



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 538/16

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

600 4th Avenue

L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room

Wednesday, September 21, 2016 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker

Robert Ketcherside

Jordon Kiel

Kristen Johnson

Aaron Luoma, Chair

Julianne Patterson

Matthew Sneddon

Emily Vyhnanek

Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Rebecca Frestedt

Melinda Bloom

Absent

Kathleen Durham

Jeffrey Murdock

Mike Stanley

Chair Aaron Luoma called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

092116.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

August 17, 2016

MM/SC//DB/JK

7:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel recused.

092116.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

092116.21 Columbia City Landmark District
4901 Rainier Ave. S.
Proposed tenant signs

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed tenant signage, consisting white, hand-painted lettering to be applied to the storefront door; double-sided blade sign, with painted lettering (no illumination); and white neon lettering set within channel letters in storefront windows. Exhibits included photographs, plans and specifications. The Hastings Building was constructed in 1905. The building is considered an historic, non-contributing building. The one-story building is clad in stucco on brick. The Landmarks Preservation Board approved building renovations in March and July 2016, respectively. The July 2016 approval included building paint colors and signage for the adjacent tenant, Pagliacci. On September 6, 2016 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. Committee members recommended approval of the proposal.

Applicant Comment:

Michael Thompson, Mallet Architecture + Design, explained that Rudy’s Barber Shop is expanding and noted that the brand allows for individuality of each store. He went through the presentation packet and summarized each of the signs.

Ms. Barker asked how white the neon is.

Mr. Thompson said it is very white that is more of a blue light; he said it is a good contrast with the black.

Mr. Kiel asked why the sign is located in the window rather than mimicking the adjacent Pagliacci sign.

Mr. Thompson said that signage diversity is more visually appealing; small businesses want to stand out.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Kiel said the proposal is reasonable.

Mr. Luoma said neon is reviewed carefully on a case by case basis; this size and color are appropriate to meet the Guidelines.

Mr. Kiel said the white neon is similar to small LEDs that have been approved.

Mr. Ketcherside said it was a well put-together package.

Mr. Sneddon said the neon is muted because it is in the storefront.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signs located at 4901 Rainier Ave. S., as proposed. This action is based on the following:

The proposed signs meet the following sections of the District ordinance, the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards:

**Relevant Columbia City Design Guidelines:
Guidelines/Specific**

11. Signs. All signs on or hanging from buildings or windows, or applied to windows, are subject to review and approval by the Review Committee and Board. Sign applications will be evaluated according to the overall impact, size, shape, texture, lettering style, method of attachment, color, and lighting in relation to the use of the building, the building and street where the sign will be located, and the other signs and other buildings in the District. The primary reference will be to the average pedestrian's eye-level view, although views into or down the street from adjacent buildings will be an integral feature of any review.

The intent of sign regulations is to ensure that signs relate physically and visually to their location; that signs reflect the character and unique nature of the business; that signs do not hide, damage, or obstruct the architectural elements of the building; that signs be oriented toward and promote a pedestrian environment; and that the products or services offered be the focus, rather than the signs.

a. Window Signs and Hanging Signs. Generally, painted or vinyl letters in storefront windows and single-faced, flat surfaced painted wood signs are preferred. Extruded aluminum or plastics are discouraged and may not be allowed. Window signs shall not cover a large portion of the window so as to be out of scale with the window, storefront, or facade.

b. Blade Signs. Blade signs (double-faced projecting signs hanging perpendicular to the building), that are consistent in design with District goals are encouraged. Blade signs shall be installed in a manner that is in keeping with other approved blade signs in the District. They shall not hide, damage, or obscure the architectural elements of the building. The size should be appropriately scaled for the building.

h. Neon Signs. Neon may be permitted where judged appropriate on a case-by-case basis. Size, letter style, color, intensity and overall impact of the neon sign shall be evaluated for compatibility with the other signs and buildings in the District. If a Plexiglas backing is proposed, it shall be clear and colorless. Neon signs should be designed to reflect the unique nature of the use within the building. Mass-produced neon signs are strongly discouraged.

The number of allowable neon signs shall be limited to one for each 10 linear feet of business frontage or portion thereof. Signs need not be spaced one per 10 feet, but may be clustered, provided the grouping does not obscure visibility into the business. Permitted neon signs may be located in transom windows. Neon is permitted only as signage and shall not be used as decorative trim.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards #9 and #10

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

092116.22 First United Methodist Church
811 Fifth Avenue
Proposed interior and exterior alterations

Ron Wright presented proposed interior and exterior alterations via PowerPoint (full report in DON file; following is an overview and board questions and comments).

Stair: stair orientation changes.

Stage ADA Ramp: ramp will manually slide in / out as needed. See sheet 17 for section detail.

Wainscoting: where escalator goes up both sides will be the same.

Balcony Bar: mezzanines will be leveled out and a bar will be added. Space was originally planned to be a restaurant but will now be a gathering / venue spot for large events associated with hotel.

Finishes: stained glass windows are being fully restored. Black carpeting is proposed. Original wood floor in Pastor's office.

Special features: lighting to accent organ pipes; light ring over back bar will hang by cables that go through existing holes, light bars at three corners curve and follow arches. Large lighting element in dome removed per ARC direction. 9' x 12' projection screen and theatrical pipe housing for screen.

Jocelyn Schmidt said that high gloss white material will clad bar with stainless steel in front of bar and uplighting at barrel vaults. She said LED lights will go in cornice and they will add new can lights. She said the black carpet has grey flecks in it so will not read as matte black.

Ms. Sodt noted that the striping in the carpet is grey as well. She directed board members to pages 13 and 14 which shows a more muted and accurate representation.

Ms. Schmidt said the walls and ceiling will be a creamy white. Metallic grey wraps part of the cornice band and triangular marquis.

Mr. Wright said the vestibule will be recreated and light fixtures with same orientation as before will be installed. He provided spec sheet of proposed pendant light.

Ms. Schmidt noted it is a custom matte white.

Mr. Wright explained proposed exterior lighting on the roof will be mounted on a bracket bar system with no impact to the tile; lighting will emphasize red tile roof. He said exterior LED uplighting will be added; he went over lighting details for each elevation. He explained that the front ramp was installed in 1954 and hides the stairs. He said the original stairs came straight down to 5th and isn't possible anymore. He said they have re-worked this and turned the stair; they added an upper and lower planter area using precast stone in verticals and solid to match the building. He said the vegetation will be linear and low.

Mr. Kiel asked how visitors will arrive.

Mr. Wright said they will park in the garage below and will come up through the new building.

Mr. Kiel asked about exterior elevation light attachment.

Ms. Schmidt said LED strips will sit behind parapet wall.

Mr. Wright said they are working on how to bring power to the lights and plan to go through existing holes.

Mr. Kiel said that preference is mortar joint.

Mr. Wright said that elevation uplights sit flush within deck on the east and in landscaping areas on the north.

Mr. Luoma asked about lighting where banners used to be.

Mr. Wright said there is no intention for banners there.

Mr. Ketcherside noted page 31 re: roof.

Mr. Wright said that there is light escape from neighboring building.

Mr. Sneddon asked about interior dome lighting.

Mr. Wright said it is a plaster ceiling and has existing can lights. He said that lighting feeds down into interstitial space and they are re-using the same holes.

Ms. Patterson asked how the east entry door – that won't be functional – is being treated.

Mr. Wright said that it originally was shown as a window but now it will read as a door to balance the door on the other side.

Ms. Patterson asked if light will shine through.

Mr. Wright said it will.

Mr. Luoma asked Mr. Wright to describe the attachment of pendants.

Mr. Wright said the single pendant will have aircraft cable wiring for suspension.

Ms. Schmidt explained there is an interior globe and exterior shade; there is a rod in the center and the four cables. She said the pendant lamp is 16” at the base.

Mr. Luoma asked about historic interior colors.

Mr. Wright said they don’t know – he said all photos are black and white and don’t show variation. He said they are creating a more uniform color scheme.

Public Comment:

A member of the public asked if original stone could be used in entry.

Mr. Wright said it is structural terracotta now; National Parks Service recommends precast to replace terracotta where possible.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker said they are creating a black box with lighting thrown in – a performance space. She said the staircase, wainscoting, balcony bar, lighting were found to be OK by ARC. She said what was presented put any concerns to rest.

Mr. Sneddon said what was presented is sensitive to maintain the character defining features and is less controversial than the escalator discussion. He said it is reversible.

Mr. Luoma said there are no real physical changes – it is mostly paint and carpet and they are using existing openings and space. He said the colors are not his taste / preference but are reversible and probably will change. He said the elements are not timeless and are subject to change. He said the entrance on the east side improves the building. He said the halo light is not his taste but is removable.

Ms. Barker said it is much less impactful and responds to the architecture.

Mr. Kiel said it meets the standards although it is not his taste but it distinguishes the new from the old.

Ms. Barker said she was glad that there will be no banners.

Ms. Sodt noted that it has been heard that there will be no banners.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for exterior and interior alterations at First United Methodist Church at 811 5th Avenue, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed exterior and interior alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 123291 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is compatible with the massing, size and scale 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/RK 8:0:0 Motion carried.

092116.3 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

092116.31 Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center
4000 NE 41st Street
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for extension to the first meeting in January 2017; she noted they have been doing three-month extensions.

Nathan Rimmer, 4000 Property LLC, updated the board on the need for finding the right use for the space and noted that use will drive design. He said they want it sensitively re-developed. He said they are continuing the exploration of use by the Academy for Precision Learning who wants to scale back their use of the property. He said they are talking with the operator of the hotel conference center about doing joint use. With hotel use expansion they could upgrade the existing lodge, and with school use they would likely add another building, but less than what was previously shown. He said they have an MOU with the school and are at the point of vetting numbers. He said they hope to have it figured out and have a basic strategy worked out by January.

Ms. Barker asked if there was a maintenance / vegetation plan.

Ms. Doherty said it is not required, but that the board has recommended one in the past.

Mr. Rimmer said the onsite managers know the requirements. He said there is no site work scheduled for now.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Luoma said it is good to hear the positive things going forward, and that the discussion and exploration for a school is ongoing.

Mr. Kiel said that everything has to come to the board now so he was OK with extension.

Mr. Luoma said the last proposal was in keeping with the goals and Guidelines of the board. He was OK with extension.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls & Incentives for Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center, 4000 NE 41st Street, until first meeting in January 2017.

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

092116.32

Ainsworth & Dunn Warehouse
2815 Elliott Avenue
Request for extension

Ms. Sodt explained the request for extension.

Jessie Clawson, McCullough Hill Leary, said they had a positive briefing and requested a four month extension.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

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

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls & Incentives for Ainsworth & Dunn Warehouse, 2815 Elliott Avenue, until the second meeting in January 2017.

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

092116.4

BRIEFINGS

092116.41

McGilvra Elementary School
1617 38th Avenue East
Briefing on cafeteria building addition

Vincent Gonzales, Amy Vanderhorst, and Sara Wilder presented.

Mr. Gonzales explained they intend to add another building to the site to replace the undersized lunchroom.

Ms. Vanderhorst went over plans noting buildings on the site and when they were built. She said the new building will be a cafeteria addition; she showed photos of what they are using now. She said the new building will be put in back behind the main 1940s building separate from the main building; the covered play area will be demolished. She said they will demolish the asphalt paving and portables and put in new paving. She said they will put in bio detention pond and said the form of the building is shaped by dripline of existing trees to be retained. She said the cafeteria will also serve as a multi-purpose room and will have bathrooms. She said it will be two story and said that the rhythm of the grid – column and window spacing is based on proportions of the historic building. She provided an elevation showing the new in relation to the height of existing building. She said it is a jewel box form with brick base similar to historic building; there will be metal siding on top. She said recessed areas will be clad in Swiss Pearl or Hardie panel. She provided color / material samples.

Ms. Vyhnanek asked how they were handling the transition from brick to aluminum.

Ms. Wilder said they are intending it to be streamlined and modern; where the brick ends the metals starts up in the same plane.

Ms. Vyhnanek said that lighter brick is shown and asked how it will weather over time.

Mr. Gonzales said it will get darker over time and it was the mason's recommendation.

Ms. Johnson asked about the profile of the metal.

Ms. Wilder said there is a thin recess and square corrugation in the same scale as the brick below it.

Ms. Doherty said the whole face will be flat except for where the reveals are.

Ms. Patterson asked about the proportion of Hardie panel to metal.

Ms. Wilder said it will be Hardie panel of Swiss Pearl and that depends on budget.

Mr. Sneddon asked about the mezzanine level.

Ms. Wilder said it is mechanical and electric.

Mr. Gonzales said this building will be independent of the others. He said that there is no adequate gym, gathering space and they want to provide more flexibility to the space.

Mr. Sneddon said it would be easy to hide the new building and asked why they made it taller.

Ms. Wilder said they have to work within a budget and be thoughtful. She said they gave a nod to the historic building and then created a more simplistic box. She said the gymnasium is not sized appropriately and eventually it will be attached to the new building.

Mr. Gonzales noted a similar project at Greenlake and said they are thinking ahead about the use of buildings and how they could be integrated / connected.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Doherty noted that there was a comment letter provided during SEPA from a student at the school, who asked that the building look historic, and be located in front of the landmark building rather than behind it.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker said it previously felt large and bulky and dark; it was good to have material samples.

Ms. Doherty said earlier comments suggested the color palette had too much contrast.

Mr. Luoma said it is a new building but not attached. He said the approach could be different; it is a modern interpretation and the right balance.

Mr. Sneddon asked about view shed issues.

Mr. Luoma said the elevation on the east is a little deceptive.

Ms. Wilder said the sidewalk is about 6 feet lower so you are looking up at the building.

Ms. Barker noted there is a dead end on the north.

Mr. Sneddon noted that they are not impacting the historic view.

Mr. Gonzales said they reached out to the adjacent Broadmoor golf course owners and received no comments back.

Mr. Luoma said he liked the material and said the weathered copper color is warm and noted that the brick preference is OK.

Mr. Ketcherside agreed.

092116.42

Kelly-Springfield Building

1525 11th Avenue

Briefing on proposed development

Jessie Clawson, McCullough Hill Leary, said they are still in conceptual design but are beyond massing. She said they have applied for their MUP and will be back for design review. She said that they removed the White Building from this project and would like feedback on the new addition and treatment of the landmark building.

Phillip Bozarth-Dreher presented via PowerPoint (full report in DON file) and provided context of the site. He said there is one original window on the second floor. He said the dropped soffits at the entry are non-original. He said they will build on

the parking lot south of the building and said that there is some original exterior elements there along with vinyl siding and windows; he said the conditions there are varying. He provided an overview of the project to date including ARC reviews. He said that Option 2 was preferred by ARC; it includes infill of the south parking lot and optimization of 21' setback. He said that they want to keep the same experience from 11th Avenue; they want to keep the east elevation. He said they want to keep the heavy timber framing inside even though it was not designated. He explained they propose to save the east and north elevations and portion of the west elevation that is visible from Pine. He said they propose new wood windows on the second floor to mimic as closely as possible the original wood window there. He said they will restore the original wood window if possible. He noted that each window opening is a different size. He said they would remove all 1990s storefronts and replace with a new curtain wall. He said they will reconfigure entries similar to original design and will add a new entry under the archway in the middle.

He said that the original sconces on the building were removed at some point and they would like to replace them – the electric boxes are still there. He said they found a fixture that is close in appearance to the original.

Ms. Sodt said the storefront systems are different in the handout.

Mr. Bozarth-Dreher said they added horizontals; the old images were giant plate glass windows which they won't try to reproduce. He clarified horizontals and different iterations of the storefront design over time.

Mr. Luoma asked if the original sconces had a longer tail.

Mr. Bozarth-Dreher said they are looking into that. He said that they are looking at wood windows and will likely use unclad and that they are looking at the same manufacturer as used on the Union Stables project. He noted the large windows are aluminum storefronts with wood trim added. He said they plan to build over the south parking lot and follow the rhythm of historic buildings and give it mass to make it distinct. He explained they have to provide loading.

Ms. Clawson said they are supposed to do three bays but they can accommodate that by making two of the bays parking spaces.

Mr. Bozarth-Dreher noted a small ground floor space that could be a coffee spot and said that the bottom floor is different from the upper portion. He pointed out that the historic building looks like a two story in that the upper and lower levels relate to one another.

Ms. Sodt noted that on page 11 the rendering above the garage is different.

Mr. Bozarth-Dreher said they have reconfigured it.

Mr. Luoma noted that on page 11 the walls between the bays are not shown.

Mr. Bozarth-Dreher said that the structural concrete columns are behind the curtain wall and has open floor plates. He said the new portion has the same bay rhythm as the historic building. He said that on the east elevation there is hollow clay tile that

they could paint and anchor to an interior concrete wall; vinyl siding will be removed and the windows will be filled in. He said that they may need mortar in the hollow clay tiles.

Ms. Patterson asked for more information on dismantling the interior.

Mr. Bozarth-Dreher said they propose to remove and then put back the columns, girders, small trusses and decking above the first floor. He said that they will add new concrete columns which will require removal of some decking.

Ms. Barker asked about the wood decking on the 2nd floor.

Mr. Bozarth-Dreher said they will put down a thin layer of concrete on the 2nd floor; the decking will not be visible from the 2nd floor.

Ms. Barker noted the creosote removal from the ground floor material.

Ms. Patterson asked about floor to ceiling height afterward.

Mr. Bozarth-Dreher said it will be the exact same height as before.

Ms. Sodt said that all details including engineering will be provided.

Mr. Luoma asked if page 15 is a pedestrian level view.

Mr. Bozarth-Dreher said it is but it won't be perceived because there is a building across the street.

Mr. Sneddon asked about board purview.

Ms. Sodt said that the truss system in the White Building is included in the designation but it was not included in this space although the board provided feedback to preserve as much of the structure as possible.

Ms. Barker said one version of the design showed the south façade of the Kelly Springfield building exposed in entrance lobby.

Mr. Bozarth-Dreher said they are not going forward with that as they thought ARC was not excited about it.

Mr. Ketcherside asked about the structure underneath on the east elevation.

Mr. Bozarth-Dreher said that there is not and that the metal siding was put up because the hollow clay tiles fell onto cars. He said since they are preserving the volume of the historic building they thought they should save the back as well.

Ms. Vyhnanek asked about the color of the new section in the middle.

Mr. Bozarth-Dreher said it is shown as a red now but it is preliminary

Mr. Sneddon asked the material of the original wood window on the second floor.

Mr. Bozarth-Dreher said it is wood.

Mr. Luoma said that he would like to see details for the proposed new all wood windows on second floor.

Mr. Bozarth-Dreher said they will come back; he said they want them to look exactly like the original and noted that each opening is a different size with different number of lights.

Ms. Sodt cited Union Stables project as an example.

Ms. Patterson asked if the landmark building being shown with a balcony.

Mr. Bozarth-Dreher said it is and that they will put in a railing pulled back so there will be no big visual impact to the building. He said he would bring site studies.

Mr. Ketcherside asked if they will excavate for the new building.

Mr. Bozarth-Dreher said that the site is almost a full story below grade now but they will do some excavation and shoring.

Ms. Barker asked if the garage heads north.

Mr. Bozarth-Dreher said yes.

Mr. Luoma said the bottom floor of the historic building has uses below; he asked if they will have three separate bays and three separate uses.

Mr. Bozarth-Dreher said it is to be determined – it can be three small retailers but it could be a larger business as well.

Ms. Patterson asked if parking is directly below.

Mr. Bozarth-Dreher said that parking and utilities are detailed on page 8.

Public Comment:

Lisa Rutzick, SDCI, said she is not the assigned planner on this project but noted Beth Hardwick who is the assigned planner said the Design Review Board's main concern was the dominance of the garage door and curb cut. They encouraged the designers to minimize the loading and garage access and said the residential entry should be more prominent. They said the size of the lobby is dictated by the large garage door. Concern was expressed for south side setbacks. She said that large curb cut departure – 37' – was revised to 30' to minimize the presence of the large garage. There are three loading berths with two below grade; one is at grade. She said the Design Review Board said to make the new building distinct from the old or make it look like the historic building.

Andrew Haas submitted written comment.

Board Feedback:

Mr. Kiel said they are on the right track. He appreciated the 21' setback and said the replica wood windows. He said the general approach to add on top with addition that is light and ephemeral is good and noted the devil is in the details. He said he wants crisp clean design. He said the hollow clay tile is on the property line and he preferred the resources be directed elsewhere – it is just infill and doesn't add a lot. He said it would be a shame if Hardi-panel showed up.

Mr. Sneddon said he applauded the team's efforts with the wood glazing restoration. He said that Staff may have original drawings.

Mr. Bozarth-Dreher said they have them but they are difficult to read.

Mr. Sneddon said he had concerns about removal of roofs and trusses. He said the area behind the parapet is not visible. He said keeping the hollow clay tiles preserves part of the story of the building and should be preserved. Regarding the loading bay and garage he jokingly said to take a cue from the historic building's grandiose garage door.

Mr. Luoma said ARC struggled with the overall massing and scale and he appreciated the setback. He said to do site line studies on what is visible. He noted the nice transparent appearance but noted the sense of scale is perceived. He said that as two stories and additional doesn't conflict with that. He appreciates that the structural members align. He said regarding the retail entrances they could do something with the central bay to hearken back to vehicular use. He said it may be a way to use materials or color to break up the monotony of that garage door. He said that if they replicate the wall sconces they should get as close as possible to original and get extended tail.

Ms. Sodt asked for input on the storefront systems and how they are divided up.

Mr. Luoma said the size of glass is difficult and noted the horizontal member. He said the efforts with the windows above help to offset what they need to do at bottom; he said to be consistent in how they align.

Mr. Kiel said the proportion between the top and bottom felt better.

Ms. Barker said she appreciates the progress and appreciates the echoing of three bays that is so strong in the landmark. She said having columns visible for the addition over the landmark seems to be competing with the landmark and that the addition should disappear as much as possible. She said the exit door on the north side of the landmark façade should be better integrated to the balance of the façade. She said to pay attention to finer detail to make garage door disappear; alternative materials could make it disappear. She said to be careful to note the difference between day and night appearances. She appreciated the setback and gave the design thus far a 'thumbs up'.

Ms. Patterson said the 21' minimum setback works nicely but it doesn't justify making the setback an outdoor roof balcony primarily because of the visual intrusion of an added rail at the roof line. She asked if there is any way to keep original first

floor instead of concrete slab because it helps to keep the original character. She said the plan for the upper windows is good. She agreed with Mr. Sneddon on preserving the hollow tiles. She liked that they were keeping the hollow clay tiles and noted that there were other siding material elements that they were planning to add or preserve (vinyl and metal). She recommended that they lose the clay tiles in place of concrete block if it meant a more uniform facade. If they planned to cover the terracotta tiles with metal/vinyl or anything else- replace all. She said the massing works and that reducing to two floors with stair penthouse would be better.

Mr. Ketcherside said the 21' setback is good. He said that bringing back the façade of the historic structure is good as is the plan for upper floor windows on the landmark building. He noted the challenges with extending lines into the new structures. He said he likes how the lines continue off to the structure on the left and then up although maybe there is exploration for making it more understated. He said the deep parking lot was the original height of the neighborhood. He said when finished they should highlight to people that this is the first Capital Hill level.

Ms. Vyhnanek said she likes the window plan on the upper floor. She liked the idea of bringing an artistic element into the garage.

Mr. Kiel said a good street section will be helpful. He preferred the roof deck experientially and it helps to understand the building in a different way. He said to make the new addition distinctly different – high design and crisp. He said to explore the bay spacing. He said he loved the idea of the micro retail space but there is too much going on there and to maybe build on that at the center bay per Mr. Luoma's comment. He said the corner windows detract from being a standalone building; they rotate the focus of the façade around to void space.

Ms. Doherty said in the 3D rendering there are some hints of signage. She said the building doesn't lend itself to putting signage anywhere because of the tile and to think about opportunities for that. She noted the proportion of the bays and said the bays dedicated as entry are different from other bays and it might be a good approach to not all be matching across the front so they could have some relief instead of all the bays being identical. She said there are a lot of retail spaces downtown that have massive windows that go floor to ceiling without horizontals so maybe you don't do that everywhere but you may have opportunity to do it in a couple bays.

092116.5 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator