



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 320/09

### MINUTES

#### Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Seattle Municipal Tower

700 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 40th Floor

Room 4080

Wednesday, June 3, 2009 – 3:30 p.m.

#### Board Members Present

Stephen Lee, Chair

Marie Strong

Tom Veith

Mollie Tremaine

Meredith Wirsching

Christine Howard

Sean Peterfreund

Mark Hannum

Steve Savage

Vernon Abelsen

Alyce Conti

#### Staff

Elizabeth Chave

Rebecca Frestedt

Karen Gordon

Chair Stephen Lee called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

#### **060309.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Meeting of May 6, 2009

MM/SC/MH/CH

Minutes approved as amended.

#### **060309.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

##### 060309.21 Selander O'Brien PLLC

3829C S. Edmunds St.

(Columbia City Landmark District)

Proposed business identification signage.

Rebecca Frestedt explained the request for business identification signage, consisting of: 1) MDO and cedar flag-mounted blade sign (dimensions: 14 h" x 28" w) attached

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

to an existing stanchion; 2) vinyl decal letters affixed to the window on the entry door; and 3) vinyl adhesive lettering affixed to the black band above the entrance. Exhibits included drawings and photographs. This proposal is consistent with other signage on the building and conforms to the building's sign plan, approved by the LPB on May 6, 2009. She noted the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval for business identification signage at the meeting of May 15, 2009.

**Applicant Comment:**

Jeannie O'Brien explained the signs are consistent with others on the building and in the District.

**Public Comment:** There was no public comment.

**Board Questions and Discussion:**

Mr. Veith agreed that the proposed signage is consistent with the District design guidelines and the building sign plan.

The Board generally agreed that the proposed signage was appropriate.

**Action:** I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signage. This action is based on the following:

The proposed alterations meet the following sections of the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines:

**Relevant Code citations**

**SMC 25.20.070** – Approval of changes to buildings, structures and other property

**Relevant guidelines**

**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.

**MM/SC/SS/CH**

**10:0:0 Motion carried.**

060309.22

Rainier Valley Cultural Center

3515 S. Alaska St

(Columbia City Landmark District)

Proposed exterior alterations and building identification signage.

*Ms. Conti arrived at 3:47 p.m.*

Ms. Frestedt explained the request for exterior alterations and signage and summarized the proposed rehabilitation and building repairs. She provided background information on the building. She said the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee reviewed the proposal on May 15, 2009 and made design recommendations which have been incorporated into this proposal. She said the Committee did not make a formal recommendation to the Board. Ms. Frestedt introduced the applicant, Jim Rymysz, from j Architects.

Mr. Rymysz went over the packet of materials provided to the Board. He said the existing roofing material was not original and that they would replace that with architectural profile composition material and would include some ridge vents. The proposed color is black. He went over the gutter detail included in the packet of materials and said the proposal includes an internal gutter covered by fascia and trim so would not be visible; he will flash and waterproof it. He went on to review the existing windows and doors where glazing had been replaced over the years with various materials. He said he has been working with Seattle Stained Glass to match and replace glazing consistent with the original appearance. He said they matched the pattern and color of the original glass and said that 21 windows would be replaced. He layered two pieces of glass to show the look and color of what they proposed and noted that only a single pane of glass would be installed. He said that signage would be along the frieze of the pediment, featuring black lettering with ¼” profile off the base of the building with a 20% black matte finish.

In response to clarifying questions Mr. Rymysz reiterated that the current roofing was not original and the client preferred black and chose a material with a 30 – 40 year warranty; he could not confirm what the original roofing material was. He said there would be a soffit vent. He noted the precedent for signage was on the frieze. He responded to Board members’ concerns about the lettering size and said the lettering was accurately scaled on the drawing. He said they are proposing 12” letters, but could change the scale if appropriate. He said the color of the lighting fixtures would be white and he pointed out on the drawings their locations.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hannum noted the CCRC had concerns about other signage that is not included with this proposal and said that the current proposal as presented to the Board was acceptable.

Mr. Abelsen noted the applicant came before the Board twice and that he thought they made good progress.

**Action:** I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations and signage. This action is based on the following:

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

**Relevant Code citations**

**SMC 25.20.070** – Approval of changes to buildings, structures and other property

**Relevant guidelines**

**2. Building Materials and Fixtures.** Integrity of structure, form and decoration should be respected. Building facades should be brick, wood, or other materials that are in keeping with the historic character of the District. Exterior light fixtures shall be in keeping with the historic character of the District.

**3. Building Surface Treatments.** Approved surface treatments shall be consistent with the historic qualities of the District. No paint shall be applied to unpainted masonry surfaces. Painted surfaces shall be:

- a. Repainted with the original historic color(s) of the building, provided that the business or property owner obtains a professional color analysis; or
- b. Repainted with subdued colors that are appropriate and consistent with the building and other buildings in the District.

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

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

**Secretary of the Interior's Standards:**

#2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

#5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

#6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

MM/SC/MT/MH

11:00 Motion carried.

060309.23

Seattle Department of Transportation  
39<sup>th</sup> Avenue S. and S. Dawson St.  
(Columbia City Landmark District)  
Proposed curb expansion and bus stop improvements.

Ms. Frestedt said that the application for right-of-way improvements will be deferred to a future meeting.

060309.24

Hamilton Middle School  
1610 N. 41<sup>st</sup> St.  
Proposed alterations to (former) gymnasium interior, and landscaping details along northwest corner of site

Don Gillmore, Seattle School District Building Excellence Program manager, explained the proposed alterations to divide the large gymnasium in half to provide separate space for choral and instrument groups. He explained the school's program changed from the last approval. He pointed out on the drawing where the wall would go and said the trusses would remain in place. He explained this alteration is reversible should they ever want to take the wall down. He said acoustical treatment would be added and a new skylight would be constructed to match the 1920's skylight. Currently there is one main duct running through and they propose two.

Board Questions:

Asked if the existing skylight was original Mr. Gillmore said it was built in the 1970's and that they are reconstructing it to make it what it looked like in the 1920's. In response to other Board questions he said the wall goes through to the outside and rises up above the skylight about 6 – 7" and follows the shape of the skylight. Each room will have half the skylight with the wall.

Scott Waytashek with BLRB Architects said tuning the room for voice or instrument has to do with the amount of absorption and the amount of diffusing surfaces in the room. He said the primary difference is they needed to add more diffusion so there would be no flutter or echo back from parallel walls.

Mr. Abelsen asked if in event of going back to music rather than voice would they remove them.

Mr. Gillmore responded that they could add curtains on windows to absorb some sound. He said there is a theater in another part of the building. He went on to talk about the stairwell “exit” which was raised above the surrounding grade; they propose to remove it and exit the plaza from other locations which he pointed to on the plan.

Mr. Waytashek noted that the previous approval had three terraces that stopped at the stairway. He said this proposal will remove stairway, continuing the terracing to the property line where the new stair occurs.

Mr. Gillmore added that Parks has approved the new stairway and had gone through the approval process – neighborhood committees etc.

Mr. Veith clarified that this Board does not have control over the park and any changes Parks may make to their proposed work.

Public Comment:

Ms. Chave noted she included a letter in Board members’ packets.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Lee noted that the ARC reviewed the proposal and this solution was acceptable.

Ms. Wirsching said the skylight was not historic and that the new skylight and other work is readily removable.

Mr. Veith said the alterations change the character of the space which is concerning since this Board is charged with protecting the character. He said it was one of the places in the building where the historic condition was visible but the changes are acceptable and reversible. He suggested adding language to the motion regarding the park property.

**Action:** “I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for the proposed relocation of the previously approved exit stair from the northwest corner of the site, and associated landscaping, and proposed alterations to the 1926 west gymnasium interior to accommodate music classroom, as described in the application submittal and submitted plans. This action is based on the following:

1. With regard to *SMC 25.12.750 A, the extent to which the proposed alteration or significant change would adversely affect the features or characteristics described in the Report on Designation:* The exterior of the landmark school and the significant interior features will not be adversely affected by the proposed changes; one of the two historic gymnasiums will be modified but the other historic gymnasium will be retained as one room.
2. *With regard to SMC 25.12.750 B, The reasonableness or lack thereof of the proposed alterations or significant change in light of other alternatives available to achieve the*

*objectives of the owner:* The proposed modifications to the northwest corner of the site and the interior alterations to the 1926 west gymnasium are reasonable.

3. With regard to *SMC 25.12.750 E., For School District property that is in use as a public school facility, educational specifications.* Regarding the interior alterations and the need for the music classroom, the applicant has provided information to the Board on how the current proposal meets the educational program for the school.
4. The other factors of SMC 25.12 .750 are not applicable to this application.

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

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

The Parks property is not controlled under the landmark designation for this property; and this action of the Landmarks Preservation Board should not be construed as mandating a design for the portion of the work on Parks Department property.”

**MM/SC/TV/CH**

**11:0:0 Motion carried.**

060309.25

Aurora Bridge/George Washington Memorial Bridge  
Proposed pedestrian/suicide prevention fence

Andrea Burgess, project manager at WSDOT, described the existing conditions and explained the scope of the project. She said that the discussion about how to deal with bridge suicides began in 2006. She said that the State legislature asked WSDOT to prepare design options and make recommendations. She said phones were put up and other alternatives were looked at such as netting, closing bridge to pedestrians or building a suspended walkway under the bridge. The proposal was looked at by DAHP; she explained the project's funding. She explained that Section 106 and 4F do not apply because this is State funded. The fence will be built on the outside of the existing railing independent of the historic rail; it will be built on both sides of the bridge from end to end. She said the fence will be 8'9" high as measured from sidewalk elevation and will be constructed from individual removable panels nested into vertical supports that align with the existing railing posts. The rods will be 3/8" diameter at 5" spacing and will extend up through the frame 4". She said intermediate pickets would create an extra obstacle if someone were to attempt to climb over the bridge. She said that at the end of the bridge they will have an outrigger piece perpendicular that is 2 1/2' wide; there are pickets at the bottom and the top to prevent people from climbing on the backside and out onto the bridge. A spreader bar placed horizontally near the top of the existing railing will prevent the existing rods from being forcibly pulled apart. She went over the material and construction details and said that the fence will be painted to match the existing steel truss of the bridge. She explained the design development used a context sensitive approach and included members of community groups, a historic preservation specialist, a crises clinic

representative, and a former Landmarks Board member. She went over their public notification efforts. She said at the end of March they did a mock up on the bridge for viewing; it was constructed of wood but provided a dimensional idea. She said the design would have minimal impact to the bridge, the colors and materials were compatible and it was removable. She went over signage that would be removed or cleaned.

Leslie Schwab, WSDOT Historic Preservation Specialist, said she uses Virginia's Historic Bridge Management Plan for in her analysis for the proposed fence because it has adapted the Secretary of Interiors Standards for bridges and bridge preservation. She cited Secretary of Interior's standards #9 and #10 and said this design has gone to a great extent to minimize the impact to any of the characteristics and qualities that define this bridge. She said the primary characteristics of historic bridges are the structural elements and in this case it is the 3000 foot long cantilevered deck truss spans that are important and that the railing is considered a secondary feature. She believes the proposal meets the criteria for approval. She said it is removable and does not impact the character defining features.

#### Board Questions:

Ms. Conti asked about the length of the rods on top.

Ms. Burgess said the taller ones are 4" and she clarified that it was the rod that is in the middle of the fence frame extending up through the top, and in between is a 2" picket.

Ms. Conti asked if the design was based on another city having used that system.

Ms. Schwab said no that it had come out of the design development process with the ARC.

Ms. Burgess said alternatives were looked for top treatments because all involved felt something needed to be there.

Ms. Conti said she looked at 1932 going forward that about 2.5 people a year jumped and asked if that number was increasing.

Ms. Burgess said it was not increasing and said this year there have been 5 but a couple years back the number was larger.

Mr. Lee noted the responsibility of the Landmarks Preservation Board is to review the design of the fence. The Architectural Review Committee has reviewed this proposal over the past year on assumption the fence is needed. He said that decision has been made in Olympia. He asked for clarification about the proposed height.

Ms. Burgess said that the proposed fence height is the maximum height they can build and allow unrestricted access for maintenance under bridge.

Ms. Tremaine asked the applicant how treatment with other bridges had succeeded in lowering the rate of suicide.

Ms. Burgess cited a couple bridges – the Duke Ellington Bridge in Washington DC at which a fence was built and a nearby bridge (near the Duke Ellington Bridge) didn't see an increase (in jumps). She provided an example in Toronto where a fence has prevented people from jumping.

Mr. Veith asked if the number of suicides had decreased or if it had prevented jumps.

Ms. Burgess said she thought there had been one suicide from the DC Bridge since the fence was installed.

Mr. Veith asked if the fence would be removed if it turned out to be ineffective in the prevention of suicides.

Ms. Burgess said it was designed to be a deterrent and that people could still get over with a tall ladder or heavy tools.

Ms. Strong asked what studies have been done to address the reflectiveness of the stainless steel rods.

Paul Kinderman, WSDOT project architect, said within short order automobile exhaust and environment will knock down any gloss.

Ms. Strong said at the beginning of the project a lot of effort was made to involve stakeholders and the citizen's group and towards the end it appeared that communications slowed down or stopped. She asked what efforts were made to communicate to the public (e.g. the mock up on the bridge).

Ms. Burgess said it was communicated to WSDOT's advisory and design committees: the community groups cited in WSDOT's documents provided to the Board.

Greg Phipps, Public Information Officer for WSDOT, said posts were on WSDOT website.

Ms. Wirsching asked about maintenance for cleaning – soot and buildup, etc.

Ms. Burgess said that roadway maintenance is handled by SDOT; she expects they will live up to their maintenance agreement that has been in effect for a while. She said bridge maintenance is planned for 2012.

Ms. Wirsching asked Board staff if views from bridge were protected.

Ms. Chave said no.

Mr. Peterfreund asked about damage to pickets. Ms. Burgess said the rods are replaceable if damaged.

Mr. Veith said that WSDOT presented the idea that the main characteristic feature is the truss work and type of construction. He said the Board is supposed to consider how the proposed alterations may significantly change or adversely affect the specific

features or characteristics specified and asked if the designation report, the approval of the nomination, or the agreement on Controls and Incentives affect only the truss work.

Ms. Chave said this is an early nomination from the 1980s and does not compare to quality (thoroughness) of nominations now. She said while the railing is not mentioned specifically in the nomination, the nomination is only a page and a half long and the nomination did not go into great detail. She said the entire structure is controlled as per the designation ordinance.

Ms. Schwab said she looked through the Historic American Engineering Record and found a description and narrative on the bridge and it doesn't mention anything about the railings, just the truss work.

Ms. Gordon said the criteria the Board has to look at is what is included in the designating ordinance; she said the designating ordinance talks about the entire bridge.

Ms. Chave read from the ordinance#121270, and she also read designation standard D.

Public Comment:

Russ Daggett said he lives near the bridge and has seen people who have jumped. He supported the fence. He said the trusses are the dominant feature but he supported the design of the fence and the need for it – its function must take priority.

John Coney, Queen Anne Community Council, spoke in opposition to the fence and said there were more deaths from lack of a median in the roadway. He said the design of the fence violates three Secretary of Interior's Standards; he said it will change the profile, appearance, texture of the bridge; and it will impede the view from the bridge. He said it is a naïve approach; he said it is an epidemiologically poor approach to preventing suicides and would move suicides to other bridges and other means of suicide. He said the Bay area has decided to use netting on the Golden Gate Bridge.

Gemma Daggett said she supports the fence-she also said she received lots of notices about the process. She spoke of the issue of safety and liability and said under the bridge are many large office buildings, boaters, Burke Gilman trail which gets heavy use; she expressed concern for the people underneath the bridge. She said that jumping is impulsive and if a barrier is up people won't go to other bridges. She said services are helpful but don't prevent jumping. She said it is the only bridge in North America that is not protected.

Erik Pihl, Board member of the Fremont Neighborhood Council said he also serves on WSDOT's neighborhood advisory committee. He said he did not support the fence and didn't think it would be effective. He said that the Fremont Neighborhood Council was not convinced that the fence was the answer. He encouraged WSDOT to do mitigation; he said that issue has not been addressed to the community's satisfaction. He said the existing interior barrier was not built to plans approved by the LPB. He said it was troubling that WSDOT has not demonstrated its respect for

the Landmarks Preservation Board process in its previous bridge project where the interior barrier did not meet the Landmarks Preservation Board's instructions. He said he was told that this was because the instructions were not drawn into the drawings that were given to the contractor that installed the interior barrier. He said many in the Fremont neighborhood find it disturbing that the interior barrier was not designed properly; he said it was addressed with WSDOT. He said he doesn't trust WSDOT – they didn't follow through on a previous change. He asked the Board to ask WSDOT to come back when they have brought the first one up to the standard that was set.

Martin Kaplan, former Pike Place Market Historical commissioner and chair, and current Queen Anne Council member and Planning Commission member, expressed compassion for jumpers and witnesses but thought the design could be more thoughtful. He said he is speaking today as an architect and historian. He said the bridge is on the historic register and the fence will diminish its value; the interior barrier was put up without thought. He said the rail is pleasing and now it will be diminished. He said it is a modern solution with no relationship to the historic structure. He cited three Secretary of Interior's Standards: Historic character should be retained and preserved; recorded as a physical record of time and use; new addition will not destroy features. He said this design does not stand up to these and said the solution should be more.

George Counts, Queen Anne Community Council, spoke in opposition to the fence and said it is a permanent alteration to an historic structure and that the State was spending \$8 million on it. He said that over a ten year period there have been approximately 2100 suicides in King County with 36 of those occurring as a result of someone jumping from the Aurora Bridge. He said in 2006 the number went up and concern was raised but in looking back it appears to have been an aberration. He suggested WSDOT follow the lead of the Golden Gate Bridge and do unobtrusive netting. He thought the fence was a misguided approach that would irrevocably alter and damage the bridge.

Erica Hansen said she manages buildings below the bridge and didn't think a net would be workable. She spoke to the trauma of seeing jumpers and said something needed to be done.

Andrea Broyer said there have been 200 suicides over the life of the bridge. She spoke to the impulsive nature of jumping and by eliminating the bridge (as an option to jump) people won't migrate to another one. She didn't think the fence was aesthetically damaging.

Don Brubeck said he was a preservation architect, a former LPB member and also served on the Citizen's Advisory Committee for the bridge fence. He said he was initially skeptical of the need but said he knows now the need is there. He said the bridge will do its job and while it is scalable, it is meant to be a deterrent, not a security fence. He went over the process to come up with this design: WSDOT and engineers listened to the ARC in coming up with the design and made it lighter and more transparent. He said the stainless steel rods are the most transparent and the best long term maintenance results. He said it is a reversible intervention. He said despite his skepticism at the beginning, he now supports the fence as it will be lightweight and thin.

Leanne Olsen, Queen Anne Historical Society(QAHS), spoke on behalf of QAHS President Char Eggleston who attended every ARC meeting on this and recently rescinded her support. She said there was no buy-in from all stakeholders and that people involved in a process were not aware of final changes.

Ms. Burgess said that regarding the interior barrier, they have met with the bridge office and construction office and for the new project they will have a pre-bid meeting at the site with the contractors. She said they are changing the way permits and commitments are handled. She said the C of A will be an appendix to the contracts.

#### Board Discussion:

Mr. Lee explained that the Landmarks Preservation Board can only make sure the design it meets the Guidelines; the decision to put up the fence had already been made by the State. He said ARC met many times with the applicants in coming up with the current proposal.

Mr. Savage noted the applicant's due diligence and redesign with ARC and he concurred with the Staff Report.

Mr. Hannum stated the Board was not charged with whether or not the fence should be installed, but rather to ensure the best design possible. He said this design has the least impact to views and is reversible. He supported the application.

Ms. Howard concurred and while she had concern with the compatibility with the massing, size and scale of the proposal, but it is acceptable.

Mr. Peterfreund was confident that many options were explored.

Ms. Tremaine said she did not support the application. She said WSDOT had done a good job with design requirements and met the concerns of the ARC and addressed all of the questions of the ARC.

Ms. Strong stated that a national landmark bridge deserves a more refined design and she did not support the application.

Mr. Abelsen said while the concept of preserving historic buildings is to minimize changes and for the Board's purposes they look at the primary or significant elements. He said that this is a bridge that is viewed from all over the City. He said the Board reviews from guidance by the Ordinance and that the historic character would remain and it would not be damaged. The simpleness of the design does not detract from the historic bridge.

Ms. Conti did not support the application because the solution does not work well with the existing structure. She said it did not meet the Secretary of Interior Standards 2, 5 and 9 and there should be a better option; this solution overwhelms the bridge including the railing.

Mr. Veith said the fence does significantly alter the character and experience of the bridge. He said the proposal did not meet all the requirements of Standards 2 and 9. He said while it is removable it is unlikely that it would ever be removed. He said we have to maintain most notably the spatial relationship on the bridge. He said there had been a very thorough process, but sometimes a thorough process ends up with a solution that one can't support. He said can't support the proposal.

Mr. Lee noted the difficulty Board members had to support the proposed fence and that there was no consensus. He said he was leaning toward approval because the bridge as a sculptural element in the urban fabric would not be affected. He noted the evolution of the design through meeting with ARC and said it was the most appropriate solution. He agreed with Mr. Veith and said he couldn't think of another design to improve it so this is the best that they could come up with. He said there is an honest disagreement among the Board members.

**Action:** I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed pedestrian fence/suicide prevention fence, as per the applicant's current submittal. This action is based on the following:

4. With regard 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 Ordinance #121270*. While the proposed fence will have a visual impact upon landmark bridge, the goal of the fence design is to have as little impact as possible on the designated features.
5. With regard to *SMC 25.12.750 B, The reasonableness or lack thereof of the proposed alterations or significant change in light of other alternatives available to achieve the objectives of the owner*: The objective of the applicant/owner is to install a fence on the Aurora Bridge that will deter individuals from jumping. The applicant/owner has stated that the other suicide prevention alternatives do not meet the needs of the owner. The Landmarks Preservation Board's role is to consider design alternatives for the design of the proposed fence. The applicant has presented design alternatives at seven meetings of the Architectural Review Committee.
4. The other factors of SMC 25.12 .750 C and 25.12.750 D and 25.12.750 E are not applicable."

*The proposed fence proposal meets the following Standard of the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:*

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

The applicant's final preferred alternative, reviewed at the ARC meeting of May 15, 2009, is a product of the applicant's incorporation of previous design recommendations and comments of the ARC over a nine month period. The preferred alternative does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, is differentiated from the old, and is compatible with the massing, size and scale given the requirements for the suicide prevention function.

*The proposed fence proposal meets the following Standard of the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:*

Standard #10 New additions or adjacent new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be impaired.

*The proposed fence has been designed so that it can be removed without damage to the historic fabric of the landmark bridge.*

**MM/SC/MH/CH**

**6:5:0 Motion carried. Mmes. Strong, Tremaine, Conti, Messrs. Abelsen, Veith opposed.**

060309.4 **BOARD BRIEFING**

060309.41 King County Landmark Challenge Grants Program  
Flo Lentz, 4Culture

Flo Lentz explained the Landmark Challenge Grants Program and she said that this was their second year (out of three). She said \$127,500 is available and they are looking for projects that meet critical physical needs and are building momentum toward a real preservation goal and are extremely visible. She said these are brick and mortar projects \$5,000 minimum with a \$5,000 cash match and the maximum award is \$25,000. She distributed flyers on the program.

**060309.4 BOARD BUSINESS**

**060309.5 STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator