



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 496/08

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Seattle Municipal Tower

700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor

Room 4060

Wednesday, August 6, 2008 – 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Vernon Abelsen
Jerry Finrow
Henry Matthews
Tom Veith
Stephen Lee
Christine Howard
Ron Martinson
Czarina Nicolas
Henry Matthews

Staff

Elizabeth Chave
Sarah Sodt
Melinda Bloom
Rebecca Frestedt

Absent

Marie Strong
Mollie Tremaine
Alyce Conti
Mark Hannum

Chair Stephen Lee called the meeting to order at 3:32 PM.

080608.1

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meeting of June 4, 2008

MM/SC/CH/HM

7:0:0 Minutes approved.

080608.2

CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

080608.21

Ford Assembly Plant

1155 Valley

Proposed exterior paint

Ms. Chave explained the project and explained that when Shurgard purchased the building they installed metal roll up doors which they now want to paint in their

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

corporate color. She showed photos of the building, a site plan and a sample of the paint color. She said the doors are interior facing and are on a smaller 1960s addition and not on the large significant assembly plant building. She said the applicants also propose to paint the concrete a neutral color. ARC recommended approval as it is reversible and it is not harming any historic fabric.

Mr. Finrow arrived at 3:35 p.m.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior paint, based on the following:

1. The proposed change does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance 119114 because the proposed change does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property and because the proposal has minor visual impact and is reversible.

The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/RM/VA 8:0:0 Motion approved.

080608.22

Carroll's Jewelers Street Clock
1427 Fourth Avenue

Ms. Sodt stated that the application is for the relocation of the street clock from its current location at 1427 Fourth Avenue to outside the entrance of the Museum of History and Industry, located at 2700 24th Avenue East.

Applicant Comment:

Leonard Garfield, Director of Museum of History and Industry, explained the Carroll's clock is the most distinguished of the nine Landmark street clocks. It was built in 1913 by Joseph Mayer and originally was located on Pike St. but has been at its current location for decades. The Joshua Green building is undergoing a renovation and the clock will be moved to safeguard it. The Carrolls family donated the clock to the museum; it will be moved to Montlake but in a couple years it will be relocated with the museum to its new home at the Armory Building at South Lake Union. The intent is the clock will be a public asset to be enjoyed by the public for generations to come. The Seneca Group will move the clock and are working with Artech which is the most experienced art handler and mover in the community to ensure the engineering and the move itself are done in a way that respects the historic character and ensures its safety.

Ms. Sodt explained that ARC reviewed and requested additional engineering information which has been provided and which she emailed to ARC members.

Mr. Veith expressed concern that in the graphics the head of the clock didn't appear to be square to the building. Jake McKinstry, Seneca Group, stated it will be square to the building.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Garfield, in response to concerns expressed about security stated the clock will be located at the entry to the museum within sight line; it is well lit and well exposed to neighbors and police. Prowls in this area are rare. If vandalism were to occur they would restore the clock.

Mr. Martinson expressed concern about the calculations.

Mr. McKinstry said the calculations were not 50 year calculations as this is just a temporary move. The clock is 4000 pounds; a flange piece has been fabricated to receive it, anchor bolts will go in 9" deep. When the relocation to its final location happens recalculation will be done with the appropriate load.

Mr. Veith asked if they were reducing loads because of duration or arbitrarily reducing loads because the risk of certain events is smaller in a two year window.

Mr. Martinson responded because of the risk of certain events is smaller in a two year window.

Mr. McKinstry said a different seismic coefficient is used on the calculations because of the temporary situation.

Mr. Martinson said it is kind of arbitrary; but it is fairly legitimate.

Mr. Garfield informed the Board the Museum is insured. The clock is just under 30' tall; the solid head from the pedestal is 10' tall. They will have a full verification of its weight when it is moved.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed street clock relocation.

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 features and internal mechanism of the street clock will not be adversely affected by the proposal.
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 applicant has chosen this plan as the preferred alternative to temporary storage and has demonstrated how this alternative meets the needs of the owner.
3. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/RM/CH

8:0:0 Motion approved.

080608.23

The Rainier Club

820 Fourth Avenue

Ms. Sodt explained that the application is for a proposed new addition and associated site alterations; she noted that the ARC has been briefed on the project numerous times.

Applicant comment:

Kate Diamond, NBBJ, explained that subterranean parking is part of another construction project adjacent to this site. There will be a two-story addition in the forecourt with subterranean below; it will house a below grade fitness center with skylight and four levels of parking for the Rainier Club and one level of parking for the new tower. Entry for Rainier Club parking will be from the forecourt; access for the tower parking is through the base of the tower. With the large tower going in next door, they are creatively using the air rights over a portion of the Rainier Club property. The two-story addition will be a subservient small scale addition that respects the original building. Through a porcelain tile element they will pick up the same colors as the clinker bricks of the Rainier Club. The structural supports will be small metal pieces that clip and hold its corners in addition to the thinset it is sitting on.

Ms. Diamond explained the single window that will have a screen that can be closed when the sun is shining in. It will be a perforated metal in similar dark color. The existing brick wall was part of original fabric; this area will now be the retaining wall of a new building. They propose to replace it with a brick wall that is similar yet different; darker in character and uses a mixture of the manganese, ironspot and textured manganese brick. They have revised the renderings and have that updated information to submit for review. The new structure allows for removability as it touches only one façade of the Rainier Club; it is on the alley side and involves only cutting existing openings to allow traffic between the structures. There is a seismic separation between the new structure and the historic fabric.

Board Questions:

In response to questions Ms. Diamond explained the equipment on the roof will be in an enclosed cleanly detailed “room”. The roof of the building is 3 ½ feet below the plaza level; the mechanical shaft is below the sight line of the other building lobby and there is no access to the roof and one can’t jump onto it. There will be pavers on the roof as it will be visible. The existing canopy was a 1967 addition in copper; it is not historic and will be removed to allow construction. They propose to replace it in the same scale with a similar canopy; the front façade of the canopy will be in character with the detailing on the addition. The brick that is removed from the existing front wall will be saved to be used for repair of other parts of the Rainier Club; as much will be saved as feasible.

Mr. Lee stated for the record the Board has no influence on the adjacent tower design.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Abelsen stated ARC has reviewed this project many times; he said the work is a challenge because it is adjacent to a highly respected historic landmark. This addition is a transition type structure; it lightly touches building so will not destroy historic materials. While the retaining wall is historic material he didn't feel it was germane to the historic nature of the landmark.

Mr. Lee agreed that ARC has seen this application a lot and said the applicant has walked a fine line with a challenging design problem to solve.

Mr. Finrow thought it was a good effort, subdued and he likes the vocabulary and scale.

The Board was in agreement that it is a good effort and good solution.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed addition and associated site alterations.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 113459, as the proposed addition and associated site alterations do not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and are compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. The proposed design also meets Standard #10, which states that new additions "shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/VA/CH 8:0:0 Motion approved.

080608.3 DESIGNATION

080608.31 Coca Cola Bottling Plant
1313 East Columbia Street

Martha Bose, Seattle University Project Manager, introduced Susan Boyle, BOLA Architects who prepared and presented the report (full report available in file).

Ms. Boyle presented the designation. She said the building was built in 1939 in Squire Park, in a low swale between the hills that made up First Hill along Broadway. It was an area that had residential neighborhoods around it but tended to not be developed probably because of drainage. Light industrial and commercial were located over time in this area. She said the Coca Cola Bottling Company's history starts in the late 19th century and got a boost during prohibition. This was not the

only bottling plant in Washington State but the ingredients were mixed here before being sent on.

Ms. Boyle explained Coca Cola's architect, Jessie Shelton from Atlanta, was the architect and worked with the local firm of Graham and Painter. The building was comprised of two separate sections: the office section which is a two-story L-shape around a bottling room and a tall one-story which was primarily used for delivery. Qwest acquired the building in 1974.

Ms. Boyle explained the building is a low scale building and is prominent because of its color and size; it is surrounded by many older small-scale houses and apartment buildings, multi-plexes and small scale manufacturing buildings. It is a simple plan with mixed construction used as the structural framing. The main entry was originally on the north end; the other common entry was emphasized by the glass block opening above it. The garage doors are no longer present. The office half is distinguished not only by the mass but also by the treatment of the facades which have a slight modeling and projections of more important elements; cast bands for the ornamentation are more prominent. The horizontality is emphasized; the curvature and use of glass block are representative of Streamlined Moderne Style. Some of the banding is painted on; the back of the building and the south façade is utilitarian.

Ms. Boyle explained the building is a good example of the Streamline Moderne Style which derived from Art Deco. Ms. Boyle said this aesthetic was applied not just to buildings but to fashion, trains, radios; it was a short-lived style that came about in the late 1920s and lasted in the mass produced products until the 1940s. She said the buildings were simple with a little bit of decorative element; remaining forward-looking but not dramatically so. Coca Cola may have embraced this style because of its expansion during the 1920s and 1930s, branding their buildings as much as their bottling process. She said with the exception of the glass block, the building doesn't use too many materials of the period; it is straightforward in its use of stucco clad concrete, industrial steel sash windows that offer a contrast between the mass and the detail.

Ms. Boyle said the interior, which was not nominated, is straightforward and has only a few remnants of what might have been characteristics of the original design. She said the interiors are utilitarian.

Board Questions:

Mr. Matthews asked if the blue was original.

Ms. Boyle replied the historical photos show a more monochromatic color; the base was cream.

Mr. Finrow asked about the building's condition.

Ms. Boyle thought the building to be in really good condition; it was built as a very solid building.

Mr. Abelsen thought the scalloping looks like a bottle cap.

Public Comment:

John Savo, local architect, represented the Citizens' Advisory Committee for Seattle University Major Institution Master Plan and said the building is well regarded and a character-defining feature based on its long term presence and scale. He said they believe the one-story warehouse section is not the same quality as the two-story portion.

Bill Zosal, neighbor, supported the designation of the building.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Martinson agreed with the staff report and supported designation based on D and F.

Mr. Abelsen agreed with the staff report and agreed the south façade was the significant feature but recommended designating the whole site.

Mr. Veith agreed and stated he walked a lot in this neighborhood and he thinks the building is distinctive in its siting. He said it is very available to passersby, it is prominent, and it has contrast of age and scale to its surroundings and that it is easily identifiable; he supported designation based on D and F.

Mr. Matthews supported designation on D and F and said it is a good example of Streamlined Moderne.

Ms. Nicolas supported designation on D and F and thought it added to the neighborhood.

Ms. Howard supported designation on D and F and said Streamlined Moderne is a relatively rare type in Seattle.

Mr. Finrow supported designation on D and F.

Mr. Lee supported designation on D and F and thought it a charming boundary building that is a fine example of its style.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Coca Cola Bottling Plant at 1313 E. Columbia St. a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards D and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the exterior of the building and the site.

MM/SC/HM/CH

8:0:0 Motion approved.

080608.4 NOMINATION

080608.41 Dr. Annie Russell House
5721 8th Ave NE

Mimi Sheridan, Architectural Historian, introduced Babs Rodieck, the owner of the house, and Nick Kindel, University of Washington Urban Planning student.

Ms. Rodieck explained she and her husband bought the house in 1978, and she supports the nomination.

Nick Kindel presented the nomination. He provided context of the site (full report available in file) and said it was one of two houses built by Dr. Annie Russell around 1908; the other house, just north, was built for her son Homer. Frederick A. Sexton was the architect. He said the house has an unusual Craftsman-Swiss Chalet style and shows an extraordinary use of rustic materials: unplanned logs, wood shakes, river rocks for the foundation and fireplaces. There have been some minor changes, additions to the house: a small addition in the back by the kitchen was added in the 1970s and one of the front porches was enclosed prior to 1940.

Mr. Kindel explained the house was built by Dr. Annie Russell who was one of the first female doctors in the state of Washington and in the City of Seattle. She was born in Wisconsin and came to Washington in the 1880s; she worked as a nurse during the small pox epidemic in Bellingham. She moved to Seattle around 1890 and practiced as a physician and surgeon in Seattle until the 1930s. She led an active and controversial life; she was an avid traveler and went to Europe, Mexico, climbed mountains. She performed abortions and subsequently lost her medical license for seven years before it was reinstated. She is significant in the medical history of Seattle.

Mr. Kindel said the site used to be one acre; as I-5 was constructed and the LDS church expanded its parking lot, the property shrunk down and is now about 1/3 of an acre. Mr. Kindel provided photos of the house (interior and exterior) and site.

Frederick A. Sexton emigrated from England in 1860; a few of his prominent buildings include the Georgetown City Hall which is a National and City Landmark, the Webber School and 101 King Street. His residential work was eclectic as with the Russell house. Numerous studies have pointed to the architectural significance of this house: the 1975 Nyberg/Steinbrueck inventory; the 1978 City Comprehensive Plans; 1980 Guide to Architecture in Washington State among others.

Mr. Kindel explained he was told the original floor plans and building permit were destroyed and that he hadn't checked the index rolls for permits. He clarified the house is located east of I-5 and not west of it as stated in his report.

Ms. Sheridan added that there were no plans or permits existing and that no effort had been undertaken to further document the floor plans more accurately. Per a newspaper article, the builder was a brother-in-law of Russell's, Walter Frost and his two sons. Frost's daughter, Cora, was married to Homer. The houses dated from 1904-1908; Woodbridge uses 1904 and Shirley and Kate use 1908. A 1906 article in Washington Magazine shows the Homer Russell House was there at that time. In

response to a Board question about significant detailing, Ms. Sheridan said the three very elaborate fireplaces, very deep eaves, windows and exposed rafter tails and the way they are used with logs extending far past the corner.

Mrs. Rodieck stated the house is in original condition but she has had the roof replaced. She said the beam ends that are lighter in color are due to the squirrels peeling the cedar.

Ms. Sheridan confirmed there seemed to be no evidence of a major rehabilitation and that the house has been well maintained.

Board questions:

Mr. Matthews stated the exterior walls are constructed in the log cabin manner and asked about the construction of the interior walls.

Mrs. Rodieck stated the wood panels were just installed over the logs.

Ms. Sheridan added that the interior space divider walls are frame walls.

Mr. Abelsen asked about the immediate neighborhood at the time the house was constructed.

Ms. Sheridan said this area was platted as the Days Acre Gardens but they were not farms. She said all the sites were 1 acres sites and many of the parcels had been subdivided to smaller properties.

Public Comment:

Philip Duff, neighbor and owner of the Homer Russell house, supported the nomination. He said the rafter tails and outriggers are emblematic of a style the Green and Green in the 1900s work in Pasadena. He said it is a log frame structure and the interior paneling appears to have been added in the later 1940s – 1950s. Regarding the parking lots, there is a 1959 document that talks about Homer Russell getting permission from the City to building a side sewer and two catch basins in that parking lot so by 1959 it was a parking lot built for a commercial structure. He said Dr. Russell was the first female surgeon in Washington and was very involved in women's reproductive rights both of which are of significance.

Valerie Bunn was puzzled about the style of the house and why it was built there. She said there was a Catholic church nearby. She wondered if she practiced out of her house or if she had a clinic. She asked if there was a message being sent by having a Swiss Chalet house.

Ms. Sheridan said she didn't think any message was being sent with the choice of the Swiss Chalet style. There is reference that she had gone to Switzerland and liked the style. It would have been very appropriate at this location/time and would have fit in very well. Blessed Sacrament Church is pretty far away and was built much later than the house.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Lee asked for more facts and plans to be provided by the applicant.

Mr. Veith stated 3 of 4 appendices were not available for his review and that the article in particular would have been interesting to look at. He advised of the need to go through the report to make sure the position of the building is properly described. He said there is more in the report about her career; an interesting supposition was made about how the back stairs might have been used and how the upstairs plan was utilized in order to facilitate her practice. He said having an as-built plan would be good especially when talking about the history of the house. He said the building is an interesting building and rates nomination. He supports nomination based on B and D. He said the interiors should be included in the nomination and the Board should look at the house. He said the paneling looks like paneling common in the 1940s; materials that aren't original can be included as long as they are within the period of significance. He said the beams in the ceilings, the double height foyer and the fireplaces are interesting features.

Mr. Matthews agreed that an as-built drawing would be helpful. He said the architect was not deeply involved with the Craftsman Style but intrigued by the river rock, the rough tree trunks but hadn't "boned-up" on Stickley and the Green Brothers. He supported nomination.

Ms. Nicholas supported nomination based on B and D and agreed the interiors should be considered.

Ms. Howard thanked the homeowner for taking care of the house and stated it has a fascinating history. She supported nomination.

Mr. Finrow supported nomination based on B and D but didn't support F. He wasn't sure about the interiors and would like to see more; he thought the interior may have been compromised and would say no to that at this point. He agreed it was worth of consideration.

Mr. Abelsen strongly supported nomination on B, D and F. Woman doctor is significant. The architectural aspect is less significant than the construction and the work of the building. The fireplace might be worthy of consideration but he would like a site visit of better photos.

Mr. Martinson supported nomination and agreed the interiors should be included.

Mr. Lee supported nomination of both the exterior and interior.

Mr. Abelsen suggested excluding the shed.

Ms. Chave noted the shed does not have a lot of architectural integrity.

Mr. Lee suggested nominating the site.

Mr. Veith noted the Board usually nominates more than it designates because items can be removed.

Action: I move approval of the Dr. Annie Russell House at 5721 8th Ave. NE for consideration as a Seattle Landmark based on Staff recommendations which will include all elements of the site and the interior including the central hallway and stairway to the second floor, and excluding the kitchen and bathroom; and including the site, including the shed; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation is scheduled for September 17, 2008; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/VA/HM 8:0:0 Motion approved.

Mr. Finrow left at 5:35 pm.

080608.5 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

080608.51 Bon Marche Stables
2315 Western Avenue

Ms. Sodt reported the owner requested a 30 – 45 day extension.

Action: I move to extend the period for consideration for the Controls and Incentives agreement for the Bon Marche Stables for a period of 45 days.

MM/SC/TV/CH 7:0:0 Motion approved.

080608.52 Fitch-Nutt House
4401 Phinney Avenue N.

Ms. Chave reported the owner’s attorney requested a continuance of six months.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to extend the period for consideration for the Controls and Incentives agreement for the Fitch-Nutt House for a period of six months.

MM/SC/TV/CH 7:0:0 Motion approved.

080608.6 TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS

080608.61 Globe Building, Beebe Building and Hotel Cecil
(First Avenue Group)
1001-1011, 1013 and 1019-1023 First Avenue
Consideration of eligibility and covenant for Landmark TDR

Ms. Sodt introduced the applicant representative, Sally Clarke, and explained that Transfer of Development Rights is an incentive available for Downtown landmarks. She explained this is the 2nd TDR covenant brought before the Board; the first, for the Mann Building, was done in 2001 or 2002. The Code has since changed; the Board now reviews the covenant and relies on DPD to make sure the calculations are correct for the amount of rights they have to transfer. The Board received a copy of

the letter from DPD as well as a Staff Report; Karen Gordon, Ms. Sodt and the Law Department have extensively reviewed the covenant with Ms. Clarke.

Mr. Abelsen stated that in Ordinance 111058, seven buildings are within the First Avenue Group that was designated as a Landmark collection yet only three buildings are within this TDR proposal and asked why.

Ms. Sodt explained the Landmark is composed of the seven buildings that are owned by various individuals. DPD used the legal description of the buildings that are owned by this applicant to calculate the development rights for these three buildings that comprise what is now called the Alexis Hotel. It is in a single ownership; the other Landmarks within this group could also transfer their development rights but that would be under a separate covenant. This case is unusual because there are several buildings included in one landmark designation.

Mr. Veith asked about the calculations in the DPD letter versus those in the HCMP letter.

Ms. Sodt confirmed that DPD reviewed those details, which was why the certification letter was provided.

Sally Clarke agreed it was confusing because this property is thought of as the Alexis Hotel but it is actually three buildings that in City files have been known by different names. When they were designated they were part of a larger development that included the other buildings.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the agreement entitled "COVENANTS FOR LANDMARK TRANSFERABLE DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS" as submitted to the Board as the legal agreement required as a condition to the transfer of development rights from the Globe Building, the Beebe Building and the Hotel Cecil, per SMC 23.49.014D(4).

MM/SC/CH/VA 7:0:0 Motion approved.

080608.7 BOARD BRIEFING

080608.71 4801 Rainier Ave. S.
Columbia Plaza
(Columbia City Landmark District)
Preliminary briefing on the redevelopment of the Columbia Plaza site.

Rebecca Frestedt provided relevant background and context information on this development proposal. To date, there have been four project briefings before the Columbia City Review Committee (CCRC) and one briefing before a joint meeting of the ARC and CCRC. The applicant proposes to demolish the existing 1950 non-contributing building (a former Tradewell grocery store) and construct a mixed use development that will include retail at the base and live/work units and apartments on the upper stories. During past briefings, the ARC and CCRC expressed concerns regarding the scale, massing and bulk of the new construction. Committee members stated that the proposed bulk and scale is not compatible with the District. A

significant part of the Committee discussions focused on the height of the proposed development. The underlying zoning is NC3-65. Ms. Frestedt stated that the Board does not have jurisdiction over the underlying zoning, but does review the project for compatibility with the Columbia City Design Guidelines.

The applicant, Ed Weinstein from Weinstein AU, stated that they propose to remove a non-contributing building and replace it with a new mixed-use project that will revitalize this portion of Columbia City. He explained the topical issues are the architectural character along Edmunds and Rainier Streets and the character of the building fronting Columbia Park. As a mixed-use structure there is an allowable floor area ratio of 4.75. He said that each of their proposals are at a ratio of about 4.00 so they are developing about 80% of the potential that would be allowed and are not maximizing the site. The area is zone commercial 65'; Mr. Weinstein provided a map showing height allowances of the site and surrounding area. The site is at the epicenter of Columbia City and is within a quarter mile walk of all facilities at Genesee and also the light rail station on M.L. King, Jr. Way. He said that Edmonds St. will be a very active pedestrian circulation zone to link the heart of Columbia City to the light rail station. He explained the site is close transit, the Genesee Playfields, Rainier Valley Cultural Center, Library and local schools.

Mr. Weinstein cited the District Guidelines and stated there were issues that they think are topical and potentially contradictory; the substance of all their design review will go toward an interpretation of these standards and guidelines in relation to new development in the District with the replacement of a non-contributing structure. He said that this is a different application than if you are looking at an in-fill site or an addition or renovation of a building. He said continuous street walls with little or no ground level setbacks are the historical precedent. Mr. Weinstein said they understand that and are proposing to follow that exactly. He summarized the guidelines for residential development and open space. He said he agreed with the guidelines and would comply with them.

Mr. Weinstein said the Guidelines state with regard to siting, new construction shall be compatible with historic buildings in terms of the set back, orientation, spacing and distance from adjacent buildings. He stated that this is an ambiguous area. Regarding spacing, he stated that they propose to build to the street wall but they do have a discontinuity at the Bank of America corner. He said they are doing everything possible to be contiguous to the adjacent neighbors. With regard to massing and scale, the Guidelines state they must be consistent with the massing of existing historic buildings. He said "must be consistent" is a challenge for them as they are looking at one, two and occasionally three-story structures in relation to the allowable 65' height limit; he thinks it is an issue not only for them but also an issue for the other 65' and 40' height limit sites as well. He stated that the issue about harmony and consistence is very important to talk about.

Reading from the guidelines, Mr. Weinstein stated on the commercial side with regard to height, new developments exceeding the typical one to three story height of the District's historic buildings should honor the scale and massing and proportions of adjacent buildings. He said they understand the intent of that in terms of honoring but there are a lot of interpretations of what that might mean. He stated that it is clear to them that the challenge of this interpretation is the distinction between predominantly low-scale buildings that are in some cases 15' – 20' tall and then the 65' buildings.

Again, reading from the Guidelines, he said that with regard to residential development the height and width of new construction that exceeds the height and width of adjacent buildings should be designed to be compatible by breaking up the mass of the building to conform to widths of residential historic buildings in the District. He said they find the writing of that to be interesting in the sense that the design strategy that is promoted to break up the mass in relation to height is actually attempting to conform to widths of residential historic buildings in the District which they are attempting to do. Absent the presence of historic residential buildings, as he and colleague Lesley Bain explained to the ARC, their firm and the Board are making this up together. He said the issue of the scale of new development and its compatibility with existing buildings is what they are trying to achieve, but that it's a matter for interpretation.

Mr. Weinstein said it isn't their intent to design an unusual building and they hope their roof forms will be compatible. He said the street forward horizontal cornices of many of the District's buildings provide the precedent they should be looking for. Referring to the section of the guidelines that addresses solid-to-void ratios, Mr. Weinstein agreed with having a visually interesting façade that includes relief and avoids unbroken surface areas. He said they do not have any historic buildings adjacent to them, so they're looking to the other criteria for guidance. Citing the guidelines for storefronts and doors, he said that he hopes the Board sees that they're headed in the right direction. Mr. Weinstein explained the criterion to provide street level interest that enhances the pedestrian environment. He agreed with the criterion and the guidelines regarding canopies and awnings.

Mr. Weinstein stated he went through the Guidelines because although they are not at the point of presenting all the architectural elevations they think it is necessary to point out guidelines where interpretations are necessary. He also wanted to identify the guidelines that they will be fully in compliance with.

Mr. Weinstein continued to cite guidelines regarding windows and doors. He noted that the relationship of width to height of windows and doors and the placement in the façade should reflect the same relationship found on other residential and historic buildings in the district. Mr. Weinstein explained a challenge in that there are solid-to-void and window to wall ratios that are evidenced here that place a majority of that ratio toward windows and a minority toward walls.

Mr. Weinstein said the criterion that says that the relationship of width to height should be the same as the historic buildings potentially puts them in conflict with the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. He said they recognize that this is more directed toward rehabilitation rather than replacement of a non-contributing building in a landmark district. He said they also realize that each property should be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use so by that they interpret that it is a mixed use building with distinctly different architectural character for the residential component than the retail or street level commercial and they do not want to design this as a new building with a false sense of historical development. He asked for Board guidance and said the guideline was written more for renovation or adaptive reuse in terms such as "adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties". His interpretation is they should not be designing in a historicist methodology and that they should be designing a building for our time but one that should be compatible with the fabric of Columbia City and there is a lot of room for interpretation. He noted the Secretary of the Interior Standard that says, "New additions, exterior alterations or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships." He said this is not really an issue for

them since they are not adding on to or modifying an existing building, they interpret the intent of that is that they should not destroy the character of the neighborhood or the landmark district. The new work should be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with historic materials, features, size, scale, proportion and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment. In going through the Guidelines they see there is the potential for some ambiguity between the Secretary of Interior Standards and the District's Design Guidelines and they seek clarification and any input the Board can provide.

Mr. Weinstein explained they have studied the storefronts and the core of the historic district. They have taken a significantly analytical look at the fabric of the Landmark District and are prepared to talk about that but given the disconnect in scale between one to two stories and six stories, this requires a certain amount of negotiation between the designers and the Board to be able to clarify words like "honor", "respect" and "compatible".

Mr. Weinstein provided photographs and detailed urban design analysis indicating the pedestrian zone along Rainier and the enhanced pedestrian zone along Edmunds. With analysis from their traffic engineers and input from SDOT and SPD they believe the proper auto access point is on Edmunds St. They believe the predominant pedestrian entry will be off of Edmunds and this was supported by the CCRC and ARC. They will have significant retail frontage along Edmunds. He provided a solar diagram showing morning, mid-day and afternoon sun as it relates to the site and pointed out the significant views of Lake Washington to the Northeast.

Mr. Weinstein provided photos of the contributing historical in the District. He said they have found no historic multi-family housing that could serve as a precedent when considering the design of the new facility. He provided a diagram which addressed some of the Guideline issues: the retail should come up and front the street at Rainier; it should front the street on Edmunds, and it should front the right of way or open space area along Columbia Park. Because this is a mixed use multi-family project it is logical to consider the arms of the buildings to be double loaded corridors because they have the potential to create amenity at the interior which is a garden courtyard that may be publicly accessible. They believe there is public benefit to turning the building inward on itself and holding the street edges. They recognize the short term challenge until the corner is redeveloped that they would need to have some screening for their own purposes in terms of not looking at the parking lot.

In respect to width, Mr. Weinstein said they think it is necessary to start to fragment the building into the perception of discrete pieces so that it doesn't look like a run-on building. He recognized that the success or outcome of that is in the eye of the beholder but one of the strategies that they are considering is trying to affect large notches in the building that have significant transparency and use those for entry zones either into the building or into the courtyard so that from a pedestrian point of view the building is fragmented and potentially can be developed in an incremental way. He said they have shown some alternate configurations although they look relatively close to one another.

Mr. Weinstein explained that the Hasegawa Clinic has always had access across the site and the owners/applicants have sold a portion of the property to Hasegawa for parking and this provides a view corridor through to the park from Rainier; although it is a parking lot and they can't say they are promoting pedestrian circulation, he said they are promoting transparency.

Mr. Weinstein summarized that they are trying to hold the edge at Rainier, Edmunds and the park and connect these with a face to the building that would orient to the north. He said there is significant public benefit to having limited public access to the courtyard. He said the courtyard would not be open throughout the night for security reasons but would be open during normal daytime hours and pedestrians could circulate through the courtyards.

Mr. Weinstein said that all the building elements fit within the 65' height limit. With regard to the mitigation of the height he referred back to the Guidelines about widths of elements mitigating height; referring to schemes presented to the Board he said this is showing an attitude about the massing of fragmenting it into the perception of individual buildings albeit they may be connected deep and in a transparent mode.

Mr. Weinstein explained their strategy for mitigating the mass which they think is in more appropriate, more interested and more in compliance with the Guidelines than extensive setbacks. They are looking to develop the Edmunds Building, circulation gasket, a corner building with a restaurant that is below it, a park building in the middle that would have a different architectural character from the two end buildings; a middle building they refer to as the "North Building", and the Rainier Building. He explained that when he says "building" he doesn't literally mean they are disconnected; in order to do a high quality building with reasonable materials, they have to affect certain economies of construction. He said they have a definite incentive and he thinks the community has an incentive for them to make an efficient building and then pattern it correctly and use good materials; he said the way to do that is to have efficient circulation strategy through the building but make it appear to be multiple buildings.

Referencing a site plan, Mr. Weinstein discussed on both Rainier and Edmunds Streets they intend to have an active streetscape and storefront system with all the elements the Guidelines aspire to in terms of marquees and awnings, some with operable storefronts that open up. In discussions with the ARC and the community at large they have located a restaurant at the southwest corner so it can activate the corner and have eyes on the park. It has a solar exposure and they propose a terrace to the west. He reiterated the potential to have limited public access through the plaza so it becomes another public place in Columbia City. He said they are activating the edge of Columbia Park with a muse type sidewalk and small patios along the face of the apartments and townhouses that would have vegetated screening at a low level, not fences.

Mr. Weinstein said they will develop a pronounced base and will have an easily interpreted middle or shaft of the building and a defined top with the units in the cornice line or some type of feature at the top of the building so they will be both vertically stratified in terms of the façade and they will have broken it up with purposeful modulation. He said there are existing curb cuts to the north to the Hasegawa parking lots; however they are proposing to develop one curb cut (he pointed to the drawing) and eliminating one.

Mr. Weinstein provided section drawings of various parts of the building. The southwest corner where the restaurant would go, there is potential for an operable window wall to have the interior spill out to the street and further presented the vertical character along the commercial portion along the western side. In the middle of the building where there are two-story townhouses, they have located the townhouses to be in use compatible with the single family houses that are opposite on the west side of Columbia Park; they will have small patios and have a vegetative

screening. Further to the north are some small flats that have similar device; all along the edge of Columbia Park they will provide activation and eyes on the park.

Mr. Weinstein described the commercial section on Rainier and Edmunds Streets, there are pronounced retail base in terms of its façade treatment and in terms of its transparency with a marquee. He suggested the character of the building will be defined by the nature of its openings and the skin of the building. They think it appropriate to animate in certain places with bay windows and think that is consistent with the Landmark District and they would like Board feedback.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked how tall the townhouse units are on the park side.

Mr. Weinstein responded 19' floor-to-floor.

Mr. Veith clarified they are more like double height units.

Mr. Weinstein stated that there is a two story living space and a loft bedroom above with kitchen below.

Mr. Veith stated he usually doesn't think of stories being added above a townhouse.

Mr. Weinstein said it is a popular feature; in Vancouver, Canada, you address the commercial scale of the base with a town house and then stack other units on top; it is ubiquitous in Vancouver and it is always used as a model. To be able to animate the pedestrian zone with eyes on the street with a sense of ownership and access and then have flats that are served by an interior corridor. It would probably all be rental property; they are trying to provide for a different housing type to promote diversity within the structure.

Mr. Lee stated that ARC saw different elevations and asked if those would be shown.

Mr. Weinstein replied no and that in talking with Ms. Gordon and Ms. Frestedt they thought it best to focus on basic principles and then come back.

Mr. Lee expressed concern about the "townhouse" being used as it is not what one thinks of as a townhouse.

Mr. Weinstein said this is a good urban strategy to be able to put residential units at grade with mediating open space that is a semi-private zone between the more public sidewalk and the private unit. There are many current examples of this; it is being promoted around Seattle as the effective strategy for live/work so you don't just walk by and have a window where you have your blinds drawn but you separate it by a little bit of grade separation and some landscaping. The most important thing is that it changes the scale at the street and allows the continuation of that datum that up at Edmunds would be the floor to floor for retail.

Mr. Lee noted Mr. Weinstein's great emphasis on his design, but reminded him that ARC asked for alternate studies where there's more density of the site so you wouldn't have to have full height on the front. He would like to see options studied, massing models, even if they are sketches that show a number of issues have been studied and this is the best solution for the site; he asked if Mr. Weinstein had done that.

Mr. Weinstein stated they are incrementalists in trying to figure out the right solution and believe it is appropriate to hold the edge of Rainier; he stated the Guidelines seem to indicate that. Referring to a drawing, he pointed out areas that could potentially be double loaded corridors so they can create reasonable housing units. He said it could be denser in the middle but it becomes dysfunctional from a housing perspective because units get very deep. He said the art of configuring housing is to be able to create reasonable housing units in relation to a corridor. Just putting an element in the middle to relieve some of the height on the perimeter doesn't do any good because it impacts all the units around it. He said from their perspective of trying to provide a higher quality environment they believe density should be distributed between an exterior orientation and interior orientation. He said they are happy to show diagrams where 20% of the distributed density is consolidated in the middle and he said all it does is it winds up impacting the character of the interior. He said they like the courtyard space because it is a significant open space that will promote the higher quality and more stable residential environment because you actually have this captive amenity that is being shared with the public. He said this could be argued a lot of different ways but if it is the mood of the Board that it would like to see other diagrams to show similar density distributed in different ways they are happy to do so.

Mr. Abelsen stated that when ARC looked at this they noted that the site plan is somewhat disingenuous in that when looking at the upper floors there are no longer spaced apart, they are tight together. It is really perceived as a single building. The Board is trying to address applicant concerns because if there is a clear disconnect between what the City is allowing for zoning and what this Historic District is. With regard to the plaza, an easy move would be to move the center box over into the plaza and now you would have a u-shaped plan that now relates to the park and is more specific to the use of the park. By doing so, it changes the dynamic and applicant wouldn't need to put in a plaza because you would already have one in a large greenspace.

Mr. Weinstein responded that it would place a building in the middle that thwarts the views and light and air for half the facility. They could move it back and it would provide a notch/additional open space but they think they should hold the edge consistent with the Guidelines; that we have an amenity to the west, a 140' separation and that open space is more valuable to them and to the community by creating this internal space. He said it is arguable but what cannot be argued is the impact on the development to really negatively impact all the other units.

Mr. Abelsen stated the Board's purview is less concerned about what you develop on your site as what the impact would be to the historic district. He noted that the project is in the epicenter of this historic district. He said the Board understands the difficulty in trying to adapt a building that is far outscaled and outmassed of any building that is within a mile let alone within the historic district. The Board would want him to study is what are the various studies the applicant can do on the street edge of Rainier and perhaps Edmunds; there will be a massive building no matter what and it is more a matter of respect to the existing neighborhood, the individuals and/or entities that are there now and the respect of the Historic District itself along the Rainier Avenue corridor. Pushing out a six story structure right up to those edges countermands that.

Mr. Weinstein stated they would look at those and will also comment in relation to the guidelines. He indicated one of the guidelines is to hold the edge and to bring it

out to the property line on Columbia Park. It doesn't say that would be appropriate for three stories or four stories or six, it just says "come out to the property line" which we've done. He said they will look at how what they've done tests against the Standards. What makes him nervous, he said is how they test against the subjective components like "honor" and "respect" and "compatible". He said we all may have different interpretations of that; we know it when we see it and it is hard to articulate or describe. He acknowledged that it is uncharted territory and they are happy for the feedback. There is a subtext to this that is important to consider, he said as he read from the Secretary of Interior Guidelines, it is important that the building be of our time but be respectful and honor the District. He said what's in Columbia City's interest to have this building be the best possible building it can be which means to have the best materials, the best composition and that is important for what they are attempting to do is to build rationally so that we can afford better materials. He doesn't know if that has any influence over this Board but it is significant in terms of the amount this building has to get denser in the middle; getting denser in the middle on a housing block is not beneficial to construction or to the value of the units. Just making a building denser in the middle to relieve the height on the perimeter is not necessarily the best response.

Mr. Veith said instead of the Board telling the applicant what to do with the additional density and instead of the applicant coming back with a bunch of diagrams that are intended to prove that this is the only thing that is going to work, he would like to see other ways of doing the edges. He told applicant to come up with the best building they can with two or three different approaches to the edges; at least one of them has to be that the yellow section on Rainier and the two sections on Edmunds, what happens if those are limited to two stories or three stories and find another way of taking care of that density. He didn't know where the applicant would put it but he is not convinced there is only one way to do it.

Mr. Weinstein said they would be happy to do that.

Mr. Veith asked the applicant to try to convince himself to find a way that it will work. He understood the plaza is a good thing in this particular approach because it opens up more wall on the interior of the building to views but he doesn't want to be oversold on the idea of the plaza being a new public amenity because it is private property and is restrictable. If the applicant were willing to have a covenant on it that would make it forever accessible by the public that might be one thing but we've had this discussion in Seattle for years, the most prominent example is the Westlake Mall development, is property that is owned by somebody – and they can restrict – is that really a public amenity. Mr. Veith said he didn't think that the trade off should be that the applicants will provide a public space which really isn't a public space and cannot even be guaranteed to be a public space. He said he wants to get away from that discussion; he understands it might be an amenity but there is no guarantee because the developer of the building could sell it in three years, ten years and then put up gates. He didn't like the idea of the applicant providing access through their property to go to the park; he doesn't like having to go through private property to access a public park. The park has plenty of public access.

Mr. Weinstein appreciated Mr. Veith's concern but stated it was in response to members of the community specifically requesting this and asking them to research the unique history of the use and circulation of alleys in Columbia City. This was not something that the applicant came up with; for all the management issues that have been address this is something that was done in response what they felt was the tone of the community. He said they also recognize that if it is going to be successful as

an open space it has to be privately maintained; there are many examples of that with covenants as necessary. A space can be made secure and can be maintained; increasingly in cities there is a recognition that a privately management open space is not a bad thing because it is maintained.

Mr. Veith stated we shouldn't be trading a "maybe amenity" for the character of the District which has been revitalized specifically because there has been an historic district there for a number of years.

Mr. Weinstein stated they would be happy to come up with alternative diagrams that show different ways to organize and will try not to burden them with being so bad it would prove the wisdom of this.

Mr. Matthews stated a plaza that looks nice on a plan, when it is surrounded on three sides by six-story buildings may not be so appealing in reality. He is dismayed by this project because Columbia City has a small town scale; it is a small town that is now part of Seattle. The minute you put a structure monolithically six-stories high, though with a bite out of it from one side, it has reached urban scale as opposed to small town scale.

Mr. Weinstein appreciated the comment and said it is a classic conundrum in that they know fully well what Columbia City is but they also know that the City has in their wisdom, because of transit-oriented development and urban neighborhoods, has zoned it NC3-65 with the intention of providing 25% more than what we are providing. He asked how to reconcile that conundrum where growth is projected and there is pressure on the neighborhoods and there are precious few neighborhoods that have been designated with this zoning. He said someone in the mapping, whether the Planning Commission or DCLU, determined that this was an ideal location for this kind of density. He said what we have is one set of values that are potentially in conflict with another and what we are trying to do is to mediate between the two. He said this may not be the solution but he knows that the conundrum is there and any development that occurs, every available piece of property will have development pressure and the area will be transformed. The issue is not one of "will it be transformed" but "how is it transformed".

Mr. Lee said this is a successful part of the City because it is an Historic District; members of the community come here and try reinforce what we do to protect the character of this District. He said all the Board has to see is a building or set of buildings that respect this District. The owner of the property knows this is in the middle of an Historic District and it is not a surprise; it is not like we just made it a landmark. It is a landmark District and so we are protecting the look of this District; that is our role by the City Council. The City said you can build to 65' here; but you're not required to build 65'. There has to be a reasonable compromise whereby the owner gets a reasonable return and we get a reasonable project that respects this District.

Mr. Weinstein stated he didn't disagree.

Mr. Lee continued that the Board deals with this all the time with additions to historic buildings and have entertained very contemporary solutions. The Board is not opposed to conversation in a contemporary way but we want to see due diligence and rigorous design exploration of what can be achieved. He would like to see at ARC, rough sketches, not totally developed projects, to see explanations of why this is the

only solution. Right now this does not comply with the guidelines in the sense the street facades are in conflict and not compatible with the existing district.

Mr. Weinstein said they are vertically stratifying, they are establishing a pronounced retail base and holding the street edge; he asked what aspect are they not in compliance with their street fronts.

Mr. Lee stated he didn't think the others have seen the previous models of what the applicant is proposing for the building because when looking at this plan he thought at first it was separate buildings but then saw the bulk and it is one building. It is an incredible challenge to pull this off to make it feasible to develop this site with the conflict the applicant has talked about. It is a conflict between the Guidelines and the zoning and that all have to work together to get it to work. It is the six-story wall along the park that in no way looks like townhouses or in no way looks like what is across the other side of the park.

Mr. Abelsen said it is pretty clear the applicant understands; he would like the applicant to explore in a specific sense is not so much about bays because that is something that can be applied and introduced as an element but more a matter of not only vertical stratification but horizontal stratification. He wants to see studies that explore how the applicant can play with elevations around the whole site. He said that exploration will help to inform the applicant; bring that back to ARC and/or CCRC to see where those studies might lead because there is always that germ of opportunity.

Mr. Weinstein replied he is happy to do so.

Dana Behar, of Hal Real Estate Investments (property owner), stated this was meant to be a briefing to bring up some of these issues and get feedback more than to discuss specifics of the development. They wanted to get at some of the issues which are difficult because they seem to be in conflict. Their objective has been to design the very best building they can within the District according to the Guidelines it provides the density the site was meant to accommodate.

Mr. Veith said holding out to the property line at least in the first two or three stories is probably exactly what we want, as that is the pattern in the District. In terms of the character of your detailing and a range from mildly to starkly modern, contemporary usage is fine. He said it is more an issue with the massing at the street. The applicant could play with a couple different ways of doing the edges; he agreed with Mr. Lee that without sitting down and sketching it out in different ways, there is no way to get there.

Mr. Weinstein said what he is hearing is the Board would like them to come back with a primary massing diagrams that are different from this that show different strategies for the perimeter and different strategies for the interior that may involve stepping or some other kind of vertical setbacks. He said he feels compelled to come back and explain what that means in terms of the building organization because it is not in the Board's interest or in Columbia City's interest to say that is the shape we want and have it be a dysfunctional plan because there are fundamental rules about multi-family housing in terms of depths and widths and locations of corridors. He is comfortable with coming back with many of these but also feel it is incumbent on the Landmarks Board to also understand there are certain conventions about organizing housing that have to be paid attention and wants to present that.

Mr. Behar showed the zoning map slide again and mentioned the anticipated growth of another 1.7 million people in the region over the next 20 years. He said there is going to be pressure to try to accommodate growth in transit-oriented locations like this next to a light rail stop. He pointed out land zones NC65 and NC40 and stated the non-historic buildings would likely be redeveloped. He said it is unrealistic to think that Columbia City can be preserved like a museum piece or snapshot in time; there is going to be more growth. They are trying to do the best they can in terms of honoring the District and honoring the Design Guidelines and to provide the density that is ultimately is going to go in there. They would like to provide a pattern for the other developments that will come over the next 20 years.

Mr. Abelsen stated the Board recognized that and that is why they are talking about this; it is a threshold discussion. The Board wants to encourage the applicant to first look at the District and build towards your goals as opposed to set your goals and then try to find a way to work with the District; it is counterproductive.

Mr. Behar stated this is the product of about \$300,000 of work; they need to step back and show the Board all the different possibilities that have been looked at and thinks that will be valuable.

Mr. Lee asked attending members of the CCRC if they had seen a lot of different schemes and if there has been a progression.

CCRC member Ann Beeman stated the CCRC has seen some fairly detailed elevations but didn't feel there was much choice in the massing of the project.

Mr. Lee cited a project that came before ARC eleven times; they used form core models and didn't spend \$300,000 to get to that point. He used very simple studies. It is relevant to this discussion to see a progression from an idea to a finished solution.

CCRC member Pete Lamb explained the CCRC had seen some variations. They would like to see a little more proportion and style of the base, cornice etc. He said there have been four or five things that the committee has asked to see and the applicants have done a lot of work and come back with revisions. There are two areas where they have not come back with variations: reducing from six stories anywhere within the site – particularly along the park and on Edmunds; and the central plaza which is not something the CCRC asked for.

CCRC member Gary Oppenheimer added that there was discussion about developing alleys and access that came off of Rainier that leads into the plaza. He expressed concern about the scale on Edmunds St. and said this has been repeated several times.

Public Comment:

Community member Scott Ringgold supported much of what has been said by the Board and that the issue of massing is pertinent. Efforts along Edmunds to relocate the Farmers Market were key, the question of vehicular access on Edmunds and its affect on the ability to bring the Farmers Market to the street were very important. He stated he is disappointed with the outcome. It is important to realize in the district every block in the historic core has a network of alleys; maintaining that style of permeability creates the interesting opportunity for access and people in the District have developed the alleys in interesting, innovative ways so they function as alleys but also as places that non-service users would also go. The permeability through to

the park with an alley would be ideal because it potentially breaks down the scale as it presents to the park.

Ms. Frestedt clarified that there is not currently an alley on that block.

Mr. Ringold noted this is a large site, unlike others in the core.

Community member Mary Alice Pomputious said it sounds like the buildings meet overhead so they turn less into charming alleyways and more into scary dark places. She wondered if there was a way of lowering the height by turning the whole site into an Oxford-esque courtyards.

Mr. Weinstein said their proposed courtyard is about 100' x 100' and is a significant open space accessed by going underneath elements of the building.

Ms. Pomputious clarified she was talking about more and smaller courtyards to the units get more light and more exposure but you aren't saddled with this enormous plaza that may not actually be useful. She said perhaps they could lower the height to four stories rather than six stories by using more ground space.

Mr. Weinstein repeated that the plaza is about 100' x 100' but at the edge of each of its arms there are smaller, more private courtyards that mediate between the public space and the unit. They think that is appropriate to provide units at that level with some degree of security and privacy. The shape has been specifically configured to promote light to all the units; as we lower and spread it out, the plaza gets smaller and darker and you lose light to the units. They set the building back to have a little bit of differentiation but the courtyard provides views and light the units. They thought it was a quiet open space that has a decidedly different character than Columbia Park but also is part of the realm of the public open space network with the alleys. Two earlier speakers have acknowledged that it has been part of the discussion. He said the design team was strongly encouraged to think about the mid-block penetrations and access from Rainier through the site to Columbia Park. If the Landmarks Board believes that is not viable then they would like the Board to tell them that because they are just responding at some length and complexity to what they heard in the community.

Ms. Sodt stated that the corner lot is owned separately and that a development could be eventually built there.

Mr. Weinstein agreed and said it is owned by the Bank of America. He said that something will be built there in strong likelihood and his suspicion is this is going to be a broken L-shaped building because it is the width of a double loaded corridor building and he suspects this building will be built out to the street wall and turned in on an open space. He didn't know if the two open spaces will merge with one another but it is possible.

Mr. Behar said they are sensitive about the location of the Farmers Market. They have been spending a lot of time and money to design and seek approval for a new location for the Farmers Market on Edmunds Street which would be closed off for Farmers Market days.

Mr. Matthews said the applicant had talked about the time spent on all this and how to create interaction between the lower two stories and the spaces around the building. But it remains an almost monolithic, six-story building and however much

time the applicant has spent looking at streetscapes of Columbia City just doesn't seem to have had much influence on the building.

Mr. Weinstein understood and added that they have done everything they can to analyze and record what is there; they understand Columbia City. They have the zoning envelope that promotes density. He summarized that they have attempted, and the Board may disagree with the success of the outcome, to erode the mass, to hold the edges as the Design Guidelines proscribe and try to fragment using the notches in such a way that we have mitigated the mass of the building according the Guidelines. He said the problem is that we have values in conflict; they have a building that is 80% of what is allowable but it is six stories and it will always be in conflict with today's historic scale of Columbia City. They have been attempting to mitigate it and it may not be sufficient mitigation from your point of view but it needs to be acknowledged that the classic conundrum here is the fact that we have a zoning envelope and a comprehensive plan that promotes 375 – 380 units on this site surrounded by a fabric of historic buildings that are only two stories. They acknowledge that and came to the Board to present the problem and he doesn't know how to reconcile the two. They are trying to craft elevations of a building that utilize the Boards recommendations to try to mitigate the scale of it. Just setting back the upper four floors ten feet from the façade is not going to do it. There are a number of really bad buildings that follow that approach and all they look like is a big housing project that landed from the air on another building. They want to go back and do some of the massing studies requested by the Board but if they look at the fabric of good apartment buildings on Queen Anne and Capital Hill, they are no different from this.

Mr. Lee stated this is an historic district and not another part of town and that is the conundrum. Mr. Weinstein had mentioned "your Guidelines" numerous times and they are not our Guidelines; they are part of the Land Use Code and are no different from other Lane Use Code issue. They are the same Guidelines the Board has to refer to when they review projects. He reiterated that the guidelines are not the Board's Guidelines but everyone's Guidelines.

Mr. Weinstein said there are specific design Guidelines for the Landmark District regarding the compatibility with the historic fabric and believes they are at odds fundamentally with the Zoning Code in terms of the height and the density of the project. He said it is a conundrum and is bigger than the applicant and the Board and they may be the test mule for the reconciliation for the values that are in conflict. He said he didn't think they had the ultimate solution yet but as struggling through this and trying to do a good building that at some core level is configured as housing is meant to be configured that has some measure of economic construction and other design Guidelines it is confusing how to try to make a six story building look like at two-story building. If they had come in with a three-story building in a configuration like this you may not have had much heartburn but they would have been developing at 40% of the allowable density which would not have been an economic proposition for any developer.

Mr. Behar said they have tried to do their best on this project but they continue to struggle with the Guidelines and criteria that are in conflict with each other and the process in the sense they have been through the CCRC, ARC and the Board and have received a variety of input some of which is in conflict with other input. They want to get some resolution and collective buy-in as to how to resolve the issues.

Mr. Lee recommended coming back to the joint ARC with some ideas about alternative massing to continue the dialog.

Mr. Weinstein said they are happy to come back.

080608.8 BOARD BUSINESS

Ms. Chave advised the Board that a tour of the Dr. Annie Russell house is being planned

080608.9 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator