



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 287/15

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
Seattle Municipal Tower
700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor
Room 4060
Wednesday, May 6, 2015 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker
Nick Carter
Robert Ketcherside
Aaron Luoma
Jeffrey Murdock, Vice Chair
Sarah Shadid
Matthew Sneddon
Alison Walker Brems, Chair
Elaine Wine

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Mike Stanley

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

050615.1

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

March 18, 2015

MM/SC/DB/NC 9:0:0 Minutes approved.

April 1, 2015

MM/SC/JM/SSH 7:0:2 Minutes approved. Ms. Wine and Mr. Luoma abstained.

050615.2

CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

050615.21

Pioneer Sand & Gravel Company Building

901 Harrison Street

Proposed rehabilitation and associated new construction

Jack McCullough said they are seeking final approval and said that not much has changed from last briefing. He said the MUP was issued and the SEPA is finished. He said they will point out changes and improvements during presentation.

Jennifer Street explained the requirement to add fire department and hose bibs and noted where they would be located. She said they will rebuild the chimney on the alley façade as well as the clerestory windows. She said they will remove the filled windows and hope to discover the original steel sash. She said they will replace upper windows in line with original steel sash.

She said on the Harrison elevation the chimney will be board-formed concrete. She said they will paint and clean existing windows, remove original door and replace when complete. On 9th St. elevation they will replace windows, add fire department connections and hose bibs, remove gate at retail entry and restore back to retail entry. She said four stand pipes are needed on each side per Fire Department; she said that stainless steel is the best match. She said that the new entry will be set back to allow the landmark to hold the corner and be exposed. She said they decided the landmark will be painted a lighter color to distinguish it from the new base; they will highlight detail with darker color. She said that the landmark building is board form concrete and the new podium is precast to further distinguish the two.

She said that the west elevation will have precast podium and will be set back from landmark. She said they will rebuild the chimney – the original one was removed. She said they will replace the upper level windows. She said the ground level will be filled with retail. She said they will keep the original entry and highlight the corner. She said the residential entry will be between the two retail entries. She said they will fill in the 2nd floor and the 3rd floor will be a typical plan with balcony on the landmark roof. She provided renderings and noted how the landmark holds the corner.

Ms. Street said that natural materials will be used at the entry with a nod to Pioneer Sand and Gravel Company with a gabion wall. She noted the open retail concept on 9th Street.

Ms. Barker asked for clarification on correct sill dimension on renderings.

Ms. Sodt explained that the rendering on the last page of the packet had not been corrected but that they rendering on page 14 is corrected now.

Responding to questions Ms. Street said they will match steel sash windows as close as possible and said it is almost spot on. She said the head jamb and sill details are on page 13 and noted that they are not sitting right on the face.

Ms. Sodt noted it was discussed at ARC in the past.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Sneddon said that ARC discussed the fire Department requirements; he said they are a minor addition and required.

Ms. Walker Brems agreed that the new changes to the design were minor.

Ms. Sodt said the bulk of discussion happened a few months ago and the applicants were responsive to feedback then.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for the new addition, partial demolition, and rehabilitation as described in the application submittal and submitted plans, at 901 Harrison Street.

This action is based on the following:

In regards to SMC 25.12.750 A, the extent to which the proposed alteration or significance change would adversely affect the features or characteristics described in the Designation Report: While the proposal includes partial demolition, a thirty-three foot setback of the new construction from the Harrison Street elevation is proposed and an eighteen foot setback from 9th Avenue is proposed, therefore the primary elevations and view of the building will not be adversely affected by the proposal.

In regards 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 applicant has responded positively to feedback provided by the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) to explore the maximum set back of the new construction, as well as the compatibility of the design of the new construction with the historic building--the design has evolved to incorporate ARC feedback.

The other factors of SMC 25.12 .750 C and 25.12.750 D are not applicable at this time in the process.

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

Mr. McCullough said it has been a great process and is a better project because of it.

050615.22

Pier 54/Ivar's
1001 Alaskan Way
Proposed rehabilitation

Bob Donegan, Ivar's, explained that renovation projects have been ongoing since 2012 and this project will focus on north and west elevations.

Doug Sharp, Mithun, said they have been working with ARC and that some earlier proposed work had been revised. He walked through the packet – starting with pages 14-15. He said they will infill the existing openings that currently create an arcade, and add aluminum clad windows in pattern consistent with fenestration on the building to create a more unified appearance. He said that as per pages 16-17 they would replace all the existing siding vinyl siding with cedar lap in the same exposure

and profile. He said it will be painted the same color as the rest of the north side. He said they will make the second floor leasable space; he said they will add windows using the same aluminum clad wood windows. He said Ye Olde Curiosity Shoppe will move to the northwest corner as will their signage and artifacts.

Responding to questions Mr. Donegan said that there will be a finger or had sign left in the old location when finished for directional purposes.

Mr. Sharp said the clerestory remains the same. He said they will use the same aluminum clad wood windows as used in the restaurant portion. He said the west façade is the other front and faces the ferries. He said they will maintain some operable double hung windows in the office space and noted the wide variety of windows on the building. He said that they propose striped awning above windows on the west side to shade the office space. He said that they will put painted signage back on the building.

He said that on the south side – the restaurant side – they will revise awnings from solid blue to blue and white striped. He said that they will remove parking on the north apron; there will be no parking anymore. He provided color samples of building, awning and windows materials.

Ms. Walker Brems asked why they are adding corner boards when they aren't there now.

Mr. Sharp said there are some there now; there aren't any on the west side but there are on the east.

Mr. Donegan said there are few plumb, level and consistent areas on the building.

Mr. Sharp said they will use 1 x 4' corner boards.

Ms. Wine asked if the aluminum clad operable windows will be on the south only.

Mr. Donegan said there are two sets of operable windows: one set on the banquet room on the south side and one set for the offices on the west side.

Mr. Sharp said they will be double hung.

Ms. Wine asked about mechanical venting.

Mr. Sharp said they will maintain what they have although they will replace some hoods in kind.

Mr. Donegan said the hoods are getting smaller and they will leave them galvanized. He explained to board members that the birds around the restaurant are not sea gulls as many people believe. He said that because of the body of water they are bay gulls. Bay-gulls.

Ms. Walker Brems said the signage looks different on the plan from what is there and asked if the west façade is part of the proposal.

Mr. Donegan said the intent is to be identical to what it is now. He said they will repaint the pentimento signs.

Ms. Barker asked about signage on new awnings.

Ms. Walker Brems asked if the logo will be on the awnings.

Mr. Sharp said that the logos will be on the south awnings but not on the west facing ones.

Ms. Wine asked about schedule.

Mr. Donegan said the second phase has not commenced but it will be done in December.

There were questions about amount of signage on awnings and how the stripes will actually look versus what is rendered.

Ms. Sodt said that DPD sign inspector will need to weigh in the signage issue.

Mr. Murdock said that there was no logo on awnings historically.

Mr. Luoma asked if the large center windows on the west façade are historic and if they are to remain. He said it looks like the proposal has them being changed to larger windows.

Mr. Donegan said they had looked at many alternatives and noted that there isn't enough light with that space occupied as office. He said that the condition of the windows is bad and it is noted in the window survey. He said that the windows on the first floor to the north are the oldest.

Mr. Sharp said that the sill is 4 ½' off the floor.

Responding to comments about the number of logos Ms. Sodt said that the City sign inspector will determine and it depends on linear frontage.

Mr. Donegan said that is how the number of logos was determined; he said they can reduce if it is overkill.

Ms. Walker Brems said it is overkill.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Barker said she appreciated the increased use of pedestrian experience, the addition of seating and the changes added to the public benefit. She said she appreciated the simplification of windows and doors and that they kept the eclecticism but simplified it. She did not like the striped awnings and said the stripes are too wide. She said the logos on the awnings are overkill.

Mr. Murdock said the striped awnings are appropriate here and work. he said that the stripes lighten the perceived mass of the awnings and the consistency of windows and awnings is nice.

Mr. Sneddon said that so much has happened over the life of the building and what is meant to be preserved is the basic shape, the roof trusses. He said with so many changes it needs to be held to an approach that makes sense for the building now.

Mr. Luoma agreed and said the structure and form make it iconic and are to be preserved. He said that Ivar's is historically significant to this pier and it is important to recognize that. He said there is history of striped awnings there and he prefers the stripes. He said it is a big improvement and they are not going back to a true history because that is long gone but overall they are going in a good direction.

There was discussion about the size of the stripes with the preference for the stripes at approximately 7" – 8" as rendered.

Mr. Donegan said he is comfortable with 7 – 8" stripe as rendered.

Ms. Walker Brems said she preferred no logo on the awnings and said it would be too much. She said she liked the stripes because they lighten the awnings. She said the old signage was for pedestrians.

Mr. Sneddon said there is history of a lot of signage here and it isn't a big deal.

Mr. Luoma said the striped awning is not as visible as solid and he was not concerned. He said that it is a unique situation – it is a Pier and it is Ivar's.

A straw poll was conducted with majority of board members supporting the application.

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

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/AL/NC 6:3:0 Motion carried. Mmes. Walker Brems, Shadid and Barker opposed.

Mr. Donegan said he will look at the details and will reduce the logos; he will check with DPD.

050615.3 NOMINATIONS

050615.31 Daniel Bagley Elementary School
7821 Stone Avenue North

Eric Becker, Seattle Schools, said they plan to renovate the school to meet current specifications and enrollment demands.

Ellen Mirro, The Johnson Partnership, prepared and presented the nomination report via PowerPoint (full report in DON file). She provided context of the building and the neighborhood. She said the building was designed by Floyd Naramore and constructed in 1930. She said that portables were added in 1952. She said the building is Art Deco / Moderne with Gothic ornamentation. She noted the ornamental shield, three-legged stool and owl which were common motifs of parent, teacher, and student.

She walked the Board around the school via photos noting elements on each façade. She noted the south entry to the kindergarten and the south entry on the west façade with detail above the door. She said the west façade playcourt volume was enclosed for an art room. She noted the entry on the north end of the west façade with detail. She noted the top of the chimney and its character of Art Deco/Moderne. She noted the different type of construction from the rest of the school on the north side although they were built at the same time; she noted the bolts through the brick visible from exterior where basketball hoop is installed in the gymnasium. She said the north façade gymnasium is double wide brick construction and the meeting room is concrete with brick veneer. She pointed out the arched window in the meeting room and the entry door with dog, rabbit and turtle above.

Ms. Mirro noted interior elements and pointed out the double stairs inside and detail of niche with animal motif. She pointed out tile artwork created by children. She said the proscenium arch in the meeting room/cafeteria is Art Deco and said that the 12' x 26' wood beams are carved and painted. She said the gym is constructed of brick and noted the wood beam and corbel. She provided photo of the typical classroom, the former boys playcourt that was enclosed to create an art room, and the interior of two portables installed in 1952.

She said the integrity is good and there have been a few changes – addition of elevator, playcourt change to art room and some seismic work (with more necessary) but there is sufficient integrity. She said that the building does not meet criteria A or B. She noted the building's association with the development of the school system and the Greenlake community but said it wasn't enough to meet Criterion C. She provided photos of Floyd Naramore's schools through time noting most of the twenty schools constructed between 1919 and 1935 were in the Colonial Revival style and four – including this one – were not. She said that this school with its Gothic elements translates well to vertical. She said it is a superior example of the period with style in this case taking precedence over budget. She said that it stands out among Naramore's schools with its superior attention to detail and that it met Criterion D.

Ms. Mirro said that Naramore was a distinguished architect in Portland, Oregon before moving to Seattle. She noted that he used the Gothic Revival Style on UW Bagley Hall, designed Bellingham High School and T. T. Minor as well as several additions to schools. He was one of the founding members of NBBJ. She said the building meets

Criterion E. She said the school is located at Aurora and 80th and is overlooked because of the park and Aurora; she said it may or may not meet Criterion F.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Sneddon said this shows the transition between styles and is one of the few that doesn't have additions and represents more of the original design. He said the transition between styles is fascinating. He noted how the kindergarten is held out in its own bay and noted the attention to detail to create a good environment for children. He supported nomination on criteria D, E, F and probably C for development of the school system.

Mr. Carter supported nomination and said it is a good example of Naramore and that he used a different style here. He supported criteria C, D, E and he could go either way on F. He supported including the site, exterior and others.

Ms. Wine supported nomination and said it has integrity and the ability to convey what its significance; she said it meets a number of criteria. She asked for a tour.

Ms. Barker supported nomination on criteria D, E, F and could include C. She said the building is a story on its own and she noted the motifs used later.

Mr. Luoma supported nomination and noted the Gothic Revival elements with shields give a preparatory university feel with a little blend of Art Deco. He noted the attention to detail and how the chimney ties to the rest of the building. He supported nomination on criteria C, D, E including the features and characteristics in the Staff Report. He asked why the gym was not included in the recommendation and wondered if it was the double sided brick walls.

Mr. Ketcherside supported nomination on the Staff Report as well as Criterion F. He said the gym is a great atmosphere and noted the brick work and the beams. He supported including the gym. He said the site specific details are great and he noted the experimentation with money and how he didn't go overboard but integrated a new style.

Ms. Shadid supported nomination and said it was a pleasure to jump back and forth and see the impact of money and expansion north. She supported nomination on criteria C, D, E and F and including the gym as well.

Mr. Murdock supported nomination and said it is a great example of Naramore's work – the integration of Gothic with Art Deco and noted the design language had not been seen before. He said the recommended criteria are appropriate.

Ms. Walker Brems said the building is worthy of nomination and thanked the presenter for the photos and details. She said she loved the symbolism. She agreed with the Staff Report and also including the gym. She requested a tour.

Ms. Doherty noted the only opportunity to expand areas of control is now.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of Daniel Bagley Elementary School at 7821 / 7901 Stone Avenue North for consideration as a Seattle Landmark;

noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the site; the exterior; and the interior of the building; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for June 17, 2015; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

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

050615.32 Daniel Webster Elementary School
3014 NW 67th Street

Eric Becker explained the intent to re-open the building as a neighborhood elementary school. He said they will renovate and expand to accommodate enrollment growth.

Larry Johnson, The Johnson Partnership, prepared and presented the nomination (full report in DON file). He provided context of the building and the neighborhood. He said that school was designed by Frederick Sexton in 1908 with the addition by Floyd Naramore constructed in 1930. He noted the central projecting entrance with rusticated stone Romanesque entry. He pointed out the windows have been boarded up to accommodate the building's use as Nordic Heritage Museum. He noted a contemporary entry system. He said that the 1908 and 1930 buildings are joined and different bricks are evident; he said he wasn't sure if they are double wide. He said the doorway has been boarded up and noted the cast stone arch and cartouche. He said the 1908 building is obscured by the 1930 addition which he said includes the auditorium, playcourt and classroom. He said the site is above grade level. He pointed out the vertical mullions in the transom window and the bas relief above entry door.

He said the former main entrance is used as a storage room and the gift shop was built over the former main staircase. He said that the museum offices are in the old principal's office. He noted windows blocked off to accommodate gallery space. He noted the mechanical rooms in the basement and the connection to the addition. He said the 1930 playcourt is used for exhibits. He noted the two kinds of newel posts on the west stairway and said they are all of Douglas Fir. He said that the second floor levels do not align. He noted the 12' x 26' detailed wood beams and corbels and noted these were different in each school. He noted the proscenium frieze and said this is the most intricate of any of the Naramore arches. He said that some of the classes in the 1930 portion have been converted to restrooms. He went over integrity issues and noted the conversion of the school to a museum; he said windows are behind plywood, windows have been changed, and he didn't know how much original fabric is left.

Mr. Johnson said that the school did not meet criteria A or B. He said that the school may or may not meet Criterion C with its association with the development of the school district and the development of the Ballard and Sunset neighborhoods. He said schools were important to communities. He said that Ballard was a thriving predominately Scandinavian community; he noted the saw mills and shingle production. He said that Ballard had its own municipal government and school district when the school was first built. He said that in 1883 the first school – Ross School – was constructed with others in 1903, and this one in 1908. He said the

school was originally known as Bayview and was then renamed Daniel Webster. He said that Ballard was annexed to Seattle and the area came under the jurisdiction of the Seattle School district. He said that this is the only remaining school building built before incorporation to City of Seattle.

Mr. Johnson said that with regard to Criterion D the 1908 building was designed by Frederick Sexton. He said it is an eclectic mix of Classic Revival and mixed eclecticism. He said there is no known building attribution list. He did not know if Sexton had traditional architectural training. He said he used elements from a variety of other buildings – rusticated block entry, ionic pilaster capitals, brick corbels. He said that Naramore’s addition was more eclectic to a more stripped down style. He said the building is an amalgam of styles. He said he loves parts of the building but wasn’t sure if it would meet Criterion D.

Mr. Johnson said that Sexton designed Queen Anne or Colonial style residences in Tacoma as well as the Biltmore Apartments, McCabe Block in Everett, Brue Building, Rose Hill School in Mukilteo and the Seattle landmark the Dr. Annie Russell house. He noted Naramore’s work and said this school is not the best example of his work.

He said that the building may not meet Criterion F because mature trees obscure it part of the year but he noted it stands out more in the winter and that it is prominent to the neighborhood.

Mr. Luoma said the City of Ballard had to raise funds to build the school. He said there were a number of wooded and school house structures. He asked why they would go to the expense of building a new school with annexation coming; he wondered how much they knew about it.

Mr. Johnson said there was a great need for the quickly growing population and the school district got ahead of itself. He said they weren’t expecting annexation and made a poor decision. He said the Seattle School District ended up assuming big debt.

Mr. Ketcherside asked about the Bayview name.

Mr. Johnson wasn’t sure and thought that when built the bay was visible. He said that there was fighting when two school populations merged and thought the name change was an attempt to temper that.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wine supported nomination and said the building is eclectic and interesting. She said there is enough character and detailing to nominate it. She supported criteria B, C, D and F and requested a tour.

Mr. Sneddon supported nomination on criteria C, D, E, and F. He noted the history of the neighborhood and built environment and said the building represents neighborhood growth. He wondered if the name change was connected to the

immigrant population. He said the building meets criterion D and said it is one of the few representative of eclecticism with regular architectural currency. He said it's reminiscent of the early commercial buildings of Seattle. He questioned what else is left from 1908 in this neighborhood. He said that thousands of kids went through the school. He said nominating the site and exterior is a great start but suggested adding the interiors and narrow down from there.

Ms. Shadid supported nomination on criteria C, D, E and F. She said it was interesting to see Naramore's arch in the meeting room and the ship theme on both schools.

Mr. Murdock supported nomination and noted the maritime decoration on the interiors was interesting and noted the Scandinavian painting. He suggested including interiors for further consideration.

Mr. Luoma supported nomination. He said it was a big deal for Ballard to come up with funds to build the school. He noted the school has lasted. He noted the development of schools and Ballard and its school districts. He said that this is one of the last things done before being annexed. He said there are more alterations on the interior because of its museum use. He supported Staff Recommendation and agreed that interiors should be included and narrowed down later.

Mr. Ketcherside said he agreed with Mr. Luoma. He said he has been in the building and said in general the interiors should be included. He said the annexation story is strong. He said that Bayview might have been a street name and explained that streets were renamed when Ballard became part of Seattle. He said that a number of schools were approved before and right after annexation in Shoreline. He said the design is nice and the addition embraces and complements it. He supported including Criterion F.

Mr. Carter supported nomination.

Ms. Barker supported nomination on criteria C, D, E and F and inclusion of interiors. She noted the 1908 building by Sexton and the frieze in the meeting room and the maritime emphasis.

Ms. Walker Brems supported nomination based on the Staff Report. She said she is fond of the building and noted its association with annexation of Ballard. She said there is an interesting association with the Nordic Heritage Museum, which may have its own significance.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of Daniel Webster Elementary School at 3014 NW 67th Street for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the site; the interiors and exteriors of the 1908 building and 1930 addition; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for June 17, 2015; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

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

Ms. Doherty said it is important to assess the interiors in detail and clearly refine the areas of control at designation.

050615.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

050615.41 Post-Intelligencer Globe
101 Elliott Avenue West

Jack McCullough said they are still working through the bureaucracy on the owner's side. He said there is another conference call next week. He asked for 30-day extension.

Ms. Doherty said the request was appropriate.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Post-Intelligencer Globe, 101 Elliott Avenue West, for thirty days.

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

050615.42 Fire Station No. 5
925 Alaskan Way S.

Ms. Sodt said FAS was not able to attend but explained she has a signed agreement. She said it is standard and read through the agreement. She said that a Certificate of Approval is not needed for in-kind repair or work related to the Seawall which was already permitted before designation.

Action: I move to approve Controls and Incentives for Fire Station No. 5, 925 Alaskan Way S.

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

Ms. Shadid left at 6:15 pm.

050615.5 BRIEFING

050615.51 Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center
4000 NE 41st Street
Briefing on proposed development

Briefing packet in DON file.

Susan Jones (Atelier Jones) provided an overview of the site and compared 1950 photos to now; she noted the matured landscaping. She provided context of the 18 acre site. She said they do not want to interfere with the lushness of the landscape and noted how the buildings are framed by it. She said there are 477 trees and site and in their preferred alternative they would retain 345. She said the maximum density is 82 units and their preferred alternative provides 73 units.

She illustrated variations on townhome relationship to the internal road and said they tried a more curvilinear approach as well as adding elements to the north. She said the Version 1A shows no buildings being removed; new buildings are added at edges and a new road put in.

Mr. Carter left at 6:30 pm.

Ms. Jones said that Version 2A provides 65 units keeping Building G (Office) and removing the Lodge. She said there is a bigger impact on the quadrant. She said that Version 3 provides 73 units and involves removing the Lodge and 3A is more playful in how development relates to the road. She said that Version 4 provides 65 units and involves moving the road although she said they are concern with the ability to do this.

Nathan Rimmer said this encroaches on the minimum buffers to wetlands.

Ms. Jones went over the Lodge and its surroundings. She noted the low overhanging roof and recessed entry. She said there is a lot of impervious surface and is not enveloped in the character of the other areas. She went over Building G (Office) and its surroundings noting its heavy roof and how it steps up the hill. She said with cleanup of blackberries and trees the proposed townhouses will be more visible.

Mr. Rimmer said they need a comprehensive landscape plan to regenerate it and to remove diseased and decayed vegetation.

Ms. Jones noted the townhouse massing is similar to existing architecture.

Ms. Wine asked the approximate square footage of the townhomes.

Ms. Jones said they will be 2400 square feet; 22' x 40' on each of three floors.

Ms. Walker Brems asked which version shown is preferred.

Ms. Jones said they prefer 3A version.

Ms. Wine noted Version 2 and asked if there was an opportunity to add elsewhere.

Mr. Rimmer said it could support more density.

Ms. Jones noted they want to preserve the landscape.

Mr. Rimmer said that Version 3 is the best option; or 3A.

Ms. Jones said they are leaving much of the landscape and are working to balance economic viability and retain the landscape. She said the remaining existing buildings will be renovated.

Ms. Walker Brems asked if they had done an in depth exploration of adaptively reusing Building G, and requested to see these options.

Mr. Rimmer said that there is less than 5,020 square feet there and it is difficult to do much with it because of the layout.

Ms. Walker Brems asked if they had looked at alternatives to demolition. She said that all of the buildings are designated.

Rich Hill said they will have that for the Board at their next briefing.

Ms. Jones noted zoning height limitations.

Mr. Murdock said the Lodge Building is a simple box and asked if they had looked at dividing it into three units residential rather than demolish it.

Mr. Rimmer said it is possible but it takes up the corner with only 11,000 square feet versus what the site could support.

Ms. Jones said that it could work as an SRO or hotel but anything larger – like apartments – would be difficult. She said there is a “moat” around the building and then there is the parking lot. She said they are looking to get rid of the parking lot although it would be needed if the space were to be commercial.

Mr. Luoma asked if they had looked at changing shapes to respond to the curvilinear road.

Ms. Jones said they are starting to do that and they could soften it up. She said they are bound on two elevations and the topography is linear.

Mr. Murdock noted the significance of the processional nature of the entrance on the south. He asked how the experience of procession in landscape and new construction is being dealt with.

Ms. Jones said that the topography goes down and it is not real visible; she said the view is pretty protected. She said they have placed the new buildings thoughtfully within the site. She said there is a balance between landscape and building density.

Public Comment:

Story Swett said the organizing principle of the site is the concentric development by original landscape architect. He said that they are trying to introduce a grid which is an alien anomaly. He said they must follow the topography. He said that the curvilinear street forms and development is based on concentric landscape forms. He said the grid obscures the development principle. He said the visualization examples indicate that they need to look more closely at architectural compatibility. He said the principle inherent within the landscape is the processional approach, and that is being lost. Significant losses to historic resource.

Mr. Luoma said the sequencing and curvilinear entry is so important, and how the existing vegetation helps to hide and reveal views. He said he was concerned about the density of development. He said that he was not as concerned because where the trees are. He said you don't really see the pond and main courtyard building until you are a ways into the site. He said that the portions of the site to the north on

perimeter are reinforced. He said the pastoral semi-Japanese style landscape is reinforced in the inner core. He said that gaps in the southeast corner lose sense of developed space. He said Building G (Office) gracefully steps down the hillside, but functionally it is a debacle of a building because the interiors are virtually non-usable. He said that from the outside it has more architectural integrity than the Lodge which is just a rectangle.

Mr. Ketcherside noted the tiny little rooms of Building G (Office); he said they are odd spaces that are unusable.

Ms. Wine said that it just frames this portion of the site and view.

Mr. Murdock said that he is mesmerized by the south entrance. He said he was concerned with construction on the loop but it appears to be mitigated with landscape. He said that some landscape preservation is needed. He said the Lodge Building is unimportant to the experience of the site and the least integrated. He said the parking lot could be removed to add more density. He said that Building G (Office) is compelling from the exterior only, and serves only as a view from the pond – the tour clarified that.

Ms. Wine said the tour helped in her understanding of the expansiveness of the site. She said the perimeter is the primary development. She said she came in through the east entrance. She said the Lodge is somewhat contributing but more to the driver than to the interior of site but not that compelling. She said that Building G (Office) was designed to frame a view, but it's not a functional building. She said it should be used as inspiration to create housing that terraces on that corner of the site; she noted its wonderful quality.

Ms. Walker Brems asked about Building G (Office) interior redesign.

Ms. Wine said it's possible to create strange studios.

Mr. Murdock noted the oppressive ceiling plane but said the structures could be adaptively reused.

Ms. Walker Brems said the Owner jumped too quickly to proposing demolition and she wants them to look at efforts to adaptively reuse.

Ms. Doherty said the Owner was asked to start with the broad overview options, and can come back to talk about these issues in more detail.

Mr. Sneddon said that there is a grouping of five buildings and elimination of two of them; they all played in integrally to what they were trying to do with the space.

Ms. Walker Brems noted the concentric nature with an imposed grid on it. She encouraged the applicants to tweak the grid and said it is too orthogonal. She said that some places are ok – the south and very north – they need to loosen things up a bit. She said it seems rigid and opposite of what the site was designed to be.

Mr. Ketcherside noted the 'twirling' aspect of the main promenade and said the access road breaks that up. He hoped they could replicate the experience of Building

G (Office) and noted a shrine metaphor: pagoda seems massive in distance but it is small and nearby. He said that the design should contribute visually structure into hill. Not interested in Option 4 – loses the swirl. He agreed that the townhomes in the midst don't bother him as much as adding in single family homes as you go in. He said that 3A goes through landscape, exposes buildings and then opens up as it does today.

Ms. Doherty asked if some aspects of the proposed grid and geometry are related to zoning requirements, based on some of Ms. Jones earlier comments.

Ms. Jones said yes. She said that there is the underlying zoning. She said within 100' of the adjacent single family homes they can only put in single family in lines parallel to the street. She said that there is a very strong grid in Laurelhurst. She said there is a sense of the grid being extended in to the boundary and then loosening up. She said that Building G (Office) and the Lodge, both built in Phase 2, are orthogonal and on a grid pattern. She said that Ms. Walker Brems made it a better scheme because of her comments; it is constrained to a 100' setback.

Ms. Doherty asked how the overlay relates to the proposed townhomes, where Building G (Office) currently sits.

Ms. Jones said they heard comments about these townhomes starting to reflect the stepped massing of Building G.

Mr. Ketcherside said the building on the north end is drawn in and the significant illusion is broken because of the large buildings across the property line.

Ms. Wine said that from the plan view perspective the site density appears sensitive. She said that she now wants to understand the vertical aspect of the density and how it will be compatible. She said there is soft light now and with ganged together buildings it will appear heavy. She said she wants to see the vertical versus the now horizontal. She wants to see the scale of three stories where Building G is located.

Additional Public Comment:

Corrine Hill asked is the Owner would consider retaining the conference center because there is need for a convention center. She wondered if the Center for Urban Horticulture could make use of it.

Mr. Hill said he didn't know, and that major institutions are not allowed.

050615.6 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator