



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 347/22

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

Remote Meeting

Wednesday, September 21, 2022 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Dean Barnes

Roi Chang

Kristen Johnson

Ian Macleod

Marc Schmitt

Padraic Slattery

Harriet Wasserman

Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Melinda Bloom

Absent

Taber Caton

Matt Inpanbutr

Lora-Ellen McKinney

Lawrence Norman

Acting Chair Kristen Johnson called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL

092122.1

PUBLIC COMMENT

Judy Smith said the Eastlake community supported landmark designation of the Steinhart Theriault Anderson Building noting it is an important billboard in the community. She said they hope to be part of a thoughtful dialog on landmark status.

Susan Boyle said a letter was sent from Docomomo WEWA (in DON file) about the Steinhart Theriault Anderson Building project briefing. She said SEPA requires design review and until Controls and Incentives document is complete design is conjectural. She said the proposed design does not meet design requirements. She said the designs do not respect the landmark. She said open negative space around the building is essential. She said the cantilever is more emphatic by extension. She said the design appears conjectural and is not worthy of consideration. She asked board to reject the design.

Ms. Doherty said the proposed project agenda item is a briefing only and is an opportunity for board members to offer informal feedback. No vote will be taken today.

092122.2 MEETING MINUTES

July 20, 2022 Tabled.

092122.3 SPECIAL TAX VALUATION

092122.31 Rohrer House
122 37th Avenue E

Property owner Trish Scarce explained the rehabilitation work that had been done and noted that a fire had happened, and some work was clean up. She said the basement was updated; she went through photos of the work done.

Ms. Doherty explained the Special Tax Valuation program. She said that submitted rehabilitation costs were \$393,245 and eligible costs were \$383,286.

Ms. Johnson said it is reasonable.

Mr. Macleod said it looks really nice and the roof replacement is important as they didn't have membrane technology when the house was built.

Ms. Scarce said the Rohrers designed the home together; it was the first flat roof with an FHA loan. She said she has learned a lot about architecture.

Approval of Rehab Work: Work for designated portions of the property were performed in compliance with the *Secretary of Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation*, and/or are consistent with in-kind maintenance and repairs.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: Rohrer House, 122 37th Avenue E, that this action is based upon criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; that this property has been substantially improved in the 24-month period prior to application; and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Landmarks Preservation Board and the owner.

MM/SC/IM/HW 7:0:0 Motion carried.

092122.4 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

092122.41 Elephant Car Wash Sign
Previously located at 6th Avenue & Battery Street
Proposed relocation and installation of sign

David Ho, Cushing Terrell provided context of the proposed site in a public courtyard and said the illuminated side of the sign will face north.

Mr. Macleod appreciated the fly through presentation. He said he is not usually a fan of plaques but that one may be useful in this case as the sign is out of context.

Mr. Ho said they are exploring where one should go for visibility.

Mr. Slattery appreciated all the hard work.

Mr. Macleod said he looks forward to the full display.

Ms. Johnson was pleased it will be in public and it is nice to see it move so quickly.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application and issue a Certificate of Approval for the installation of the Elephant Car Wash Sign (small version) to 2205 7th Avenue (7th Ave. and Blanchard St.), as per the attached submittal.

EXPLANATION AND FINDINGS

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 the report on designation.*
 - a. The sign had been removed from its long-time location at 6th and Battery prior to nomination, as the business it is associated is no longer in operation at that location. The proposed new location of the sign will be approximately two blocks away from its original location, and although the context will change, it is still in close proximity.
2. The factors of SMC 25.12 .750 B, C, D and E are not applicable.
3. The proposed work as presented is consistent with the following Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as listed below (or cite other applicable standards):

Standard #1: A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the object and its site and environment.

MM/SC/HW/DB 7:0:0 Motion carried.

092122.42

Villa Costella

348 W Olympic Way

Retroactive proposal for arbor structure

Elizabeth Friesen and Annamaria Lloyd presented a retroactive proposal for a wood arbor, and noted there are awnings elsewhere but worried about attaching to building. The arbor structure is free-standing and there have been objections by some other condo owners.

Ms. Doherty said she reached out Ms. Friesen after being contacted by another condo owner who expressed concern. Ms. Doherty said she initially thought the arbor had below grade footings, but once that was clarified Ms. Doherty confirmed that it still did not qualify as a movable planter and would need the Board's review and approval. She said public comment was received and provided to board members.

Mr. Macleod asked about intended plantings.

Ms. Doherty said they would be in the ground.

Mr. Barnes asked if the arbor would be a climbing issue.

Ms. Friesen did not think so.

Mr. Slattery asked if installing a cloth awning instead of the arbor would pose a structural issue.

Ms. Friesen said they looked at awnings, but it would have to attach into stucco at this location which was not desirable; other awnings are attached to wood.

Ms. Johnson asked if other units have the same issue with sun exposure.

Ms. Friesen said there is one other that does but there are hedges that help with shading.

Mr. Macleod said an awning is nice from aesthetic point of view but it is invasive for the building envelope and he understood structural concerns. He said he understood the complexity of an HOA, but said that the arbor is entirely reasonable – it doesn't touch the building or harm the landscape, nor is it visible from the street.

Ms. Wasserman said the arbor is not visible but that the site is designated, and this should have come to the board first. She said no harm was done; it is not perfect, but she sympathized that an awning would not work at this location.

Ms. Johnson said the design is nice; the arbor is removable and not attached. She reiterated that board review should come first in the future.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the retroactive application and issue a Certificate of Approval for the single wood arbor structure at Villa Costella, 348 W Olympic Way, as per the attached submittal.

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 123847.*
 - a. The site and physical fabric of the building are not adversely impacted by the arbor structure.
 - b. The arbor obstructs the view of a window on the south patio level. However, the scale of the arbor is small compared to the overall scale of the building.
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 and the applicant.*
 - a. No alternatives were presented to the Landmarks Board. Per the applicant, the Homeowner's Association previously denied an alternative for an exterior shade/awning.
3. The factors of SMC 25.12 .750 C, D and E are not applicable.
4. The proposed work as presented is consistent with the following Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as listed below (or cite other applicable standards):

Standard #9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

Standard #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/DB/MS

6:1:0 Motion carried. Mr. Slattery opposed.

092122.43

Space Needle

4075 SW Stevens Street
Proposed vehicle gate

Ron Sevart, Space Needle LLC explained that the 2016 refurbishment has been completed and they would move on to update the expired Certificate of Approval for replacement of elevator systems.

Blair Payson provided historical overview of the 1961 design and 2016 project to enhance the visitor experience while maintaining all character defining features. He said the four aspects of this part of the project include: modernize elevator cabs, new elevator hoistway attachments, enclosed stair enclosure and new elevator machine room at the roof level.

Mr. Sevart said new elevator technology has evolved and there have been significant improvements. He provided elevator outreach plan.

Cabs

Mr. Payson said the existing elevator cabs are 1992 cabs. The new cabs are double stacked and one single stack service elevator is proposed. He showed the original cab floor plan, and 1992, 2016 and 2022 proposed plans and noted they have maintained the curvilinear aspect of the original design and expanded the use of glass. He said the red single car is the only one that goes to every landing which is not possible with the double stack. He said the double stack car was an early concept for the Space Needle.

Hoistway Attachment

Mr. Payson said it reads as a dark vertical band. He said they will replace all components which will be same size or smaller. He said it will read the same as it does now.

Egress Stairs

Mr. Payson proposed replacement of the chain link material wrap fence in-kind.

Elevator Machine Room

Mr. Payson said there are only a couple other elevators in the world that will operate as fast as this one. He said machines require more room and he proposed raising the roof penthouse about 18". The railings can be simplified for cleaner profile, removing some elements leaving a cleaner roofscape. He said additional louvers will be incorporated. The machine room will be separated into two rooms which decreases air flow and necessitates adding it back in. He showed comparison rendering of existing and proposed machine rooms and said they will remove uplights and railing will be simplified. He said the modifications really can't be seen from a distance which is mostly how the Space Needed is perceived.

Mr. Barnes asked if colorful lights at top would continue.

Mr. Payson said it will continue but with different set of existing lights. He said these unused lights will be removed.

Ms. Chang asked the difference between 2016 and 2022 proposals.

Mr. Payson said because it is the Space Needle and given its prominence in the city it is good to have board review. He said when they presented in 2016 it was a learning experience about how complicated the raised roof is.

Ms. Clawson noted the original Certificate of Approval has also expired so they need a new one.

Ms. Chang asked why the double stack cabs.

Mr. Severt said the modifications future-proof the functionality and provide ability to add redundancy in operations. If one elevator is down, others can handle the capacity. He said this was part of the original design intent and now we are able to build some of those things.

Ms. Wasserman appreciated the nice presentation and said the proposal is impressive and thoughtful; she noted improved wheelchair access.

Ms. Johnson said it has been a fun review and that she had no issue with what was proposed. She said the changes are small relative to the giant scale. She said the double elevator will look nice and most won't notice it.

Mr. Macleod said it is a fantastic project for a fantastic building. He appreciated the remodel with the glass floor. He said losing the spotlights was originally a concern, but they weren't original and hadn't been used in 20 years. He said the double stack cab versus single elevator cab won't be noticed. He said he looked forward to seeing it when finished.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application and issue a Certificate of Approval for the elevator, penthouse, and stair alterations at the Space Needle, 219 4th Avenue, as per the attached submittal.

EXPLANATION AND FINDINGS

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 119428.*

- a. The proposed changes to the elevator cabs, penthouse, and stair enclosure are minor in scale and appearance.
- 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 and the applicant.*
 - a. The owner explained the need for increased elevator capacity to better serve visitors and staff.
- 3. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 C, *the extent to which the proposed alteration or significant change may be necessary to meet the requirements of any other law, statute, regulation, code or ordinance.*
 - a. The elevator system needs to be replaced for improved safety and reliability.
- 4. The factors of SMC 25.12 .750 D and E are not applicable.
- 5. The proposed work as presented is consistent with the following Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation as listed below (or cite other applicable standards):

Standard #9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

MM/SC/HW/DB 7:0:0 Motion carried.

092122.5 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

092122.51 Freeway Park
700 Seneca Street
Request for extension

Ms. Sodt explained the request for four-month extension until the second meeting in January 2023. She supported the request.

Mr. Macleod concurred.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for Freeway Park, 700 Seneca Street, for four months.

MM/SC/DB/HW 7:0:0 Motion carried.

092122.52 former Steinhart Theriault Anderson Office Building
1264 Eastlake Avenue E
Request for extension

John Hempelmann, Cairncross & Hempelmann PS and property owner Bob Breskovich requested a four-month extension to work through framework to preserve the building as well as the development rights.

Ms. Doherty said the extension is for the negotiations period for a Controls and Incentives agreement. She said the building was recently landmarked and had been nominated by an outside party.

Mr. Barnes asked how Controls and Incentives relates to development.

Ms. Doherty said without an agreement the board considers all changes to development potential around and over the landmark. She said no action will be taken today a briefing will follow so board can offer feedback independent of the Controls and Incentives process. She said the Controls and Incentives extension process is a separate matter from the design briefing.

Ms. Johnson said four months is reasonable.

Mr. Barnes concurred.

Mr. Schmitt concurred.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for former Steinhart Theriault Anderson Office Building, 1264 Eastlake Avenue E, for four months.

MM/SC/DB/MS 7:0:0 Motion carried.

092122.6

BRIEFING

092122.61

former Steinhart Theriault Anderson Office Building
1264 Eastlake Avenue E
Briefing on proposed development potential

John Hempelmann, Cairncross & Hempelmann PS counsel for the property owner said there are no immediate plans to redevelop the site, but they had a unique idea that they wanted to present to the board for feedback. He said the idea preserves and honors the landmark while preserving the most property value for the owners. He said the owner did not nominate the building but appreciates the importance of preserving architectural history which is a significant benefit for the public. He said the board does not have the authority to take into account adverse impacts of designation which eliminates significant development rights. He said they have explored options to save the building and allow development with ability to cantilever over the designated landmark. He noted Martin Selig's addition to the top of the Federal Reserve Bank building as an example of how good architecture could achieve multiple objectives. He said the team wants feedback from the board and hopes to include language allowing a cantilevered option in the Controls document.

He said they have approval from the adjacent property to include a development concept that includes their property in the presentation made today.

Russ Hazzard, MG2 said the design is very conceptual at this time. He provided context of the area and noted the transformation of the neighborhood. He said they are exploring what the development potential is for the building. He showed adjacency of building to landmark building and noted they are almost on top of each other. He showed the Federal Reserve Bank as an example of a successful project involving a landmark. He explained massing studies that accentuated the landmark rather than turned its back on it. He suggested a sculptural landscape to restore it to the original idea and tie it in to the development as a recognized design element.

Ms. Johnson asked about any precept to include a future project in a Controls & Incentives Agreement or when contemplating designation.

Ms. Doherty said sometimes in Controls and Incentives agreements a portion of the site is excluded, but she is not aware of any that exclude space over the landmark building. That is an idea the owner has proposed and is interested in exploring.

Ms. Sodt said she tries to avoid a specific development proposal or concept in the Controls and Incentives. She noted the Seattle Times Building where what was built was entirely something different from what was initially planned. However, she said the Eitel Building agreement included the assumption that a lightwell infill addition on a secondary elevation was possible as a concept.

Mr. Hempelmann said if you look at the incentives provision of the Landmarks Ordinance there is no question that the board has legal authority to approve in concept a cantilevered building as an incentive that could compensate owner. He said it is a unique idea.

Mr. Barnes expressed concern about how it would look. He said he is not an architect but that seeing the landmark building and the proposed design, the landmark building looks so minimal that it is lost. He says it loses its prominence and is hidden within the bigger scale.

Mr. Schmitt concurred and questioned how the landmark could not be subsumed into a larger structure. He said the zoning allows the height. He worried about impacts to the landmark. He appreciated the idea to cantilever over and preserve the landscape.

Mr. Macleod appreciated the team for bringing the concept to the board and noted he had never seen anything like this before – the potential for a preliminary approval attached to Controls and Incentives. He said the massing study overwhelms the historic property and site. He appreciates the design intent to echo cantilever. He said the Martin Selig project is a vertically oriented building in an urban site which worked in its context. He said this building is horizontally oriented with interplay between the landscape and the site; cantilevering over it destroys that and it becomes a bit of a façadectomy. He said he echoed public comment that

a more fully formed concept than what was presented should be under consideration at this point. He said all property massing studies are overwhelming in scale and in relationship to the building.

Ms. Wasserman appreciated the early briefing and said there is no control over adjacent properties. She said the massing studies are too enormous especially when projecting over the building. She said none of the studies work.

Mr. Slattery said it is an iconic building which needs to be highlighted rather than treated as an afterthought. He said the project concepts don't accomplish that.

Ms. Chang said she is not opposed to getting the most out of vertical mass area surrounding this building. She wanted to see more setback to feature the landmark. She said cantilever needs to still highlight the landmark building. She said the ideas are good and she suggested the design team hammer things out. She asked how it works with different property owners on block development, and if Eastlake has air rights ownership.

Mr. Breskovich said he owns two properties to the south. He said he has no arrangement with the adjacent owner to the east, but collectively owners realize it makes sense and they did get Alexandria Real Estate's blessing to share the concept.

Ms. Doherty said she doesn't believe that TDR/TDP transfers are available in Eastlake at this time. She said it is worthwhile for the owner and team to talk to SDCI. She said there are a lot of "what ifs" and a lot of questions need to be explored regarding the potential of aggregating parcels related to the zoning envelope.

Ms. Sodt said the briefing was hypothetical to get feedback for the two property owners.

Ms. Chang appreciated outlining the ownership of the parcels and what options could be negotiable with SDCI.

Ms. Johnson said it is interesting to think about the Controls and Incentives agreement. She noted the large addition to the Firestone Building and the unique take on the Federal Reserve Building. She noted the original design of the Federal Reserve Building had the precedent for additional floors. She said the examples provided are not the greatest precedent. She said this building is small, Northwest Modern scale with wood detail that is harder to incorporate. She said she is not totally opposed to development. She said when she said the cantilever all the way to street encompasses the building and the landmark is being eaten up by the new. She said that is not to say that cantilevering is not possible. She said it is the issue of scale. She said it is an interesting idea.

Mr. Breskovich appreciated board feedback and said the goal is to not lose development potential of his three lots. He said they want to find a way to

celebrate and preserve the building and that he thinks collaboratively we can get there.

Mr. Hazzard appreciated the discussion. He said he would step back and would explore how to engage with the street and pedestrian scale. He said it could be done with good design.

Ms. Doherty thanked the team and said she would work with them to figure out next steps.

092122.7 BOARD BUSINESS