty history he is supportive and said that there are not a lot of good solutions. He said the applicant has done a lot to date. He said he is not 100% supportive with proposal and has mixed feelings.

Mr. Sneddon said it is a tough one. He said he appreciated the work the design team had put in to accommodate the building and noted there are tricky issues. He said he had to look at the final analysis in terms of Secretary of Interior's Standards; he cited #1 about new use. He said he started to make lists of all the proposed alterations – major terracotta replacement, major obstruction to south elevation, windows and doors moved or blocked, loss of two staircases, demolition of sloped floors, changes to patterns of flow and circulation, among others. He cited SOI 9 and 10 about new additions. He said he appreciates the glass hug but if the tower were to be pulled away at a future date you would see unalterable changes to the building. He did not support the application.

Ms. Wine said there are good points but there are a lot of alterations that are uncomfortable. She said that regarding reuse context it is unlikely to be used as sanctuary space in the future. She said the space has been used flexibility. She said that more people will experience the building now. She said there is more leeway in supporting some of the alterations. She said they have tried to maintain the look and feel. She noted that circulation patterns have changed but the space will still have the overall look and feel. She said it is difficult to see the floor level changes, window changes, but they need to make it usable. She said that if the escalator was not there, there would be stairs but that she said it wasn't enough to not approve.

Mr. Carter supported the project. He said the building will get reused. He said he prefers the glass hug rather than see columns. He said he had no problem with the organ pipe wall. He said the escalator has the biggest impact. He said they have done a relatively good job.

Ms. Anderson said they have shown great attention to detail to make it safe. She said the canopy seems to take away from the entrance space but that overall she was supportive.

Mr. Murdock said it is a problem that the tower was design before care was taken to engage the landmark appropriately with SOI and that the board is not fighting something that could have been designed better. He said that the organ pipes are an important character defining feature of the space and it is hard to accept that a decorative screen of pipes is enough. He said the console, steps and valves are portable. He said the pipes are part of the architecture. He noted the loss of volumes of the building and loss of proportions of space. He said it is awkward to have a doorway to nowhere over the escalator. He said this is one of the most important buildings in downtown Seattle. He said he would support the proposal.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for the proposed interior and exterior alterations, as described in the application submittal and submitted plans. This action is based on the following:

1. With regard to *SMC 25.12.750 A, the extent to which the proposed alteration or significant change would adversely affect the features or characteristics described in Ordinance No. 123291*: The exterior of the landmark building and the significant interior features will be affected by the proposed changes, specifically the proposed seismic upgrade; however, the applicant proposes to carefully remove, and then reinstall and/or rebuild significant interior features that are impacted by the structural upgrade as per the submitted plans and specification.
2. *With regard to SMC 25.12.750 B, The reasonableness or lack thereof of the proposed alterations or significant change in light of other alternatives available to achieve the objectives of the owner*: The proposed seismic work appears reasonable in light of alternatives that may have a greater visual impact.
3. The other factors of SMC 25.12 .750 are not applicable to this application.

The proposed modifications meet the following Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:

5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

MM/SC/AL/DB 7:1:0 Motion carried. Mr. Sneddon opposed.

091615.2 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

091615.21 Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center
4000 NE 41st Street
Request for extension

Rich Hill, McCullough Hill Leary, requested a three month extension and provided an update. He said that Susan Jones was asked to look at the feasibility of adaptively

reusing the Lodge (Building E) and the Office (Building G). Mr. Hill said that the property owner is evaluating this study for the reuse of one or both buildings. He said that is their focus for the next few months.

Ms. Barker asked about other extension requests.

Ms. Doherty said this might be the fourth request, and that she anticipates more.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Doherty said the request is reasonable.

Mr. Sneddon appreciated more adaptive reuse.

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

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

091615.22

The Theodora
6559 35th Avenue NE
Request for extension

Jessica Clawson, McCullough Hill Leary, requested a three month extension and anticipated that the Controls & Incentives Agreement would be completed before that time. She indicated the Board would see the Certificate of Approval application soon, and completing the agreement should happen shortly thereafter.

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/RK/AL 8:0:0 Motion carried.

091615.23

Kelly-Springfield Motor Truck Co. Building
1525 11th Avenue
Request for extension

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

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

091615.24

White Motor Co. Building
1021 E. Pine
Request for extension

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for White Motor Co. Building, 1021 E. Pine, for three months.

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

091615.3 NOMINATION

091615.31 Meany Middle School
301 21st Avenue East / 300-315 20th Avenue East

Vincent Gonzales, Seattle Public Schools, said they hope to make alterations and return the school to a neighborhood middle school in 2017. He said that the School District does not think the property has significance.

Ms. Doherty said that the School District's letter of opinion was sent to the board.

Ellen Mirro, The Johnson Partnership, prepared and presented the nomination report (full report in DON file). She provided context of the building and site. She said that the Longfellow School was built on this site in 1904 and over the years multiple additions and expansions were added. She said in 1961 the original building was demolished. She provided a 'virtual' tour of the site and buildings via photos. She reported that the school was never designed as a whole complete structure; even in 1904 it was designed for expansion. She described the additions by Naramore and Brady, and by John Maloney. She said that the Mahlum addition is the largest portion of the school. She said its thin roof has been thickened to different depths around the school with the addition of rigid insulation on top. She noted water intrusion and deterioration of brick due to poor detailing. She said that original windows remain in this portion. She said that interiors have been altered many times and finishes were redone during asbestos abatement. She said there was a 2011 seismic upgrade.

She said that the building doesn't meet criteria A or B. She said a piece of art by James Washington, Jr. is sited on the property, but it is not a strong enough association with the school; Mr. Washington is best associated with his home and studio which is a designated landmark. Regarding Criterion C she said that the building is associated with the development of the schools district and Capitol Hill but not in a significant way. She said the school typology is Modern and Mid-Century. She noted Mahlum was not a Modernist. She provided examples of other better examples of the style: Ansonia; Portola High School in California; LaFayette and Olympic Hills schools. She said that each portion is typologically unrelated and that the school is an amalgam of various styles. She said the building doesn't have integrity and doesn't meet Criterion E. She went over Floyd Naramore's work in the city specifically the schools he designed while serving as the School District architect; 13 of the schools are landmarked. She provided examples of John Maloney's work including Seattle First National Bank as well as examples in central Washington. She provided examples of Edward Mahlum's work including North Seattle Community College, Phinney Lutheran Church addition, among others. She said the school is not very visible and doesn't meet Criterion F. She said the school does not possess integrity and is not significant.

Mr. Carter asked if the metal sunscreens on the Maloney addition are original.

Ms. Mirro confirmed that they are.

Mr. Murdock asked if Jack Christiansen was the engineer.

Ms. Mirro said she didn't know.

Mr. Gonzales said that the sunscreens are easy to climb onto, and break-ins happen through the clerestory windows.

Ms. Doherty said the school district likely has the structural engineering drawings for the Maloney addition in their archive.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Wine supported nomination based on the Staff Report recommendation. She said the Maloney section is the only portion with interest and integrity.

Mr. Sneddon said a school has been there 111 years, and he noted the importance of how schools relate to communities and are markers of development. He noted the school's relationship to the development of the Central District and those who lived there. He noted integrity issues but said he supported nomination based on the Staff Report recommendation – the Maloney portion.

Mr. Luoma said the sawtooth roof and clerestory windows are the most striking feature. He supported nomination and said he was interested in hearing more about how contributing it is as an element and how the style continues throughout the building as a feature.

Mr. Ketcherside said the Maloney portion is the only portion that stands out. He said he has a jumbled image of the school because there are so many styles. He said the 1904 dating of the original building predates the streetcar line. He noted explosive growth after the streetcar was put in.

Ms. Barker said the only thing intact is its name and said the rest is piecemeal.

Ms. Anderson said the Maloney wing's roof form embodies a distinct architectural style and she supported nomination of that portion of the school.

Mr. Carter did not support nomination and said that Olympic Hill has similar qualities that were done better.

Mr. Murdock supported nomination and was interested to know if this is a Maloney-Christiansen collaboration. He said that this is one of Maloney's few buildings remaining, aside from religious institutions. He noted the skillful use of space and natural light. He said it is fortunate that this portion is segregated from the rest of the complex.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Meany Middle School at 301 21st Avenue East / 300-315 20th Avenue East for consideration as a Seattle

Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the exterior of the 1954-55 classroom wing and portions of the site within 30' of the 1954-55 classroom wing; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for November 4, 2015; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/EW/RK 6:2:0 Motion carried. Ms. Barker and Mr. Carter opposed.

091615.4 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator