



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 254/23

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

Remote Meeting

Wednesday, July 19, 2023 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Dean Barnes

Taber Caton

Roi Chang

Ian Macleod

Lora-Ellen McKinney

Lawrence Norman

Becca Pheasant-Reis

Harriet Wasserman

Staff

Erin Doherty

Melinda Bloom

Absent

Matt Inpanbutr

Marc Schmitt

Padraic Slattery

Acting Chair Roi Chang called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL

071923.1

PUBLIC COMMENT

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle and DoCoMoMoWeWa spoke in support of designation of the Bullitt House. She said she was thrilled to see it move ahead and she agreed with the Staff Report – it meets five of the six standards, and the entire site should be included.

071923.2 MEETING MINUTES

June 7, 2023

MM/SC/IM/TC

6:0:2 Minutes approved. Ms. Chang and Mr. Barnes abstained.

071923.3 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

071923.31

Continental Hotel

315 Seneca Street

Ms. Doherty said the recently designated building has a signed Controls and Incentives agreement. She said language is similar to other recent agreements with a short exclusions list. She went through the agreement with board members.

Mr. Macleod noted there had been a recent briefing.

Ms. Doherty said the subject building is one of Ms. Sodd's properties and that she was not familiar with the details of the proposed work. She recalled that it is mostly rehabilitation work.

Action: I move to approve Controls and Incentives for the Continental Hotel, 315 Seneca Street.

MM/SC/HW/IM

8:0:0 Motion carried.

071923.32

Freeway Park

700 Seneca Street

Ms. Doherty said the signed agreement has language consistent with other Park properties and she proceeded to go through the agreement.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis noted public comment about lidding the adjacent highway.

Ms. Doherty said there is nothing that prevents expansion or addition. The project would go through the Certificate of Approval process like normal, where the board would review it to see what impacts it might have.

Ms. Wasserman said there is public confusion about the landmark review process, and she had no concern about the proposed agreement.

Ms. Doherty said Seattle Parks and Recreation signed the agreement, so they clearly don't see it as a problem.

Mr. Macleod said he was puzzled by the public comments.

Ms. Doherty said she reached out to David Graves, SPAR and shared the public comment. He told Ms. Doherty he is planning to brief the Board about upgrading their wayfinding on the property.

Mr. Macleod said he looks forward to the upcoming briefings. He said the document as written, makes sense.

Ms. Chang said there is nothing out of the ordinary about this agreement.

Action: I move to approve Controls and Incentives for Freeway Park, 700 Seneca Street.

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

071923.33 former Steinhart Theriault & Anderson Office Building
1264 Eastlake Avenue E
Request for extension

Mr. Doherty explained the request for a three-month extension. She said the owner has presented to the board conceptual designs about possible development on the subject site.

Robert Breskovich, the property owner said he hopes to be ready in three months to present revised information to the board at a briefing.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the former Steinhart Theriault & Anderson Office Building, 1264 Eastlake Avenue E for three months.

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

071923.34 Hotel Elliott/Hahn Building
103 Pike Street
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty said the ownership has requested an extension of 120 days.

Ian Morrison, McCullough Hill Leary said he has been working with Ms. Sordt on economic information.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for Hotel Elliott / Hahn Building, 103 Pike Street for 120 days.

MM/SC/IM/TC 8:0:0 Motion carried.

071923.35 Mama's Mexican Kitchen Building
2234 2nd Avenue
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for extension for 120 days.

Ian Morrison, McCullough Hill Leary said they are still working through the MUP process. He said the building is vacant and has been boarded up to secure it. They are looking for short-term tenancy.

Ms. Chang asked how long the building has been vacant.

Mr. Morrison said he didn't know but said the short-term tenant left. The leasing agent is looking for another tenant.

Mr. Barnes asked if the building name remains the same even though the Mama's Mexican restaurant is gone.

Mr. Morrison said that is correct.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives Mama's Mexican Kitchen Building, 2234 2nd Avenue for 120 days.

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

071923.36 Seattle Times Office Building Addition
1120 John Street
Request for extension

Jessica Clawson, McCullough Hill Leary requested a four-month extension for the Office Building Addition and the Printing Plant. She said construction will start soon. She said they are working with Ms. Sodt on a draft.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Seattle Times Office Building, 1120 John Street for four months.

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

071923.37 Seattle Times Printing Plant
1120 John Street
Request for extension

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Seattle Times Printing Plant, 1120 John Street for four months.

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

071923.38 Lloyd Building
601 Stewart Street
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for extension to February 7, 2024, by Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill Leary. She said the ownership has plans to rehabilitate the building and redevelop the adjacent property, and has presented briefings to the ARC

which has been supportive. She said they are working on permitting and will come back with more briefings and a Certificate of Approval application. She noted the Controls and Incentives negotiation process is separate from the Certificate of Approval review process.

Ms. Wasserman said she was happy to know the project is coming along and moving ahead.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Lloyd Building, 601 Stewart Street until February 7, 2024.

MM/SC/HW/TC 8:0:0 Motion carried.

071923.4 DESIGNATION

071923.41 Bullitt House
1125 Harvard Avenue E

Chrisanne Beckner, Historical Resource Associates prepared and presented the nomination report (in DON file). She provided context of the site and area and noted the large parcel contains eight lots combined. The site is located within the Harvard-Belmont neighborhood on Capitol Hill as a ‘non-contributing’ building. She said the house was constructed in 1955 with two-bedroom expansion in 1956, each designed by Fred Bassetti. She said the in 1893 Horace Chapin Henry built a house on the site in 1893 which burned. A new house was constructed in 1904. Henry donated his art collection to the University of Washington – Henry Art Gallery. The Henry children donated the property to the city who planned to use the site for a new library. The house was demolished, and the library was sited elsewhere. J. H. Bloedel, a prominent lumberman owned an adjacent property and later acquired this parcel. She said his son Prentice Bloedel, who founded the Bloedel Reserve with his wife Virginia, later sold it to Stimson Bullitt.

Ms. Beckner said Charles Stimson Bullitt was born in 1919, the son of Alexander and Dorothy Stimson Bullitt, developers and early Seattle Broadcasting family. He was a Yale-educated lawyer and philanthropist. He married Carolyn Kizer in 1948 and they had three children. In 1952 he ran for Congress in Seattle’s first congressional district and acquired the 1125 Harvard Avenue E property for a new family home. His marriage to Kizer ended in 1953 and in 1954 he met Kay Muller at Americans for a Democratic meeting. She was the daughter of William and Marion Muller and was a Radcliff-educated political activist and teacher. In 1944 she attended the Hampton Institute. She moved to Seattle in 1953.

Ms. Beckner said the residence sits on the north end of the parcel. She noted the roof gables and use of stone on Bassetti’s take on Stimson’s envisioned ski lodge. The San Francisco landscape architects Eckbo, Royston, and Williams designed the grounds and retained a remnant from the Henry era – the elaborate wall and staircase to Boylston Avenue E. She said the house was a family home for the Bullitts and their six children. It was a gathering place for extended family and the

wider community. She said the house was a place for recovering friends and visiting dignitaries. She said the house was headquarters for Stim and Kay's social and political activism:

- Keechelus Group, which grew into the Metropolitan Democratic Club
- Summer picnics for the neighbors and political associates
- Summer camps that promoted racial equity
- Volunteer Instruction Program
- Coalition for Quality Integrated Education
- Mayor's Arts Festival of 1971, which grew into Bumbershoot
- Urban League and Save Pike Place Market
- Japanese American Citizens League
- Washington State Advisory Committee to the U.S Commission on Civil Rights
- Sound Savings and Loan

Ms. Beckner went over alterations including accordion doors were replaced and shelving added to closets; baseboard heating added when heated floor failed; bookcases and other built-ins removed; all bathrooms heavily renovated; balcony rebuilt; pocket doors / Dutch doors replaced with solid doors; large window added to breakfast nook; kitchen upgrades, appliances, and counters; and sheds added at carport. She noted the landscape plan by Eckbo, Royston and Williams was not entirely implemented. She said extant elements from the Henry era included two retaining walls which helped manage the grade change and the stair down to Boylston. Extant elements from the Bullitt era include the stairs and retaining walls, house and immediate grounds, amphitheater, and the Cass Turnbull Garden. She noted the entrance to the house, west elevation with balcony, A-frame next to bedroom wing; bathroom addition from the 1980s; landscape features, stair and retaining walls.

Ms. Beckner said the interior of the house is emphasized with wood, light, concrete floors, fireplace, skylight, loft above kitchen. She said bathroom addition is from the 1980s. She noted the bedroom has its own fireplace and said the children's bedrooms had built-in desks, and dressers. She said the bathrooms are altered.

Ms. Beckner talked about Fred Bassetti's style involved a lot of light and visible structural elements; his use of natural materials, large windows to connect inside and outside. She read passages which she thought exemplified Bassetti:

I remember Bassetti once instructing me that his kind of modernism 'felt good to the human hand.' Put your hand down on a Bassetti design (railings, door handles, edges) and it feels warm and rounded, often because it's a lovely piece of wood – a reminder of his mother's Norwegian heritage.

As for the regional references he also favored, they were subtle but not literal. He loved to articulate the way rainwater flowed down a roof and alongside buildings, using modern forms rather than historic references to barns or Indian longhouses. He liked buildings that tell the passerby how they were made, reflecting a simpler time of good craftsmanship and skilled Scandinavian carpentry."

--Fred Bassetti's legacy: Modernism that feels good to the human hand.

by David Brewster, *Crosscut*, December 5, 2013

“Fred Bassetti belongs to the ‘Northwest School’: the collective drivers behind the new regional identity that began to emerge in the late 1940s, that included Arne Bystrom, Wendell Lovett, Gene Zema, and Ralph Anderson. Key features of the Northwest School's work are the influence of the Pacific Northwest climate and landscape on modern design, materials selection, and a legacy of environmental responsibility. Concrete and steel are hallmarks of modernism, but in the Pacific Northwest there was also a passion for natural materials.”

--University of Washington Department of Architecture Student Drawings. PH Coll 740.

“Lorne McConachie, a principal at Bassetti Architects, said Fred Bassetti was known for architecture that focused on ‘humanism combined with modernism.’ ‘Much of our modern architecture has gone slick and kind of crispy — not very friendly to the human touch,’ said McConachie. ‘Fred never lost the sense of how people use the space.’

Bassetti believed in modernist tenets for designing functional buildings where the structure was clear, said McConachie, but he also believed in regionalism: ‘understanding place, the climate, the people, the character of the landscape and how those aspects of the place were reflected in the buildings that we make.’”

--Bassetti ‘never lost the sense of how people use the space,’

Daily Journal of Commerce staff, December 9, 2013

Ms. Beckner provided photo examples of Bassetti work including the Marshall Forrest house, the Gerber house, Armbruster and Wertheimer residences.

Mr. Macleod said he appreciated the site tour. He noted the house is in the Harvard-Belmont Historic District and listed as ‘non-contributing’.

Ms. Beckner said it was such a young resource when the district was established. It was of tertiary significance to the district; not an intrusion, but not contributing.

Mr. Macleod asked about Bassetti’s dismissal of this project as noted in public comments.

Ms. Beckner said Mr. Bassetti said nothing. She said Bassetti had a social relationship with the Bullitts which likely impacted how he talked about it.

Ms. Wasserman said she talked to Fred Bassetti about the house. She said he noted a few problems about his design of the house. She said Stim Bullitt wanted a ski chalet so that is what Bassetti gave him. She said this is not one of Bassetti’s best works, but he didn’t hate it.

Mr. Macleod appreciated the anecdote. He said he was skeptical that Bassetti felt strongly against the house. He agreed it wasn’t one of Bassetti’s most outstanding works.

Ms. Wasserman said Mr. Bassetti seemed pleased with her wanting to attribute his name to the house design, as part of the event she was planning there.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis asked what happened to the Henry House.

Ms. Beckner said the first one burned. The second one passed to the city and was earmarked for a library. She said the house might have been removed by the city after which the Bloedels acquired the property.

Mr. Barnes asked about the 'camp' aspect of the property.

Ms. Beckner provided photos of the property and explained the whole parcel was used by the family. There was an above-ground pool in the center which has been removed. She said the natural slope to the parcel was used to create an amphitheater where the kids did performances. She said there were areas of exploration not garden or fancy landscape for the kids to use.

Dr. McKinney said the whole area was for the kids to explore, the theater parts were shown on television. She said there was a pool and stables at the far end. She said it wasn't a 'campground' but more of a day camp for kids. She said the Peace Camp happened later on the other side of the property. She said the day camp was for the children of Kay's friends. The Peace Camp was an organizational group. She said meeting activities took place inside and outside the house. She said the great room held meetings of civil rights leaders, educators and others. She said doors led onto the patio where meetings were held as well.

Ms. Beckner said the Bullitts were known for hosting picnics in the summer for neighbors, and for fundraising efforts. She said the Bullitts were very socially and politically active.

Mr. Barnes asked if the architecture is unique.

Ms. Pheasant-Reid said it has Northwest Style qualities in its expressive structure and light as part of the design with lots of windows. She said the ski lodge typology is only expressed in the A-frame. She noted the use of stone, wood and lots of built-ins, custom work, and said she noticed the front door hinges that were unique. Everything had a level of craft to it; a lot of thought went into it even if it isn't Bassetti's best. Bassetti had a high bar.

Ms. Wasserman said the house is an example of Northwest Modernist building and is a lovely example of the style. Bassetti had a high bar, and she noted his excitement at being able to design the City's East Pine Substation (now a City Landmark).

Mr. Macleod said it is unfair to compare this house to other neighborhood houses and their grandeur. He said this is not a grand, luxurious home. It is a great example of the Northwest Style. He noted the attention to detail and spatial organization. He said it is stunning walking into the great room with the loft and the

play of light. He said there is a poetic logic to how it is laid out. It is understated. He noted the way the stair handrail was carved and how it curves around the landing. He said it captures the ethos of buildings being 'good for the hand'. He said the front door carving is wonderful.

Dr. McKinney noted the intimate feel of the place, and a room could be closed off and feel cozy.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis said the house is functional and flexible and was an expression of the Bullitts. She said Bassetti likely did not have as much fondness for designing to others' design aesthetics. She noted his excitement to design an electrical substation, where he could do his own design.

Mr. Barnes asked for clarification about Modernism.

Ms. Macleod said it was a move away from traditional references. He said it was a very different era and design ethos.

Mr. Barnes noted the building is amongst 1920-30s era structures.

Mr. Macleod said the period after WWII was a breakaway period in terms of design.

Ms. Wasserman said that what one loves is not relevant to what the board does. She said a Victorian castle and a Modernist house are very different styles, both of which can be good examples of their respective styles.

Mr. Barnes said there are multiple things coming together and he was struggling with how to view it all.

Ms. Wasserman said architecture is just one of the criteria and there are others to look at.

Ms. Chang said this is a unique and younger building; it is a different style and from a different era. She said there is a lot for board discussion.

Mr. Macleod said city landmark eligibility is 25 years.

Ms. Doherty said that is true, but often the 50-year mark is used related to SEPA referrals. Both come up in different contexts.

Ms. Chang asked if there are other examples of estates that have become parks.

Ms. Wasserman noted Parsons Gardens in Queen Anne, Volunteer Park, and play fields.

Mr. Macleod said his opinion changed after touring the site. He said there are a lot of lovely design projects there. He said the site has changed a lot although the (Henry House era) stairway and retaining walls remain.

Ms. Doherty said the board nominated the whole site, and the interior and exterior of the house, and noted that could refine this. She said if designated she and the property owner will delve into the items that can be excluded in a Controls and Incentives Agreement.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis asked about future plans for the park.

Ms. Doherty said the board's consideration should be based on the code, and not future plans. She said the future is outside of the board's purview. She said the board should review to determine if it has significance, and if so, decide if it has the integrity or ability to convey that significance.

Ms. Wasserman said she supported exempting parts during the Controls and Incentives process.

Mr. Macleod agreed with Ms. Wasserman.

Ms. Caton said there are too many pieces, and it is best parsed out during Controls and Incentives process.

Dr. McKinney said the basement had a lot of uses. She said the bathroom was changed out, but she couldn't remember for whom. She said it could be significant, but she didn't know.

Ms. Doherty said Kay Bullitt had a friend live with her for a period of time for whom she fully adapted the bathroom. She said the whole interior was included at nomination and the board can subtract elements as desired, while considering the designation standards.

Mr. Macleod said future plans will be addressed through the Certificate of Approval process. He supported designation based on the features listed in the Staff Report. He said the bedroom areas also fit into the narrative of public space and the private side of the home.

Dr. McKinney supported inclusion of the bedrooms and said she appreciated the care that went into the design. She noted the built in desks, closets with drawers and shelves, lighting. She supported inclusion of the private wing but not the bathroom.

Ms. Wasserman supported designation and said the property meets all the criteria noted in the Staff Report – cultural, political, economic. She said it would be nice to include the personal space and to add the bedrooms but not the bathroom. She said addition of bedrooms would not hinder future use.

Mr. Macleod agreed and supported inclusion of the bedrooms. He noted the interesting scheme of skylights augmented with lighting. He supported all criteria noted in Staff Report A, B, C, D and F. He said the site is integral to the house and is

more complex than what can be discussed at this meeting – it should be left to the Controls and Incentives negotiation process.

Mr. Barnes said he struggled to understand how this site could fit all five criteria. He supported criteria C and D but said it was hard to see where the social piece best fits.

Dr. McKinney said historic events happened at this site. She said the Bullitts alone were significant, but they were involved in lots of issues that fall into the political, and the economic. She said they were important people in the city.

Ms. Wasserman said Stim was a significant figure in cultural history.

Mr. Barnes said it is hard to have that home designated for that. He asked why this home should be designated.

Dr. McKinney said that her father was a civil rights leader and a minister. They lived in Madrona and many meetings were held at her house – it was a very busy house. People came to talk about political things and ways to intervene and to organize. She said it wasn't safe for this to happen at their home, so they went to Tom Brown's Gas Station at 34th and Union to meet. She said there were lots of civil rights meetings held in people's living rooms, including the Bullitt House. Because it was not visible from the street, it was a safe place for these gatherings. People would not know they were there.

Mr. Barnes said Reverend McKinney was a prominent person in the Black community and what he did for the city, but the McKinney home is not designated. He struggled with why this house should be designated for the person rather than the activities that happened there.

Mr. Macleod said it is important to consider why we honor who we honor. He said Kay Bullitt and her family are a great example of people worth honoring. Regarding Criterion C he said this house is where these activities took place - it is about the activities, not the house. He said Criterion B is about honoring the person rather than the activities. He said they are connected but distinct and each has a distinct purpose. He said the house was home of a prominent person and the site of historic activities. He said Criterion F is harder to articulate.

Dr. McKinney said meetings were held there regarding the 1966 school closure boycott and noted her father did some planning at the Bullitt House. She said that Black people didn't get to work at stores they bought things from, and her father said "if you can't get a job there, you are not going to spend your money there". Kay Bullitt opened her home to have meetings and that is how her father became friends with Kay. Dr. McKinney noted it was not safe to have meetings at the McKinney home. She said there were only so many people who could fit in the gas station after dark. She said Criterion A makes sense to her.

Mr. Barnes said it falls under Criterion C more strongly because of the cultural, political and economic heritage of the city because of what Reverend McKinney did and what the Bullitt family did in terms of working together for making that happen.

Dr. McKinney said she couldn't say if Martin Luther King, Jr. went into the house when he came to Seattle, but it might have happened. She said she knew most of the places he went. She said when she went to day camp there she didn't go home until really late because they were all hanging out.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis supported designation and noted the association with Kay Bullitt met Criterion B in the way the house and grounds were set up. She supported Criterion C because so many significant events are associated with it. She said it meets Criterion D for its Northwest style. She said criteria A and F were a struggle for her. She said there was no singular event associated with the house, and it is set back and not visible from the street.

Ms. Wasserman supported designation to include the whole site. She said the site is visible, both the wall and the landscape but she was torn on Criterion F.

Ms. Caton supported designation and said she agreed with Ms. Pheasant-Reis' comments. Regarding Criterion F she said the house contrasts with others in the area but noted its proximity to the street. She said while there wasn't a singular event, there were many. She supported criteria B, C, and D.

Mr. Macleod supported designation and cited criteria B, C and F. He said the odd and unique property in a historic district is exactly why F is relevant. He said he was on the fence with Criterion A.

Dr. McKinney spoke from personal experience and said what makes Criterion A relevant is these were historic events that happened here.

Mr. Norman supported designation and cited criteria C, D, and F.

Ms. Wasserman asked if there was board support for criteria B, C, D, F and inclusion of bedrooms.

Ms. Chang said she was on the fence about the criteria and noted she supported criteria B, C, and D. She said with walled off properties, it is hard to distinguish between one property and the next, so she did not support F. She said so much history took place here and it is evolving and the challenge of designating an evolving site. She supported the criteria cited in the Staff Report at the maximum. She was not strong on inclusion of the bedrooms. She said she wouldn't vote against if more were included.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis said designation allows flexibility of uses for the open space. She noted the remaining Henry House era features, volume, A-frame, and open space. Public spaces should be included because it is where the public activities happened.

She did not support including the kitchen or bedrooms as they aren't necessary to the story of what happened at the site.

Dr. McKinney said if the bedrooms are a challenge, don't include them.

Mr. Macleod agreed and said that they are an important aspect to the architectural significance but less so to the social significance. He noted the complexity of the individual components.

Ms. Chang said that criteria B, C, and D were solid.

Ms. Wasserman wanted the bedrooms included.

Dr. McKinney said yes to the bedrooms.

Mr. Barnes said he was not on the tour so he wouldn't comment on bedrooms but that he supported criteria B, C, D and he said he would have no problem with including F, but no to A.

Mr. Norman said he concurred with Mr. Barnes.

Ms. Caton suggested using Controls and Incentives process to allow flexibility.

Ms. Wasserman and Dr. McKinney agreed.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Bullitt House at 1125 Harvard Avenue E for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards B, C, and D; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the site; the exterior of the house; and portions of the interior including the main entry foyer/hall/stairs, the bedrooms and the A-frame portion of the house (excluding the kitchen, lavatory, and basement).

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

071923.5 BRIEFING

071923.51 Georgetown Steam Plant
4022 32nd Avenue SW
Briefing on proposed rehabilitation and addition

Presentation details available in DON file.

Mark Johnson, Signal Architecture provided a recap of the project's goals. He shared ideas about programming and how it could be used to entertain and to educate visitors about the process of converting coal to steam. He talked about how to tell the story while also providing accessibility, seismic upgrades, elevators, bridges, and protecting character defining features. He went over options for proposed vertical

circulation, ingress/egress and programming. Possible options for use of the site include museum, learning place, community gathering, academy for hip hop. Existing building and site have physical square footage and constructability limitations. Both interior and exterior features are important.

Scenario 1: The Final Entry

Strengths: appears to have the least impact on the exterior site and west elevation. Takes advantage of the proposed access road.

Flaws: Opportunity to combine with other required modifications is limited. Full extent of impacts to interior beyond historic doors is unknown but required impacts are likely necessary for building entry and egress. Physical modifications may need to be made to the historic doors to meet code compliance.

There are a few pairs of these oversized historic doors that provided function at the south and west façades.

Scenario 2: The North Elevation

Strengths: Clear opportunity to pair with required seismic structure, exterior foundations, and vertical circulation. Location is in line with where exterior accessory structures were located historically as well as where the steam plant was initially planned for expansion. Relatively discreet location.

Flaws: Visual impacts to multiple façades (primarily north and east, but also west approach). Site impact may potentially be greater than other scenarios to fully engage with the proposed access road.

Entry approach could compete with the final historic entry.

Scenario 3: The Cistern

Strengths: location is in line with where exterior accessory structures were historically located, the cistern in particular could create another strong interpretive opportunity. Independent structure divorces modifications and impact from the existing building. Strategic location does not have to compete with final historic entrance. This scenario takes advantage of the proposed access road.

Flaws: visual impact to the west elevation is potentially greater than other scenarios.

Scenario 4: Service Entry

Strengths: clear opportunity to pair with required seismic structure, exterior foundations, and vertical circulation. Location is in line with where exterior accessory structures were located historically as well as where the steam plant was initially planned for expansion. An entry point located at this location of the building

allows for discreet use by staff or can be advantageous for connecting to exterior program elements.

Flaws: visual impacts to multiple façades (primarily east, but also south elevation upon approach).

South Entry

The ash room at the south end of the building directly connects with the ground-level exterior. If site activities and program are to be expanded or supported, this would be likely the ideal location to provide that. There is an existing exterior classroom building onsite. Its footprint could be repurposed for new functions to support the building program. There are many potential opportunities to provide accessory structures at the south portion of the site. These structures could be attached to the south façade or located away from the existing building entirely.

Other Site Features

The Duwamish River originally moved through the south end of the site. There are interpretive stories that are best told within the site. The site has a large capacity for potential program but is currently underutilized.

Program scenario layout possibilities A and B, levels 1 - 4 were presented.

Ms. Caton appreciated the presentation and the ideas about how one moves through the space and potential for 'aha' moments. She said telling the story of the Duwamish River via stormwater is compelling.

Ms. Chang appreciated the presentation and two possible program scenarios. She said both options would work but the team hasn't decided on one or the other.

Mr. Johnson said it was valid to bring forth to board before continuing down either path. One might be more landscape dependent than the other but they intend to create a landscape that is an interpretive story.

Ms. Chang asked what would be seen first on approach, the original structure or new.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis asked if there is a vision for canopies connecting buildings and noted the idea for a visitor center in front.

Mr. Johnson said perhaps.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis asked about additional impacts to visibility of landmark.

Ms. Doherty noted a potential kitchen was proposed and asked what kind of connections would be needed.

Mr. Johnson said it could be connected, they are exploring canopies, ancillary space and said it would be interesting to look at something that is almost like a vestibule space that is below a certain elevation on that side of the building.

Ms. Wasserman asked about how the access road is planned.

Dr. McKinney left the meeting at 6:58 pm.

Mr. Johnson indicated the route on site plan.

Ms. Wasserman appreciated the transparency and being able to see the old structure through the glass.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis agreed with Ms. Wasserman and said it feels appropriate for a steam plant. She said it all depends on the whole story that is being told via the design.

Mr. Macleod said he was intrigued by the image of rising up through stairs or an elevator core – some sort of vertical circulation through the boiler that would be removed. He said the experience of progressing along the path of coal is a compelling way of organizing circulation, almost like one is becoming the coal. He said there is something about the idea of emerging through the boiler itself that is more powerful than just seeing a cutaway for those three different pieces. He said that moment ties with following the path of energy and the story is better told by arriving through the boiler itself. Keep thing outside – attached to rather than bored through. He said it is too interesting of an idea to let go of.

Ms. Caton said where they are using the cistern as an element she appreciated the idea of having peripheral buildings integrated with new purpose and have them integrated with the new purpose in some way that celebrates them. She appreciated keeping the corner and the essence of arrival as it was and preserving that. She said that the building is all about being useful and making energy and being productive so it feels nice to celebrate these formerly industrial pieces and giving them new life and purpose.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis agreed. She said she would like to see the interventions explained in their form as well so that when they are looking at what kind of materiality and what sort of opaqueness versus visibility, to highlight those items that were the structure that was required to keep this building from coming down. This is what was required to allow access and not let that be something that does become hidden but is also part of the story of the steam plant and the efforts going in to making it accessible. She said it would be cool to put back a translucent smokestack.

Mr. Macleod said it would be a cool idea or something wireframe may come to life on the outside of it. He said the cistern is an intriguing part of the site including the underground pipes and connections. He asked if there were options for the cistern.

Mr. Johnson said for the cistern, maybe a canopy that flies over it and there is a gap of some sort and then a vestibule that touches it. It could be a visitor center type of space.

Mr. Macleod liked the idea of being able to peek inside the machinery and the pipes and said there is a lot more potential for that versus just sitting there.

Mr. Johnson asked, what if it were opened up and you could walk on it?

Ms. Wasserman left at 7:12 pm.

Mr. Macleod said that sitting untouched, the plant is preserved in a literal sense. He said sometimes sacrificing pure integrity by cutting something open to tell a better story is valid. It becomes not just an object you look at, but it is experiential.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis said she was in favor of that and wanted to see it articulated further. She said it is worth exploring as long as it is done in a respectful way.

Ms. Caton agreed and said it is an opportunity to tell the water story, both a natural water story that is happening in the south and this manmade industrialized water story and the relationship between the two. Either way it could be a cool element whether or not it is connected to the building.

Mr. Macleod said it doesn't have to be transparent and the team showed types of projects and glass and steel and exoskeleton that were stunning. He suggested translucency rather than transparency. He noted the Innovation Powerhouse in Wisconsin. There is an opportunity to be a little more unconventional with materials.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis appreciated Mr. Macleod's ideas. She cautioned against glowing boxes and said she finds the Powerhouse distracting. She said it is a personal opinion and it all depends on how it is done. She said there is a tendency to avoid heavy materials when there are heavy materials in the area that historic. She said there are many ways to do it that falls somewhere between concrete and translucent boxes.

Mr. Johnson looking at lighting arrays above exhibits and they are trying to integrate lighting into structure as much as possible so that the open space above the boilers and turbines is an uninterrupted as possible.

Mr. Norman appreciated the presentation.

Ms. Chang appreciated the thorough presentation and process.

071923.6

BOARD BUSINESS