



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 262/10

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
Seattle Municipal Tower
700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor
Room 4060
Wednesday, July 21, 2010 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Vernon Abelsen, Chair
Jerry Finrow
Christine Howard
Patrick King
Aaron Luoma
Steve Savage
Marie Strong
Tom Veith, Vice Chair
Elaine Wine
Meredith Wirsching

Staff

Elizabeth Chave
Sarah Sodt
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Mark Hannum

Chair Vernon Abelsen called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

072110.1 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

Public Disclosure/Disclaimer Statement

Consistent with the Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, all records within the possession of the City may be subject to a public disclosure request and may be distributed or copied. Records include and are not limited to sign-in sheets, contracts, emails, notes, correspondence, etc. Use of lists of individuals or directory information (including address, phone or E-mail) may not be used for commercial purposes.

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

072110.11 Parker-Fersen House
1409 E. Prospect St.
Proposed kitchen/pantry alterations

Ms. Chave provided an overview of the project noting that this was just part of a larger project. She explained that this property was designated in the 1980s and that the controls include the butler pantry and other interior features.

Mr. Finrow arrived at 3:34 p.m.

Marvin Anderson, project architect, provided context of the butler's pantry to the kitchen.

Ms. Howard arrived at 3:35 p.m.

Mr. Anderson pointed out walls that had been removed – with neither permits nor review by the Landmarks Board – by a previous owner. He said the chase on the west wall had been enlarged.

Mr. Veith arrived at 3:37 p.m.

Mr. Anderson went over modifications that had been made to what remained of the butler's pantry cabinets as well as changes made to the kitchen – new counter tops, floor, and lighting. He said the new owners want to remove what remains of the butler's pantry in order to make the kitchen larger and more usable for their family. He went over the planned changes and noted they would pick up on original detailing. He said they propose to install a leaded glass window on the south elevation that will not be visible from the street or neighbors. He said a larger island is desired.

Responding to clarifying question about the designation, Ms. Chave explained that it was an early designation from the early 1980s and that it is probably the only house to have a pantry designated.

Responding to Board member questions, Mr. Anderson noted that nine rooms were listed in the Designation and that the butler's pantry had not been described in the nomination. He said that the original u-shape configuration and only 50% of the cabinets remain. He said that the ceiling plane will not change and that the new window will not align with anything – it is lower than others. He pointed out it will be the only window on this elevation.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Abelsen said that it is unusual to designate a butler's pantry, particularly as the only interior feature, and noted that little remains of the original cabinetry.

Ms. Wirsching commented that modifications had been made over time and because of that the case work was not significant. She said that because it was designated there should be some indication of where it was and asked if there was a way to do that. She said she was not concerned about the new window.

Ms. Wine expressed concern that since the butler's pantry had been designated, she was conflicted about the changes. She asked if there could be left some semblance of what that space was. She said she had no problem with the new window as proposed.

Mr. Luoma noted the value of leaving something that would recognize that the pantry had been there. He said he had no problem with the window.

Ms. Howard noted the importance of honoring what was designated and balancing that with making sure the kitchen is usable, vital and maintains the value of the house.

Mr. Finrow regarding the public-service minded owners who are restoring the house. He said that if one looks at the whole picture the changes should be allowed in order to serve their needs. He said they are making a substantial investment in the maintenance of the house and he urged support for the application.

Mr. Abelsen noted the general consensus of the Board on the proposed new window and a "mixed bag" reaction regarding proposed changes to the butler's pantry. He agreed with Mr. Finrow's comments and suggested photo documentation of the pantry elevations be submitted for the City's file.

Ms. Wirsching expressed concern about precedent-setting but noted the unusual situation of designating a portion of the house that is normally not designated.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed alterations to the butler's pantry, and installation of a leaded glass window on the south elevation, for the Parker-Fersen House at 1409 East Prospect Street, as per the application submittal, with the condition that the butler's pantry cabinets be photo documented for the file for future reference. This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed work does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 113423 because the proposed alterations do not significantly alter historic materials that characterize the property, and are

compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features of the property, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.

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

MM/SC/JF/S 8:2:0 Motion carried. Mr. Luoma and Ms. Wine opposed.

072110.12 McGraw Square
5th Avenue and Westlake Avenue
Proposed site alterations

Ms. Sodt passed out drawings for board review.

Casey Hildreth, SDOT, explained the intent to make the area into a transportation hub and to close the Westlake roadway between Olive St. and Stewart St. to create a pedestrian and bicycle friendly plaza. He went over proposed changes to the park which includes the 1913 statue, landscaping and a retaining wall that acts as seating. He said they propose to alter the surface treatments and incorporate it into the integrated design of the larger area. The pines are proposed to be removed with replacement two for one within the project area. He explained they proposed to replace the retaining wall with an ADA accessible plinth and curvilinear stairs for better access. He said the project will bring greater attention to the statue which will be integrated into the larger plaza. He noted the non-traditional grid arrangement of the street in the area. He said they propose to replace the benches with seat walls: the base from the ground plane will be a light gray concrete with a darker colored cap to the seat wall with integrated lighting that will provide a wash lighting effect and flush, in-pavement lighting will provide up-lighting for the statue. He said that they have worked to keep the integrity of the circle enhancing the focus on the statue and the circular geometry by pushing out landscaping elements and that replacement trees will be placed symmetrically around the statue to frame it.

Ms. Sodt explained that Mr. Hildreth had modified the drawing to have two handrails instead of one per ARC suggestions.

Ms. Wirsching asked to what the proposed paving pattern relates.

Mr. Hildreth said that because of the many street grids merging in this area they picked up the 2 x 2 scoring pattern on 5th Avenue and Stewart Street which would provide some consistency. He said the Westlake orientation of the scoring pattern will remain so there will be visual cues of Westlake continuing through the plaza. He said that within the circle the scoring pattern will be oriented based on the statue and that they took cues from the 1919 Olmsted Plan

that was never implemented. He said in this area they moved to a 4 x 4 scoring pattern because there are inlaid light tile elements.

Mr. Finrow asked for clarification on the replacement trees.

Mr. Hildreth said the trees had not been finalized yet but that Black Maple or something similar was an option.

Mr. Finrow said that the replacement trees should be large caliper trees – 20’ – 30’ tall – and hoped that they would have some presence right away rather than waiting for twenty years. He said he knew it was more expensive and more involved but strongly urged SDOT that large caliper high quality trees be used. He said it is part of a historic preservation issue in this project. He said the size and presence of the trees right from the beginning are very important to restoring the historic value of the open space. He said he would follow up on it and suggested it be added as a recommendation.

Ms. Sodt advised that where the future trees are to be located is outside of the designated area but that the board can encourage SDOT to use large caliper trees but can't require it.

Mr. Finrow urged Mr. Hildreth to make sure that the large caliper trees are part of the redesign of the square.

Mr. Hildreth appreciated Mr. Finrow's comments and said that approach to landscaping fits their goals for this project. He said that the existing tree pits are larger than typical standard so within a confined heavily pedestrianized area they are planning room for healthy growth of these trees.

Ms. Sodt noted the value of having the recommendation in the minutes. Responding to clarifying questions Ms. Sodt explained that Mr. Hildreth identified the designated area and said that it is the official park property on the existing conditions.

Mr. Hildreth said that he also provided the perimeter of the designated area and that the features don't match up with the Parks parcel. He said that some elements are in the right of way.

She said that the new proposed trees in the right-of-way are outside the designated area.

Mr. Abelsen stated that the new pavers in the perimeter circle - because they enter into designated area - would be under board purview.

Ms. Sodt agreed and said that it is one design, and what has affected the designated features is in Board purview.

There was confusion about the drawings and it was noted that the construction level drawings are correct with the exception of the last sheet. Ms. Sodt said that the correct sets are the stapled ones that she provided to Board members.

Mr. Luoma asked what measures had been taken to deal with skateboard use on the railings, seat walls, and statue.

Mr. Hildreth said they brought back the street wall elements – which are quite high - and they will add the L-shaped anti-skate block.

Mr. Luoma noted that he didn't see that noted in the drawings.

Ms. Howard asked about concrete color and Mr. Hildreth explained that there will be two color concrete throughout: all walking surfaces will be a consistent light gray and the prefabricated cap will be a darker contrast.

Responding to clarifying questions Mr. Hildreth said there will be two symmetrical seat walls about the statue and rain garden; he pointed out where the site slopes noting there will be a consistent minimum and that the interior at the rain garden will be lower. The perimeter curve around the rain garden will be a solid 6" curve with a 2-3" slit at various locations. He said that 80% of the plaza will drain into the rain garden.

Mr. Luoma said he agreed with Mr. Finrow that although the trees on the perimeter are outside the landmarked area the specimen trees in the plaza are more focused on the terminus of the trolley car and that the four trees around the statue are shown as smaller. He said it would be nice to enhance the symmetrical quality of focusing on the statue with all four perimeter trees being the same species and a larger caliper.

Mr. Hildreth said that all trees will be the same and added that they will have to be limited in size because of bus traffic.

Mr. Luoma explained that trees can be limbed up.

Public Comment:

Char Eggleston, Queen Anne Historical Society, said this was one of her favorite places and she asked that the board make sure to protect what is there. She asked that the history of the site be protected and that no skateboarding be allowed.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wirsching said there was significant discussion at ARC and the many modifications would emphasize the statue better than it is emphasized now. She urged caution about the large number of paving patterns and to not create a crazy array of patterns.

Mr. Finrow said it is better than it was. He commented that the steps would provide seating but noted that the stem wall was small. He said that the intent of the space when Victor Steinbrueck put it on the list was related to making space for people and observed that the design is not too generous for people space.

Ms. Wine agreed and added that ARC encouraged more furniture and said that there may be plans for more in the future.

Mr. Luoma agreed with Ms. Wirsching and said it has come a long way and does a better job of emphasizing the statue and making it about McGraw Square rather than just the terminus of the trolley and the multi-modal transportation hub that it is.

Mr. Abelsen agreed and said that he agreed with comments made by Messrs. Finrow and Luoma about the trees. He said that the trees are outside the designated area and noted Board review is an adjacency issue; the Board could make a recommendation for improvement in the motion. He said the design is an improvement and does recognize and save McGraw Square as much as possible and the proposed trees frame the statue nicely.

Mr. Finrow reiterated his encouragement to SDOT to make the trees as large a caliper as possible.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed site alterations for McGraw Square, per the application submittal (insert date of construction drawings) with the recommendation that the four street trees on 5th Avenue and on Stewart be of as large a caliper as possible.

This action is based on the following:

2. The proposed site alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. **112271** as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and are compatible with the massing, size and scale of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
3. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/TV/CH 10:0:0 Motion carried.

072110.13 Wallingford Center
1815 N. 45th
Proposed signage for Yazdi

Ms. Chave explained that the applicants asked to have this application pulled from this agenda.

072110.14 Paramount Theater
901 Pine Street
Proposed signage

Jim Risher, Tom Bonn, Ken Naasz, Sign Factory, and David Allen from the Seattle Theater Group presented the application.

Mr. Risher brought a timeline of the marquee showing changes over time and pointed out the new box office canopy.

Mr. Bonn said the intent was to emulate the look and feel of the existing sign with graphite element and that the flourishes were to carry through the look to tie the whole sign package together.

Mr. Allen said the box office change in 1995 took the old one out and put in a new one on 9th.

Mr. Finrow asked the applicant to talk about the significance of the graphics on the cover and that it seems like a larger marquee and seems too important.

Mr. Bonn said they emulated the design intent of when the original marquee was designed; they added more flourishes to pick up that theme.

Mr. Allen said that when the theater is closed people have trouble finding the box office and this will bring attention to where it is. He said the lighting will be a combination of LED and high-tech electronic ballast.

Mr. Naasz said the lights will be steady burn and there will be neon on the edges. He said there is neon on the front sign as well.

Mr. Finrow said it was overwrought but understood the applicants' concern about people not being able to find the box office.

Ms. Wine noted that it was part of their branding element and asked if it would be used for some other form of marketing for the Seattle Theater Group.

Mr. Allen said they are trying to tie the corner together and noted a similar look at other Paramount theaters.

Ms. Wine asked why they chose the scroll treatment.

Mr. Bonn said that they were picking up elements from both signs.

Mr. Veith asked to what the new elements would be attached.

Mr. Bonn said the new elements would attach to the canopy.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wirsching commented that it was helpful to see the historic photos. She said that ARC had been concerned about matching historic elements. She said that seeing that the marquee has changed and that they are trying to match an element that has been modified over time, she was less concerned about the detail on the signage.

Ms. Wine said the scrolls were overdone but not so much that she would vote against it. She said it ties into the theme and look around the building.

Mr. Veith said that it is not damaging to the historic fabric, it attached to the canopy and is easily removable and matches the non-original sign. He said it was acceptable.

Mr. Abelsen said that ARC members brought up false historicism as an issue, and that the applicant did the right thing by bringing in the history of the marquee. He said the scale of the proposed canopy is relatively small relative to the building's west elevation. He said the proposal is reasonable and can be removed in the future without impact to the historic building.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed alterations to the box office marquee, for the Paramount Theater at 901 Pine Street, per the application submittal.

This action is based on the following:

4. The proposed alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. **117507** as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and are compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.

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

MM/SC/MW/CH 9:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Savage recused himself.

072110.2 DESIGNATION

072110.21 Pacific Science Center
200 2nd Ave. N.

Bryce Seidl, President and CEO of the Pacific Science Center (PSC), introduced David Peterson, Nicholson Kovalchick, who would present the report (full report is available in DON file). He said that since the nomination they have done additional research and Mr. Peterson will provide information on historic figures associated with the Pacific Science Center.

Mr. Peterson pointed out that additional photographs had been added since the nomination meeting and he thanked Shannon Nicholson and Neal Erickson who provided additional historic photos. He said he would explain the interior and exterior structure “tectonics”.

Mr. Peterson said the Pacific Science Center was originally called the United States Science Pavilion at the 1962 World’s Fair, and it was considered to be the most important building in the fair. He provided context of the site and clarified that the garage on the corner is not part of the site. The architect was Minoru Yamasaki & Associates, and the structural engineer was John Christensen. The buildings were constructed of pre-cast concrete and he said that Yamasaki incorporated Gothic arch design into the repeating elements. He said that the pieces were erected by cranes very quickly.

Mr. Peterson explained that there was a specific route into and through the complex and Building 1 (originally Building 5) is where people entered and they queued up in a high covered porch. He said the perimeter elevations were more utilitarian. He said that on the second floor in the Eames Theater visitors watched a film on the curved soffited wall designed by Charles and Ray Eames. He said the soffited curved oval wall and the original “shell” remain but noted the new screens, new seating, and the gridded wall surface that has been applied on top of the original wall surface. He said that the first floor houses offices and has seen few alterations. He said the buildings were essentially concrete warehouses with exhibits inside.

Mr. Peterson explained “tectonics” which refers to the way structure is expressed on a building and went on to explain that this kind of architecture with its precast members is so simple and clear in how each wall member supports the ceiling above.

Mr. Peterson reiterated that one can see how the buildings were made and noted they were created to house exhibits. In Building 4 (originally Building 2) he pointed out that the ceilings are painted black and down-lights provide lighting.

Mr. Peterson went over the Laser Dome's (originally Building 3) scalloped wall panels and geodesic dome of what was originally called the "Boeing Spacearium". He said there was no seating – people stood to watch the film. He said the pill-box projector was in the floor and was a first for domed theaters. He explained that new lenses, film and processing had to be invented to work with the screen. He explained that R. Buckminster Fuller owned the patent for the geodesic dome and although Fuller did not work personally on this one, one of his companies designed it. Mr. Peterson said that the rest of the building was originally an open-air building and noted that the floor has been removed, walls modernized and what had been an open pavilion now has a glass wall added.

Mr. Peterson reported that Building 2 (originally Building 4) is the largest building and contains exhibits, offices and a planetarium. He noted the direct connection to the Boeing IMAX Theater and the current butterfly exhibit. He pointed out that utilities hang from the ceiling and noted the large amount of space between the ceiling and exhibits.

Mr. Peterson said egress from Building 1 (originally Building 5) was from the ground level and there was a giant turntable under the floor which carried visitors passed exhibits and to the exit. He explained the Central Courtyard and noted that when the reflecting pool is filled it looks like the platform is floating on water. He pointed out the towers at a gateway element, the custom light fixtures, the paving patterns, in-ground lighting, original art, benches and planters. In 1993 a pathway was added from the arches directly to other building noting that now there are multiple points of entry/access and there is no longer a specific pathway through the facility. He went over maintenance issues and water damage with the courtyard water features. Mr. Peterson said the original bermed gardens are gone and noted that the terraces have been altered/transformed. He commented that what was built does match the drawings.

Mr. Peterson said that this was one of Yamasaki's early designs and later he repeatedly used the system of pre-cast elements and did a lot of integration of sculpture and landscape with his designs, often with courtyards. He said that Yamasaki later became known for skyscrapers, most notably the World Trade Center, and two other buildings in Seattle: the Rainier Tower and the IBM Building.

Mr. Peterson said that Criterion B could apply and described a number of people who were significantly involved with the Pavilion or the Pacific

Science Center. He said Dr. Dixie Lee Ray was the first long-term (nine years) Director of Pacific Science Center during which the mission statement and how the Science Center would be funded was determined. She came from a science background, university professor, was a native of the area (Tacoma) who later went on to become the head of the Atomic Energy Commission, Assistant Secretary of State, and then served as Governor of the State. He said that she had a background in marine and fisheries and oceanic sciences and then became Director of Atomic Energy Commission. He said that what President Nixon saw when he appointed her was that she had the ability to communicate with the general public complicated scientific ideas. He said that her nine years at the Pacific Science Center thrust her into the situation of having to deal with politicians, local people, local possible sponsors, donors, visitors and had to have honed her ability to engage them in this facility. He said that is a skill she used throughout the rest of her career because she was in public service the rest of her life. He said that every decade of her life continued to be a touchstone to scientific issues.

Mr. Peterson said that Eddie Carlson was President of Pacific Science Center from 1962 – 1966; he was President of the World’s Fair Committee, President and CEO of Westin Hotels and later United Airlines. He said he was a “local boy” who became a prominent business man and stayed active at the Pacific Science Center as long as he was able. Buckminster Fuller owned the patents for geodesic domes and had no direct connection with the project but later made a visit to the site.

Mr. Peterson said that Warren Magnuson, Washington State Senator, was powerful and was able to do a lot for the State. Although this is one element of a long and storied career, a lot of his work was around science and environmental issues.

Mr. Peterson noted that there were perimeter exterior lights and said they are out on sticks and project back and provided spots of light rather than a washed wall. He called out the non-original spaces in the theater spaces: in the Laser Dome – the bank floor, the seating and projection equipment, the space between the theater wall and the shell (interstitial space), sound equipment and carpeting.

Mr. Seidl said they are committed to being good stewards of the buildings. He said the Pacific Science Center is one of the most historic and most recognized facilities in the region and the Landmarks Preservation Board’s willingness to consider the designation as meeting all six of the criteria confirms that assessment. He urged support for designation including the arches, the ponds, the walkways, pools, exteriors of the original buildings excluding the newer additions and said it gets to the heart of protecting what the community really cherishes about the Pacific Science Center. He said that

these are the images that create the permanent image in the minds of the community.

Mr. Seidel said those are the same elements that resonate with the history – the feel and the function of the site and facility is related to those views – the sense of the ponds and the arches and the things that Yamasaki created with his architectural genius. He asked that the interiors not be designated to allow for flexibility to support the mission and drive the economics and maintain the facility. He said that Yamasaki created an elegant site composed of big empty boxes that were then used for exhibits. He asked that the interiors of the theaters not be included – although Board staff recommended that they be – and he noted modifications that have been made over time. He said that the curved walls still do what they were intended to – they set a sense of ambience and provide some acoustical benefit. He said the dome and screen in the Laser Theater should not be included and said that its purpose has expired and noted the screen was part of an exhibit and not part of the structure. He said this building is handicapped for other uses because of the screen.

Regarding the interesting engineering and structural components, Mr. Seidl said it is something that should be visual and should be interpreted but the most visible way of seeing it is from the exterior. He said that to maintain visibility of all the remaining visible structure from the inside would create significant issues: 1) the ability to present exhibits which requires lighting and the ability to show it in a way that the building and structures don't take your eyes away from it and, 2) the structure is tilt up concrete panels which are not thick and have caulking in between them. He said from an energy standpoint this is a problem noting the responsibility to be more energy efficient and the need to insulate. He said they would like to be able to show how an historic facility can be kept in current and modern functional use and adopt new technologies and understandings as they become available.

Mr. Seidl finished with words from Eddie Carlson, the first PSC Board Chairman, and one of the people why the Board is considering Criterion B. He said that our heritage is one of looking ahead; these were remarkably visionary people that did the fair to begin with. He said that looking forward is part of the fundamental DNA of Pacific Science Center. The first annual meeting of the Board of Directors of the Pacific Science Center Foundation was on June 8, 1963 and Eddie Carlson commented on the importance for the work of the board to be solid and to be forward thinking. He said way back then they understood that the future of the buildings depended on the success of the organization and its work. Mr. Seidl read Carlson's concluding comments to the PSC board, "It is hope that time will record that trustees of the Pacific Science Center Foundation will be an annual session fifty years from now as a result of our considerations today but unless we can clearly define our objectives today and set ourselves a solid course to follow during

the next twelve months this great structure could become a dark and black tomb”.

Mr. Seidl said they are committed to being good stewards of the facility, to maintain it and to help showcase the important history while at the same time leading our community – in particular our young people – forward in understanding the world of science.

Board Questions:

Responding to Board questions Mr. Peterson explained that at the time the director position occupied by Dixie Lee Ray saw to the day to day operations while Mr. Carlson as President was concerned more with the bigger picture.

Mr. Seidel said that Dixie Lee Ray’s words about what science centers should and shouldn’t be defined a whole new field of presentation of science to general audiences around the world were recognized by the association making her one of the fellows of the industry of being one of the most significant founding people for what is now a global phenomena.

Ms. Wirsching asked about additional information provided on page 12. She said the first sentence talks about Building 5, the interior of the theater on Level 2 and that it “may be considered historic due to its relationship to the original 1962 fair” and asked for clarification on what was meant.

Mr. Peterson explained that the curved soffitted wall, the space itself, is essentially unchanged unlike all the other buildings where all of the exhibits have changed over time.

Responding to clarifying questions about Warren Magnuson’s role with the Science Center Mr. Seidl explained that Magnuson obtained \$9 million dollars for the U.S. Science Pavilion in 1962. Later he played an interesting role in supporting the institution and arranged for the federal government to pay for repainting and maintenance after visited by 7 million people because it was beyond the capacity of the fledgling Science Center to do that. He said that Magnuson remained a champion for the Pacific Science Center.

Mr. Peterson added that Magnuson was instrumental in bringing the World’s Fair to Seattle and after that he took care of Pacific Science Center. He said that Magnuson was very powerful and kept cheerleading for PSC for decades. He said that he was a really powerful man and was able to “cut to the chase” things that otherwise would have taken a very long time.

Public Comment:

Leanne Olson, Queen Anne Historical Society, expressed appreciation to PSC for bringing the nomination forward. She pointed out that it would be the sixth property on the Seattle Center campus to be designated. She said it was timely. She thanked Mr. Peterson for adding information to support consideration of Criterion B calling Dixy Lee Ray “compelling,” and said that Magnuson retired to Queen Anne. She said that in the early days architects came from the east and Yamasaki was “home grown” from the University of Washington and went on to become world famous.

Char Eggleston, Queen Anne Historical Society, thanked Mr. Peterson for adding Criterion B and thanked Mr. Seidl for his support. She urged the Board to support designation. She noted the importance of a “hands-on” learning environment for children and said that Pacific Science Center provides that.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wine asked if the Staff recommendation of “site” was inclusive enough and said there are so many architectural elements that are part of the site.

Ms. Chave explained that “site” means everything unless noted as “excluded” except for moveable trash cans, furniture, and that specifics are handled in Controls and Incentives. She said that after Controls and Incentives are completed, future boards will have everything very clear unlike some Controls agreements from thirty years ago. She said the Controls and Incentives agreement will be very specific because we have a report that is very specific to work from.

Mr. Veith said that when there is a phrase excluding certain items, one must assume that everything that is not on that list is included. He said that in addition to the first two items the Board should deal with the exterior features and the site. He said the second two items which deal with interior features and as Board members discuss he asked what, if any, interior features should be designated.

Ms. Chave said that the Board nominated more on the interior than what was included in the Staff recommendation for designation. She explained what the Board approved for nomination, and what staff is now recommending for designation. She said that Mr. Veith had wanted a chance to look at the structural elements on the interior.

Mr. Finrow said he was impressed at the tour by the interior spaces. He said on the other hand, he realized that the essence of these buildings is that they are gigantic warehouses in which you can put anything. He said the essential historical quality of these buildings is a warehouse and that the stuff inside – while wonderful and interesting and having historic significance of their own

– are at a bit of a conflict with the actual purpose of the building in its core mission. He said the question is do you keep those things or encourage their documentation, find a home for these things – the geodesic dome is a remarkable structure but he said he completely understands why it is totally inadequate for its purposes. He asked what kind of precedents are there for this issue of documentation of interiors.

Ms. Chave advised that the City’s landmark designation process doesn’t allow for mitigation like the National Register does. She said in Certificates of Approval, yes, because applicants are requesting something so we can make conditions but we can’t have conditions on nominations and designations – it either is or it isn’t. She said you could request or, include as a Board comment, “if you don’t designate this particular feature, it would be nice to have additional photographs for documentation” but there is nothing that can be required for mitigation in a designation.

Mr. Veith said that the way the guidelines deal with it is in Guideline # 8 states that if you find something that meets the standard for designation, you designate it. He said the issue of what happens to it at a later date is decided by the Certificate of Approval process. He said there is a hierarchy of how you approach it – if you can save it, we save it. If there is some reason why it conflicts with the buildings owner’s needs or requirements then the Board has to discuss what can be done – can it be preserved in another way. He said the last thing on the list is to document it. He said that the real issue for the Board is if it meets the criteria for designation then it is designated and the issue of how obsolescence or other issues get addressed is another issue. He said that as with the previous discussion the item discussed was obsolete and already partially modified, did not have a current use; he said there were a whole host of issues that make documenting it a reasonable way to go.

Ms. Chave said if there was a request for removal of a particular feature then, at that time, as a condition on a Certificate of Approval the Board could request documentation.

Mr. Finrow said now we have on the table these two interior spaces that are on the staff recommendation.

Ms. Howard asked if there was a suggested distinction made in the case of the Laser Dome, that it was an exhibit that persisted rather than an integral part of the structure. She recollected the Sunset Bowl nomination in which the bowling lanes would have been considered “furniture” rather than an integral part of the structure.

Mr. Veith said that a furnishing is something that can be moved and adjusted versus an installed feature. He said there will always going to be the case that the interior space is designed to suit the use of that space. He said that built-in

cabinets are not considered a furnishing; they are an installed item where a rolling table or dishwasher that moves around in the space is a furnishing. He referred to the Naval Reserve Armory museum proposal where exhibits were addressed only in how they would impact the structure.

Mr. Luoma said that the way that the interior structures – furnishings or not – are installed and suspended lends more to their temporal quality rather than more substantive structure being built in to support it. He said it may be just because of what it is but to him it is much more of a suspended, puppet-like, very exhibit-like structure rather than integrated into the building and building walls.

Ms. Wirsching said it is important to note that these two interior elements have existed since the building was built and that they are important elements of the building. She said they are important historical elements and noted that the staff has been very sensitive to the needs of Pacific Science Center on the interiors. She agreed with Mr. Finrow’s assessment that these buildings are big warehouse boxes. She said the two theaters are very important elements and the features that are being proposed to be retained are the most important elements in those theaters so they have pared down to the basic elements. She said that what is listed on the Staff Report are the most important elements. She asked if the theater could be modified so that the dome is covered up, but remains. . She said there are ways to address issues like the dome in the theater that allow it to be retained as a historic element in the building but also allow modifications as needed in the future.

Ms. Wine said she looked at it in terms of designation standards A – F and then looked at those two theaters as individual components within the big picture. She asked if you were just looking at that one component would it meet some of this criteria and it is questionable. She said she likes Ms. Wirsching’s idea of preserving some of these basic historic elements and integrating them into a new usage.

Ms. Chave clarified that it was not just because of the physical architectural interest that those two interior features were included in the recommendation; she thought that historically those two spaces had significance. She said that in terms of designating them it is acknowledging the role they played in the history of the Science Center in 1962. She said that Mr. Peterson did a good job of documenting both spaces – why they were historically important - and noted that the Spacearium was the most popular exhibit. She said whatever happens to them in the future is another issue; in 1962 they were significant interior spaces.

Mr. Veith posed the question “is it significant?” and noted that it has to be in order to be designated.

Mr. Finrow said that the test for interior spaces is the same as for the rest of the complex and in a certain sense it is a kind of independent judgment because you look at the interior spaces and because they are designed by different people you have to apply the same template of criteria to those interior spaces as you would to the complex as a whole. Because they are not designed by Minoru Yamasaki it adds to the complexity of what we have to think about. He said he would say that the Eames interior is so significant because the Eames' did very few buildings and almost no interiors except for exhibits; he said that would meet the criteria from the point of view of the design of the original theater in Building 5. He said there are questions about whether the Eames really designed it or not – it is not definitive and has not really been answered.

Mr. Peterson interjected that it could be answered with a considerable more time, effort and money.

Mr. Finrow continued that if it is true then it is a pretty important building. He said the geodesic dome is not as critical in the evaluation because there are a lot of geodesic domes all over the place; Buckminster Fuller designed a lot of them. He said that it is reputed that the projection dome was the first project dome ever built-period. He said the projection dome would make it on that basis –not because Buckminster Fuller or a company he owned designed it – but because it was the first piece of that kind of building that was ever built. He said these things should be included and we should just deal with it under the Controls and Incentives and in the future as that comes up. He said it seems that both would meet the criteria.

Mr. Savage said the flip side of that coin is that it might not happen for a long time and a board ten years from now, when they finally get the money to do this, might see that it has been designated and take a completely different stance. He said that from flexibility and a mission statement kind of perspective he said we are walking a pretty fine line about pushing it off into the future about thinking about that is going to do down the line. He said he looks at these as exhibits that have lasted longer than other exhibits inside big boxes that are the real landmark.

Ms. Howard said that there are safeguards against that in the ordinance where it talks about not imposing Controls that would cause financial loss for the owner. She said that speaks in part to Mr. Savage's concerns that a future board, even if it was less flexible than this board, there would still be a basis on which they would be able to approve something.

Ms. Chave said that the way the process works is we keep eliminating (elements from Board review) from nomination to designation to Controls. She said if the Board is struggling with how to acknowledge the historic

significance of these spaces, the Board can designate them and then can direct Staff to eliminate the spaces from review in the Controls and Incentives. She said if the Board feels strongly that they should not be controlled but we want to acknowledge them as significant, “designate-able” features, the process allows for that.

Mr. Veith said we intentionally have this process where we have the designation process where we don’t consider anything except “does it meet the criteria” and “does it meet the basic requirements for any landmark in the City”. He said that as we do that, the consideration that you have to make is “should I designate this knowing that this control might be considered a barrier by the owner” and said you don’t want to designate something just because you like it, it has to meet the criteria. He said if it does meet the criteria then you have to proceed with it; basically you have to trust the Board in the future to make the judgment “what can be changed?” He said this Board has been pretty flexible and he can’t imagine that a future Board will be more doctrinaire than this one. He said each Board member’s consideration should be “does this meet the standards?” and “should I designate it?” without considering any future proposals. He said because he had added the amendment at nomination about including the interior of buildings where the structure of the building is exposed he wanted to get a sense of the Board on that issue and then “yes” or “no” on designation.

Ms. Howard said with regard to the interiors there is enough expression of tectonics upon the exteriors that she was not concerned with designating interior spaces simply for that reason.

Ms. Wine said it wasn’t necessarily the intent to view that structure on the interior – the intent was to look at the exhibits; she said she didn’t have a problem not designating that.

There was general Board agreement with Mmes. Howard and Wine’s comments.

Ms. Howard thanked Mr. Peterson and the Pacific Science Center and noted that all criteria were met, specifically A & C. She said that there was no question that the World’s Fair changed Seattle and that the way the Pacific Science Center developed changed the cultural history not just of Seattle but the nation. Regarding Criterion B she said that Dixie Lee Ray’s contribution is really significant. She shared her own experience the week before when, after a presentation on Science and Technology for incoming parents at the University of Bothell, one of the parents commented on how wonderful it was to see a woman representing science. She supported Criterion B noting all people mentioned were important but specifically Dixie Lee Ray for making a significant contribution to women in science. She said the interior spaces (noted in the staff recommendation) were significant in 1962 so supported

them as well as the Staff Report with the understanding that there is a process to address if they are no longer meeting the needs of the institution.

Mr. Finrow said he supported the Staff Recommendation – with all six criteria.

Mr. Luoma said he supported designation on all six criteria. He appreciated the presenters bringing up Dixie Lee Ray and said seeing her involvement in science and her significance locally and nationally was a valuable picture to see. He said that he wouldn't vote "no" if interiors are included but said he sees them more as apparatuses or exhibits rather than integral pieces of the structure even though they were significant. He said in that light all the exhibits were probably significant back when the Center first opened. He commented on the joy of walking by the Science Center every day and said it is fun to see the tourists there – they know about the Space Needle and they walk by the Pacific Science Center and stop when they see the arches. He said they stop and take a picture and contemplate about what the arches and what they represent; he said it is fun and intriguing to watch their reactions.

Ms. Strong supported designation based on all six criteria and said she was inclined not to include the interior but would not vote against if they were included.

Ms. Wirsching supported designation based on all six criteria. She said that the interiors that are being proposed to be retained and designated do meet Criterion A.

Ms. Wine said it was a really exciting application and said it was the first that she saw that embodies all six criteria. She said it was a great report and noted that she learned a lot from it. She said that she was on the fence regarding inclusion of the interiors but considering that there is a process to allow flexibility in the future was leaning more toward designating the interiors.

Mr. Savage said all six criteria readily apply and said that he did not support including the interiors. He said the interiors proposed are exhibits and should not be included.

Mr. King agreed with his colleagues and said that all six criteria were easily met but that he struggled with including the interiors. He noted Yamasaki's purpose of making modal boxes that can be changed and if relating the design to that of a house, these spaces would be the kitchens and bathrooms and were meant to be changed. He said that the two spaces have lasted 50 years and do have a significant history and meet A. He said he was conflicted about the interiors.

Mr. Veith said that the building meets Criterion A because of its association with the Century 21 exhibit and its focus on science and the future which was the focus of the exposition in general; he said the two interior spaces meet Criterion A. Regarding Criterion B, he noted Dixie Lee Ray and Eddie Carlson and said that Carlson was involved with the entire exposition and was a mover and shaker of his age. He said that the building doesn't have significant association in the sense that you think of that person. He said it meets Criterion C because Seattle, in its early years, was kind of a "wild" city with founders who were always looking for ways to develop the cultural background of the City and, more importantly, the political and economic background of the City. This falls into line with the whole line of thought that had existed since 1852. He noted Yamasaki's unique Modernism and the way the building involves the technology of that age for building a multi-use structure. It involves trends in history in a very distinctive manner and embodies them in a very clear manner. He said that he was not sure that this is an outstanding work of Yamasaki but is among his most iconic works. He said the way the building of the specific items that Christensen discussed – the towers and the platforms and the way the structure is expressed in detail in those structures makes this also an iconic feature of his work. He said the building is well known throughout the region and anchors people in their understanding of the Seattle Center and its position in the City and the Pacific Science Center itself. Mr. Veith said that he was most interested in seeing the interior spaces included and said he would include the interiors of Building 5 as they are stated and that he might include the whole interior of the building that houses the laser dome. He said the features of that structure that are visible in the interstitial space are as interesting and as significant as the generally visible features but for most of the people that attended the fair they were aware of the interior of the dome. He said that those two theater spaces would have been a strong memory in the minds of people who attended the fair and therefore are very connected with the character of the building and should be designated.

Mr. Savage asked for clarification why Mr. Veith and Ms. Wirsching think the interior would meet A.

Ms. Chave said the criteria aren't applied specifically to one space or another.

Mr. Veith said the laser dome would also meet Criterion D.

Ms. Howard said that both meet Criterion C because that sort of presentation is so typical of that time. She said if the Board is going to designate them a case can be made that they fit more than one of the criteria.

Mr. Veith said we're looking at a landmark which includes all these features and overall we may quibble about the interiors but in general the Board has been able to associate the building with all six of the criteria.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Pacific Science Center at 200 2nd Ave. N. a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards A, B, C, D, E and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include:

- The site, including the entry towers, walkways and pools, excluding the non-original water features and displays, and excluding non-original sculpture and artwork.
- The exteriors of the buildings, excluding the following: the Seattle Rotary Discovery Labs Building (Building 6A), the Boeing IMAX Theater and Exhibit Wing, the north entry ticket kiosks, the temporary office trailer and the temporary lunch tent.
- The hemispherical projection dome (geodesic dome) of the Laser Dome Theater, including the original screen.
- The original curved walls of the interior of the theater in Building 5, including the curved walls of vertical tongue-and-groove wood paneling.

MM/SC/MW/JF 9:0:0 Motion carried.

Mr. Finrow noted that Yamasaki's archives were saved in Michigan.

072110.3 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

072110.31 George W. Carmack House
1522 E. Jefferson St.
Request for extension

Ms. Sodt explained the request for a 60-day extension while the owner and Historic Seattle negotiate a purchase.

Action: I move to approve consideration of Controls and Incentives for the George W. Carmack House at 1522 E. Jefferson St for a period of 60 days.

072110.32 Kenney Seaview Building
7125 Fauntleroy Way SW

Ms. Chave explained the request for an extension to second meeting in September.

Action: I move to approve consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Kenney Seaview Building at 7125 Fauntleroy Way SW until the second meeting in September (September 15, 2010).

072110.4 BOARD BUSINESS

Ms. Chave reported that tours would be set up for the Admiral House and Yesler Terrace.

Ms. Sodt explained the nomination for Yesler Terrace had been submitted and it has been scheduled for August 18.

072110.5 STAFF REPORT

6:40 p.m. Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator