



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 344/15

MINUTES

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

Board Members Present

Deb Barker
Robert Ketcherside
Aaron Luoma
Jeffrey Murdock, Vice Chair
Matthew Sneddon
Mike Stanley
Elaine Wine

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Nick Carter
Sarah Shadid
Alison Walker Brems

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

060315.1 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
May 6, 2015
MM/SC/DB/AL 6:0:0 Minutes approved.

060315.2 **CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

060315.21 Montlake Elementary School
2409 22nd Avenue
Proposed garden storage building

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Ms. Wine arrived at 3:32 pm.

Gretchen DeDecker, Seattle Public Schools, provided context of the school and site, and said the proposed garden storage building will be placed just south of the greenhouse inside the fence. She said they will paint it a medium brown tone and provided a color sample. She said that a mural painted by students will be on the south façade of the shed. The shed is 4' x 8' and is the standard developed by their architect.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Luoma said that ARC agreed that painting the storage building off white was not appropriate and suggested an earth tone. He said the proposed color is reasonable.

Ms. Wine said that the garden storage building will not impact views of the school.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed garden storage building at the Montlake Elementary School, 2409 22nd Avenue East, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed garden storage building does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 124778, as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/MSN/AL 7:0:0 Motion carried.

060315.22 Pacific Medical Center / former U.S. Marine Hospital
1200 12th Avenue South
Proposed metal window replacement

Halla Hoffer, PMA, went over building siting and historic photos. She went through windows proposal (see detailed packet in DON file). She said they propose replacement of a mix of metal window sashes and frames that were originally steel. She said they will replace them with new aluminum sashes and frames to match as close as possible to original steel windows. She said

there is a hodge podge of replacement metal windows now, mostly in poor condition.

Tom Johanson, Schreiber Starling & Lane, said that the sashes and frames are continuing to corrode.

Ms. Hoffer went over window conditions and said that 21% of all windows surveyed need to be replaced due to corrosion and water intrusion. She said they propose a frame into which operable and non-operable window sashes will sit. She said the sashes and frames will be the same color as the existing windows, with Cardinal clear glass and LoE coating.

She said they propose limited repair work to the original wood windows. She said they will add sill waterproofing and then reinstall wood components and sealant. She said they will perform in-kind repair of the sash and sill. She said they will add new storm windows on the interior that will have a dark bronze finish. She said that the glazing is Cardinal clear glass with LoE i89 coating. She said that they have done additional investigations and have confirmed that the existing steel frames are not embedded in the masonry, but if they encounter an unanticipated condition during construction they will work with the Landmarks Staff to develop a strategy to safely perform the work.

Ross Whitehead, Schreiber Starling & Lane, said that there are accessibility requirements for ADA access and they propose to use the north building entry to serve that need. He said that past utility work marred symmetrical paving pattern; they propose to develop a new symmetry and replicate some of the chevrons. He said they will leave the center thermoplastic crosswalk. He said that paving will contrast with adjacent asphalt; they will use an integral color concrete; LM Scofield "Westwood Brown".

Mr. Whitehead showed the photos of the storm window mockups. He said that photos show the difference of the original mock up on the 2nd floor vs. the proposed Monray Storm Window on the 6th floor; he said they show the different frame and glass colors. They decided that a darker frame is less visible from the exterior than trying to match the lighter color of the window itself.

Ms. Wine asked how the corner windows will meet the circular tube.

Mr. Whitehead said that they will butt into it as they did originally.

Mr. Stanley asked if the storm windows will be operable.

Mr. Whitehead said that it will be a single hung sash and will pivot inward to allow for cleaning. He said that it will have tubular frame rather than flat.

Mr. Sneddon asked if they are replacing the cathedral type windows at the top.

Ms. Hoffer said yes, and noted that these had already been replaced and/or altered, and are not in good condition.

Mr. Whitehead said they were heavily damaged in the Nisqually quake and are now screwed together with safety glass.

Ms. Doherty said she reviewed the full window schedule comparing the proposed configuration and operability to the original windows. She said there were a small number of variations, but that they seemed reasonable.

Ms. Hoffer said the new aluminum windows will be consistent and have the same quality and feel throughout the whole building. She said the profiles are slightly larger than the original steel, but that the existing windows don't match the original profile either.

Mr. Johanson said that they proposed a fixed window at these upper floor; the originals had some awning sashes. He said they are tall and span 13th through 14th floors.

Mr. Murdock asked how the floor plate meets the window.

Mr. Johanson said there is a gap where the window bypasses the floor.

Public Comment:

Chris McKay said that the windows kill the aesthetic of the building.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wine said that they initially wanted a full window replacement on the entire building. She said she was glad they found an alternative which is reasonable. She said that the original steel had already been replaced and this seems appropriate. She said that it is impossible to get the profile of original steel sash and the applicants have provided reasonable accommodation.

Ms. Barker said they greatly reduced the number of windows to be replaced.

Ms. Wine said that the steel windows and replacements done give an overall comprehensive look and this will help. She said ARC was okay with the sidewalk alterations.

Mr. Luoma disclosed his office is doing work with Schreiber Starling & Lane, but that they are not involved in this project.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed metal window replacement and sidewalk alterations at the Pacific Medical Tower, 1200 12th Avenue South, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed window replacement and sidewalk alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 116055, as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

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

The following item was reviewed out of agenda order.

060315.42 Seattle Post-Intelligencer Globe
101 Elliott Avenue West

Ms. Doherty explained that she had a signed agreement and noted the ongoing challenge of finding a new site for the globe. She went through the Controls & Incentives agreement and said that when a site is selected they will come back with a Certificate of Approval for how the globe will be reinstalled. Responding to questions she said that the City is looking for a site with good visibility and has already ruled out other sites. She said they want to find a place where the public can appreciate the globe.

Mr. Ketcherside expressed concern about how the globe will be moved. He noted his dismay with how the Carroll's Clock was moved with a crane. He said how important it is to find the right people to do this work and to take care in doing it.

Ms. Doherty said they will make sure it is protected when moved. She said they will have to design a foundation and the board will review that as well. She said that the last time the globe was moved it was well documented and that will be factored in when it is moved again. She said she believes MOHAI will be careful in their planning efforts.

Action: I move to accept Controls and Incentives for the Seattle Post-Intelligencer Globe, 101 Elliott Avenue West.

MM/SC/RK/AL 6:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Stanley recused himself.

060315.3 NOMINATIONS

060315.31 E.C. Hughes School
7740 34th Avenue SW

Ellen Mirro, The Johnson Partnership, prepared and presented the nomination report (full report in DON file). She reported that the school district wants to open the school back up as public school. She provided context of the site and neighborhood. She said the school was built in 1926 and designed by Floyd Naramore; an addition was constructed in 1949. She said the Colonial Revival style building is a duplicate of Dunlap School except the ornament here is matte glazed terracotta instead of cast stone. She noted the boiler room separated girls and boys play courts on the east side. She said the windows on the south façade of the 1949 façade are non-original. She said that the main entry is on the west. She noted the cartouche at the proscenium arch in the meeting room; she said that the beams and corbels are wood with secondary steel pipe columns holding them up.

She noted the classrooms with original built in cabinetry. She said the original kindergarten with the square bay window was turned into the library. She said that the meeting room was designed for southern expansion. She said that sprinklers were added in 1971 and window sashes on the south façade of the 1949 addition were replaced. She said that there have been electrical and seismic updates; she noted that the chimney height was reduced. She said that south façade windows were reglazed in 2009. She said that portables were added. She said that there is enough integrity especially in the 1926 portion. She said that the building doesn't meet criteria A or B. She said that while the school is associated with the development of the Seattle School district and the West Seattle neighborhood there is no double significance. She said that Dunlap was an integral part of the community while this school was not, so it may or may not meet Criterion C. She went through the nine schools Naramore built from 1921-1932 and compared this school with Dunlap. She questioned if Hughes embodies the style – as Dunlap does - and said that it may or may not meet Criterion D. She said that Naramore along with Brady, Bain and Johanson formed NBBJ. She went through other schools attributed to Naramore and noted that the list of buildings attributed to NBBJ was too long to list. She compared this building to Dunlap and said it may or may not meet Criterion E. She said that the school is a block off the main thoroughfare and takes up a city block. She said that Dunlap is more prominent than this school and was not designated on Criterion F.

Tingyu Wang said the district plans to reopen a school at this site and they have long term plans for it.

Mr. Ketcherside said it seems odd that Hughes didn't have the gym to begin with, when Dunlap had one.

Ms. Mirro said they had the play court in addition to the meeting room.

Mr. Sneddon asked if there were any Naramore mottos or iconography here.

Ms. Mirro said no, that this was a more generic Colonial Revival and not as specific in decoration; Bagley had the most elaborate detail.

Ms. Barker asked about Dunlap's site plan.

Ms. Mirro said that Dunlap is a different setting; there is a park on the west side and it is flat.

Mr. Murdock asked Ms. Mirro to speak to the steel columns in the meeting room.

Ms. Mirro said they were part of a seismic retrofit.

Mr. Ketcherside asked about the patterned material at the ceiling and beams.

Ms. Mirro said that they are acoustical tiles.

Ms. Doherty noted they are glued on.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Ketcherside said he sent comments and minor corrections to The Johnson Partnership, regarding the Railway and Burien portion of the report; he said the Lake Burien line shut down in 1934.

Mr. Sneddon supported nomination on criteria D, and maybe C. He said schools were markers for growth of communities and the establishment of families, which is significant. Regarding D he said that with the 1926 big world fair there was a groundswell of support of the Colonial Revival style. He said that Dunlap and Hughes were some of the first two story schools with a move to larger structures. He said Naramore chose to use an almost standardized plan but broke away; he said there is some standardization but it still has individual elements.

Ms. Wine supported nomination and noted the school's integrity. She said the mass and scale of the original addition is sensitive to the original building. She said even with window replacements and electrical upgrades the building can still convey its significance. She said the building as a whole has integrity. She suggested including the entire interior for consideration, and criteria C and D. She noted the similarity of Dunlap's design but in a different neighborhood.

Mr. Luoma supported nomination on criteria C and D and noted the expressive Colonial Revival style. He said the addition complements the original building and is successful. He said the style is more subtle in

ornamentation. He said the interior spaces recommended by Staff are appropriate. He said that Naramore re-used details out of necessity because there was so much work. He said the building is still a little different from Dunlap with different grades and orientation.

Ms. Barker supported nomination on Criterion C noting the 1940s activity and development of Westwood neighborhood. She said this building is in contrast to the small 1940s “box” houses and said the design is wonderful. She said she wished it were better sited to respond to Criterion F – it is hidden. She supported Criterion D as well.

Mr. Stanley supported nomination on criteria C and D. He said that the building is a copy of Dunlap and noted the detail of the entry is good. He said that he wasn't sure about the 1949 addition, and noted the replacement of windows and installation of conduit at the exterior as problematic. He agreed with Staff recommendation on the interiors.

Mr. Ketcherside supported nomination. He said the addition is not as strong as the original building. He said the play space was curious – if programming was key to structure and the gym being delayed – he wondered if in 1920s the gym was a key feature. Apparently they could play outside in covered courts and maybe there was a change in philosophy by the 1940s. He noted the late residential development in southern part of West Seattle and White Center triggered by the 1914 street car line. He said ship building was important but disappears at the end of WWI. So suddenly all the residential growth peters out until the late 1920s growth wave. He supported Criterion C because it was right at the forefront of this neighborhood development in the 1920s. He said the building was an upgraded copy of Dunlap; the terracotta here is nicer than the cast stone.

Mr. Murdock supported nomination. He said it was interesting – the north windows at the meeting room were a direct response to the site, and it was therefore not a carbon copy of Dunlap. He said this was a fringe community where schools were much more important to the development of the area. He supported criteria C and D.

Ms. Wine suggested inclusion of all interiors and pare down at designation.

Mr. Ketcherside agreed.

Ms. Wine asked for a tour.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of E.C. Hughes School at 7740 34th Avenue Southwest 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 interior and

exterior of the 1926 building and 1949 addition; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for July 15, 2015; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

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

060315.32

Magnolia School
2418 28th Avenue W

Tingyu Wang, Seattle Public Schools, said they plan to reopen as neighborhood school. They plan to renovate to increase enrollment.

Ellen Mirro, The Johnson Partnership, prepared and presented the nomination report (full report in DON file). She provided context of the site and neighborhood. She said the building was designed by Floyd Naramore. She said the school was built in 1927 with the north addition in 1931 and the south addition in 1940; the learning resource center was added in 1967. She said that Laurelhurst is a duplicate of this Colonial Revival School. She noted the long west façade with additions in 1931 and 1940 at bays. She said the original windows are in poor condition and the lower windows are boarded up. She went through exteriors with a photographic ‘walk around the building’ noting the play court; auditorium with lattice truss and proscenium arch, medallion decoration, redundant structural lattice on steel and corbel; the original windows; kitchen; and classroom cabinetry. She noted the original skylight in the playcourt; she said it is in poor condition but noted it is the only one she has found. She noted issues of moisture intrusion throughout.

Ms. Mirro said the building doesn’t meet criteria A or B. She said that schools are associated with the development of school district and the neighborhood but not in a significant way. She noted development of Magnolia and the associations of Henry Smith, Smith Cove, Westpoint Lighthouse, Fort Lawton and Discovery Park and said that this school may qualify under this Criterion.

She said that Floyd Naramore designed the school and one year later the same plan and orientation were used for Laurelhurst School. She compared the two schools and noted that Magnolia is typical of the style and was designed for expansion. She said the school doesn’t stand out in Naramore’s school work or his work with NBBJ. She said the building may qualify for Criterion F because of its scale in the neighborhood.

Mr. Ketcherside asked about the siting of the school and if it may be prominent as seen from the ‘saddle’ of the residential area.

Ms. Mirro said it is hard to see the school from the west and noted that the streets don't align. She said that houses and vegetation also obscure the school.

Mr. Luoma asked about integrity to the stairs on the west side, and the ramps on the east.

Ms. Mirro said the stairs have good integrity.

Mr. Luoma asked if the ramps are original; he said he is interested in the history of the ramps on the east side.

She said they were put in when they did the street vacation.

Mr. Murdock asked who did the 1967 design.

Ms. Mirro said Seattle Public Schools.

Mr. Ketcherside said 1940 is an odd year and asked if there was a gap.

Ms. Mirro said a levy was passed in 1939; T. T. Minor was included as well as many school additions.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Ketcherside supported nomination on criteria C, D and maybe F. He said the design was great and they continued the design when adding on; he noted the coherent additions.

Mr. Stanley supported nomination on criteria C, D and maybe F. He agreed with the Staff recommendation for areas of control.

Ms. Barker supported nomination based on Staff recommendation – criteria C and D. She said the building has good strong facades. She noted the coherent repeating design until the 1967 addition.

Mr. Luoma supported nomination based on the Staff Report and supported including interiors. He said there is better continuity in additions as a whole and it can be seen as one design. He said that he liked the stair entrance and the sequence to the front and that the ramps – if significant – should be included. He said it is interesting to see how they accommodated the grade changes to the adjacent park.

Ms. Wine supported nomination and said that the additions are strong and she liked the differentiation at the bay. She supported including all the interiors and then scaling back at designation. She said to include the original school house fixtures. She requested a tour.

Mr. Sneddon supported criteria C and D and noted the attempt to blend the two additions, and that post-war they were more likely to differentiate additions. He said two sets of schools as duplication efforts. He said he would like to look at the iconography and other design moves Naramore made.

Mr. Murdock supported nomination and said it is interesting to see a mothballed school because it still has the ghosts of prior users. And some of the images are beautiful. He said he wants to see the interior.

Ms. Doherty clarified that the staff recommendation does not include the 1967 addition, and that they would need to change the motion if they want to include it.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of Magnolia School at 2418 28th Avenue West 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 interior and exterior of the 1927 building and the 1931 and 1940 additions; and the ramp to the park; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for July 15, 2015; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

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

060315.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

060315.41 Loyal Heights Elementary School
2501 NW 80th Street

Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for a six month extension.

Tingyu Wang, Seattle Schools, said they want to present to ARC before Controls & Incentives are signed.

Ms. Doherty said she is okay with that. She said that the project has already had one ARC briefing and there will be another in the near future. She said the six month request was reasonable.

Action: I move to defer consideration for Controls & Incentives for Loyal Heights Elementary School, 2501 NW 80th Street, for six (6) months.

MM/SC/EW/AL 7:0:0 Motion carried.

060315.5

BRIEFINGS

060315.51

Woodrow Wilson Junior High / Wilson-Pacific School
1330 N. 90th Street

Briefing on proposed commemorative space and interpretive exhibits

Justine Kim, SOJ / Seattle Public Schools, explained that they have incorporated community suggestions into their design. She noted there was random community turn out for the stakeholder meetings; they had a brainstorm session and outlined a story that should be conveyed. She said that community members wanted the display wall to provide more information – and convey emotion – of Native American culture. She said they wanted to make it a living thing and they wanted to not forget Robert Eaglestaff.

Ms. Kim said the Honor Circle will be of nature, understand earth, water, fire; a community place; entered from the east; a healing place; have authenticity; and be usable. She said the Interpretive Wall will be age appropriate; tell a story – historical and modern story of site; include indigenous story in curriculum; and bring in sound, voice, and drumming, to be interactive.

She went over the site plan and location where the Honor Circle will go – off center from the middle school courtyard with a view of the relocated four main Chief murals. She said the circle will be 63’ in diameter with the outside defined with colored concrete; there will be four deciduous native trees in the cardinal points – north, south, east and west – and markers for the 12-months of the year. She said there will be four smaller C-shaped walls in colored concrete: white for the wind, red for fire, green for the earth, and blue for water. There will be representation of the solstice as well. She said the top of the seat wall will be very quiet; quotes from the four chiefs will be on the face and on the inside, quotes from Robert Eaglestaff. She said that the center of the circle will have a ceremonial rock to mark the center and represent the land.

Mr. Ketcherside asked about inspiration.

Susan Moore, Mahlum, said they are trying to honor all tribes – each has a different ceremony and a different story; the time of year such as at the solstice or when fish spawn, are important and expressed in different ways.

Mr. Ketcherside said that the concept of months seems imposed.

Johnpaul Jones said yes and no. He said that everything is connected with the seasons but not as we see it now. He said they decided to call out the months and let the storyteller use it as they wish.

Ms. Barker asked the distance between outer four sections and the inner seating.

Ms. Moore said it is about 6’.

Ms. Barker asked if the inner circle could accommodate a class.

Ms. Moore responded that it could.

Ms. Barker asked what has been incorporated into the design to keep it from feeling antiseptic and rigid until the trees fill out and a patina develops.

Ms. Moore said that they approached the project by bringing in colors of Licton Springs Park - greens and rust reds – nature into a vertical stance. She said the Honor Circle will have brick patterns, colored concrete and colored glass tile tops. She said the whole circle is supposed to be subdued; the sparkle of glass will represent native colors.

Ms. Barker asked about potential for climbing on features.

Ms. Moore said that skateboard deterrents will be incorporated.

Ms. Wine asked how they envisioned use of the space – active? contemplative? She asked about acoustics.

Ms. Moore said that the Honor Circle is right outside the Commons and will be used for lunch time, breaks and it will be used quite a bit for teaching, so the use is varied.

Mr. Jones said that State legislation was recently passed that requires incorporating teaching about tribal history along with culture and government into the public school curriculum, and this is one of the first places that will do that. Responding to questions he said that the large murals are right across from the Honor Circle. He said that interpretive wall displays will be in two locations: one in the middle school and one in the elementary school. He said that the kids will see them every day – they are the spine of the circulation space and are closer to the cafeteria. He said that the themes will tell kids about the murals, history of the place and the Indian Heritage School. He said they based sections of wall with different themes. He went over details page by page noting the scale, lighting, prominent position, etc.

Ms. Kim noted recessed wall-washing type lighting on the interpretive walls.

Mr. Jones noted the relationship of the wall to the cafeteria and the Board's request to get rid of a door.

Ms. Moore said that the PTA storage room needs to be where they have it planned; she said they moved the door as far to the north as possible.

Mr. Jones said that sitting in the Commons there are only a few seats that don't see the entire interpretive wall at once; he said that the goal of having it as the center spine means it will be seen all the time. He said this is the best they could do and it works. He noted the wall will be by the computer lab and most kids there will see it from an angle. He said the wall itself is touchy-feely. He said there will be a screen in the center of both walls; kids can select topics and learn about the history of the site, murals, school, Honor Circle, and First People.

Ms. Moore said she hopes the displays will get updated as part of the curriculum and that kids can be involved in that.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Doherty explained that this is a briefing and not a Certificate of Approval, but that the applicants were hoping this would be their last briefing, and that the Board should let the applicants know if they are comfortable with the design.

Mr. Sneddon noted the hard work that he has seen in the development and said he was okay with their design.

Ms. Wine said she was comfortable with it and that she liked the interactive portion, the artifacts incorporated and the way it tells a story.

Mr. Murdock agreed with Ms. Wine and noted the integration of the walls to the centralized locations in the schools.

Mr. Luoma said the applicants have done a good job and he noted the good community participation. He expressed concern over ongoing maintenance and his concern for vandalism.

Ms. Barker said that something should be done with the door adjacent to the one exhibit; she said it is used occasionally and it is an insult. She said the elementary interpretive wall is not tactile enough and has too much text.

Mr. Stanley asked them to think about how they will maintain the LED display screens over time because they will fail. He said to have a backup plan so that the exhibit will remain effective.

Mr. Ketcherside noted the development of the design over time. He agreed with Ms. Barker about the door in principle, but said that if this is the best we can get he is ok with it. He appreciated the incorporation of original artifacts, indigenous words, and the telling of a story.

Ms. Doherty noted that the majority of the Board's comments were positive, and that she would write a letter on the Board's behalf in favor of the project moving forward.

060315.52

First United Methodist Church
810 Fifth Avenue
Briefing on proposed alterations

Ms. Sodt went over designated and controlled elements: exterior including concrete stairwell landing on east; interior features: the sanctuary but not the pews; the main entrance vestibule, formal stairwells, side entry vestibules, the pastor's room, balcony excluding the pews, and the organ pipes and pulpit area.

Ron Wright explained they would provide some background behind their decisions.

Terry Lundeen said they need to get the structure to meet current code which will require substantial alteration. He said the main elements they are looking at in how the building works in an earthquake: the dome at the top; the exterior unreinforced masonry wall; the horizontal elements – roof, low roof, floors; and foundations. He said the dome is supported only by four large concrete columns. He said the roof elements are out of timber, the balcony is timber and the sanctuary floor is timber frame. He said that the

walls are unreinforced masonry (URM). He said they need to hold the dome together and transfer load down the structure and to keep the URM walls from failing. He said the URM walls act like shear walls carrying a lateral load. He said URM are recognized as the most hazardous construction type in the world. He said that after the New Zealand quake there are mandatory upgrades.

Mr. Lundeen said they want to transfer the dome weight through non-visible horizontal elements. He said the roof level seismic load can be handled in conventional ways and shear walls can be put in. He said that bigger challenges are the brick walls that could fall off. He said that after the Nisqually quake some connections were improved. He said they need to connect all the masonry in a more reliable way and keep it from blowing out. He said the walls are very brittle and once they get beyond a certain point they will shatter like glass; he said this is way past the breaking point in the demands for the building. He said they propose to remove the plaster and apply shotcrete to get it stiffer; he said they would add stiffer concrete 8 – 10” thick applied to as much of walls as possible on all four walls.

Ms. Wine asked what the thinnest wall they could do is – 8 – 10” is a lot for this church.

Mr. Lundeen said that is what it pencils out to.

Ms. Barker asked if the shotcrete would hold the existing brick together.

Mr. Wright said that terracotta is interspersed in the walls; it is unstable and can't support anything.

Mr. Lundeen said that the existing timber doesn't have load capacity and is a fire hazard. He said that they propose to replace horizontal timber with steel structure and floors. If keeping the timber would have to thicken the concrete or add vertical ribs. He said that given the seriousness of seismic hazard he thinks the scheme is as sensitive as it can be.

Mr. Murdock appreciated having comparisons of existing with proposed addition of concrete. He said it is important to be able to envision what that will do.

Mr. Wright said that all trim will be removed and then put back on. He said the most impact will be at the windows which will have jamb extensions. He said the total thickness will be about 1'. He said they are doing tradeoffs in calculations. It will be 1' for the entire face of the wall all around; the internal dimensions will be reduced.

Mr. Ketcherside asked about shotcrete life expectancy.

Mr. Lundeen said it will last forever and gets stronger with time.

Mr. Wright said that they will come back with plaster to replicate and will eliminate metal studs as much as possible. He said that shotcrete is a very rough product. He said that at Langston Hughes they did a veneer plaster ¼ - ½” thick. He said there was power in the walls etc. He said that at MOHAI they did the same thing with fiber wrap. He said they can't on exterior wall where there are energy issues with existing building.

Mr. Wright said that they prefer usable space.

Mr. Lundeen said they could keep the balconies and said they can replace with steel structures.

Mr. Wright said that the ornate vestibule is protected; they will add 1' wall and will rebuild vestibule 1' in. He said they will take it apart and then put it back together 1' in. He said the depth is now 8'; they will add a second set of doors and windows.

Mr. Murdock asked about more detailed sections.

Mr. Wright said there are constraints; the red notation denotes the sanctuary protected space. He said if they protect three primary facades and the organ pipes they would have to change the access point to use the southeast corner. He said that they want to put in an escalator. He said they have tried various locations and propose to put it on the east exterior façade of the church. He said that there are short pipes behind the organ and they can't get all the stuff into that space. He said they propose to bring the pipes forward intact and install the HVAC in back. He said that the roof back in the southwest corner is not visible – it is obscured by the Rainier Club – so mechanical placed there won't be visible. He said that a restaurant is proposed for the space and equipment and hoods will be needed. He said they are working on it and aren't there yet. He said that units only come in certain sizes and vents will be required.

Mr. Lundeen said that they will have to meet energy code even with full historic exemption.

Mr. Wright said it is CFM mandated.

Mr. Murdock said the organ pipes are designated, not just the first row of pipes. He said it is dishonest to have only a couple pipes and not the guts; it is façadism.

Ms. Wine said that the back pipes aren't seen and the visual focus is in front. She said the sanctuary is designated; she noted the loss of the altar and asked how they would preserve the sanctuary feel.

Mr. Wright said that the kitchen will be visible so patrons can see happenings there. He said they are still working on this; there is no back of house. Cutting down 4' would eliminate the entire mezzanine which would be a tradeoff.

Mr. Stanley said the concern is with the loss of volume in the sanctuary and that the thought that penetrating the envelope might be better than losing volume.

Mr. Lundeen said the space to the west is just a narrow alley.

Mr. Stanley said he never saw the grand entry and they are now so far into a new dynamic. He said that it seems a lot of compromises are going into a designated stair.

Ms. Sodt explained that at the original briefing the applicants proposed removal of the stained glass window and the board asked for alternatives.

Mr. Ketcherside said that board asked for other choices and why something is needed or was recommended. He said that the space behind the pipes is dark and the first layer is

visually significant but with no depth. He said he doesn't want to lose any more than we have to structurally and seismically.

Mr. Luoma asked why, with a nice stairway, an escalator is proposed.

Mr. Wright said it is program-driven by how the space will be used.

Mr. Luoma said it is damaging to the historic character to punch in an escalator when there are stairs now.

Mr. Wright said that outside steps are fine but escalator is redundant with little tradeoff and that no one likes an outside escalator. He said they will look at options to make it work. He said they want to protect the exterior and noted that there are usually not so many significant interior spaces. He said they will look more at putting equipment on the roof and not pushing the organ so far interior.

Ms. Wine said she appreciated the use of the main vestibule as the area to be impacted; she said altering the southeast stair is ok but treatment is left to be studied. She said the issue of how the escalator is detailed needs to be looked at; she said she didn't want to see it on the exterior. She said it is a shame to think people can't walk up stairs and need an escalator; she said they should take elevator if they can't. She said the HVAC is tied to present sanctuary space and alternatives need to be explored.

Mr. Murdock expressed frustration that the building is being sacrificed in the design of the new building knowing this is a landmark; he said much could have been incorporated into the new structure. He noted the cost to this building's integrity. He said that structural changes need to be made. He said to keep trying to maintain the volume and details.

Ms. Barker said the escalator should not punch through the historic structure it should be contained within the lobby of the tower. She said it is almost as bad as putting it through the window. She supported adding equipment to the roof because it will be hidden. She said the Narthex should be a transition place. She said some solutions out of the box should be explored. She said to keep the volume.

Mr. Lundeen said that the tower was originally designed as a standalone building with no interconnection.

060315.6 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator