

**Advocacy Update**  
**June 26, 2008**

Previous issues of the Advocacy Update available at: <http://historicseattle.org/inthenews.aspx>

**In This Issue:**

- **Upcoming Seattle landmark nomination and designations**
  - |Seattle Post-Intelligencer: **Mediation team floats ideas for 520 Bridge**
  - **Upcoming Tacoma landmark nominations**
  - **Federal Avenue E Open House Tour: A special event to benefit the Seattle Architectural Foundation and Historic Seattle**
  - **Fort Lawton Reuse Plan**
  - **Modernism in the Northwest: Mid-century Architecture Identification and Evaluation**
  - **Three books for preservationists**
  - **Activists Unite! Changing Guard, Grassroots Opportunities**
  - **WSDOT Viaduct open houses in May drew 200 visitors**
  - **Livable Seattle Movement's Two Step Plan**
  - **Seattle Streetcar network community input opportunity**
  - **Viaduct interest group briefings**
  - **Member Sought For International Special Review District Board**
  - **City of Seattle Looking at New Rules for Unreinforced Masonry Buildings**
- 

**Upcoming Seattle landmark nomination and designations**

The Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board will consider the following nomination and designations at its meeting on Wednesday, July 2, 2008 at 3:30 p.m. in the Seattle Municipal Tower, 700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor, Room 4060. The public is invited to attend the meeting and provide brief comments. Prior to the meeting, written comments can be sent to the staff of the Landmarks Preservation Board at [beth.chave@seattle.gov](mailto:beth.chave@seattle.gov). Copies of the Landmark nominations are online at: [http://www.seattle.gov/neighborhoods/preservation/landmarks\\_current\\_nom.htm](http://www.seattle.gov/neighborhoods/preservation/landmarks_current_nom.htm). These documents are large and may take sometime to download.

Designations:

Terry Building, 320 Terry Ave. N  
Brasa/Metropolitan Press Printing Company, 2107 Third Avenue

Nomination:

Nathan Hale High School, 10750 30th Ave NE

\*\*\*

**Seattle Post-Intelligencer**

**June 19, 2008**

**Mediation team floats ideas for 520 Bridge**

**By Debera Carlton Harrell**

Unlike rush-hour traffic across the Evergreen Point Bridge, plans to replace the aging span are moving right along. State transportation officials met with state Route 520 mediation team members earlier this week to discuss three updated alternatives that could break a decades-old deadlock over the new bridge's design. Bus rapid transit, adding green space, restoring connections between neighborhoods split when the bridge was built, and protecting the Washington Park Arboretum were among the common objectives of the alternatives crafted by mediation team members and the groups they represent.

Each is being studied as part of a supplemental draft environmental impact statement process launched at the group's last meeting in March. The governor and Legislature will decide which will replace the 45-year-old bridge from among the plans in the next session. The three plans have distinct differences, particularly when it comes to moving cars and buses north of Montlake Cut to the University of Washington, the UW Medical Center, University Village, Children's Hospital and Regional Medical Center and neighborhoods.

One plan calls for a tunnel beneath the cut, another features a second bascule bridge parallel to the current one, while a third places a bridge at an angle from the main corridor to the UW campus. "We're in a very transformative time for transportation; we have to find a way of moving people better and faster," mediation team member Virginia Gunby told the group. She supports the second bascule bridge alternative, which removes the Lake Washington Boulevard ramps to south Montlake, the arboretum and Madison Park.

The proposal, a relative newcomer to the mediation process, urges a broad public switch from single-occupancy vehicles to transit. While the concepts behind the plan were discussed at the group's last meeting, WSDOT and plan supporters worked until early this week to refine it for public presentation. "If 250 to 300 more people -- three articulated busfuls -- changed their habits and took the bus instead of driving, those (Lake Washington Boulevard) ramps won't have to be there," said Larry Sinnott, who represents Friends of Olmsted Parks. "The main idea has been to protect the arboretum." He called projections of 22,000 cars a day cutting through the arboretum "unacceptable" and said if the ramps are removed, so is a "scar from 40 years ago."

Another plan, dubbed "K" or the Parkway Plan, features a tunnel beneath the cut and a bermed stretch of highway at Foster Island, lidded to restore arboretum connections. "It is a balanced and fair plan; a negotiated solution among major communities," said Paige Miller, the Arboretum Foundation's executive director and a team member. Madison Park, North Capitol Hill, Portage Bay, Roanoke, Montlake and Laurelhurst, as well as the boating, arboretum and bicycling communities, support the Parkway alternative, Miller said.

While tunneling has been -- and remains -- a huge question mark, technical experts who met with the mediation team Tuesday said soil conditions are adequate and that using a newer method like Sound Transit's light rail tunnel at Beacon Hill would work. Experts said creating a bored tunnel -- another method -- is cost-prohibitive, since it would require a much larger, specialized boring machine -- estimated at \$50 million to \$60 million. State transportation officials said such a machine

## ALTERNATIVES FOR 520 BRIDGE REPLACEMENT

### KEY ELEMENTS IN COMMON

- ▶ Restores neighborhood connections with green space/lids at Roanoke, across I-5, and at Montlake.
- ▶ Additional lanes across or beneath Montlake Cut to accommodate traffic and relieve congestion on Montlake Blvd.
- ▶ Narrowed footprint through Portage Bay, lessening impacts on boating communities.
- ▶ Dedicated transit lanes across the bridge.
- ▶ Eliminate bus "flyer stops" at Montlake.
- ▶ Avoids Marsh Island (Arboretum).
- ▶ Museum of History and Industry must re-locate.
- ▶ Improved stormwater facility.
- ▶ Bike and pedestrian path.



### KEY DIFFERENCES

#### Alternative A

- 1 Splits north-south traffic along Montlake Blvd. with a second bascule bridge.
- 2 Prioritizes transit; has transit-only ramps.
- 3 Eliminates Lake Washington Blvd. ramps to Arboretum and Madison Park.
- 4 Retains McCurdy Park.
- 5 Has "cut-away" lid at Montlake.



### KEY DIFFERENCES

#### Alternative K ("Parkway Plan")

- 6 Tunnel beneath McCurdy Park, Montlake Cut and UW stadium parking lot.
- 7 Bermed bridge deck at Foster Island, with lid on top, to mute traffic noise in Arboretum and restore park pathways.
- 8 Moves Lake Washington Blvd. ramps west, but allows "roundabout" access for neighborhoods south of bridge.
- 9 Green space lid where tunnel, Montlake Blvd. and Pacific Street meet.
- 10 Has the slimmest footprint through Portage Bay.



### KEY DIFFERENCES

#### Alternative L

- 11 Angled bridge across Montlake Cut.
- 12 Green space lid.
- 13 Bermed bridge deck at Foster Island.
- 14 Has Lake Washington Blvd. ramps.

Source: Washington State Department of Transportation

SEATTLE P-1

would have to come out of the project's overall, state-mandated cost of \$3.9 billion, possibly detracting from mitigations needed throughout the corridor. Plan A supporters say theirs is the less costly alternative.

In-water construction, shading from piers or the bridge deck or blocking fish passage are also problems, said team member Mike Grady of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife/National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration. He has expressed doubts about a tunnel and its affects on federally protected salmon. "May I remind the group that we are required to come up with a 'feasible' plan, and that doesn't only mean can you build it, but is it permissible (under federal law)?" But Miller told the group: "We believe there is a way to tunnel ... without hurting fish."

Alternative "L," the least popular among mediation team members, will be analyzed as well for comparison and possible "mixing and matching" of bridge design elements, said Julie Meredith, 520 project director for WSDOT. Now that the three proposals are better defined, she said, engineers can further analyze issues such as identifying the optimal height of the bridge deck in environmentally sensitive areas, noise and visual effects, tunnel grades and curvature, and computer modeling of future traffic demands.

The latter is important, Meredith said, particularly at Montlake -- already a gridlocked area that backs traffic up so far it affects Interstate 5 in both directions. Yet an estimated 1.7 million more people are expected to move to the Puget Sound area in coming decades. "We will be analyzing not just how the proposals work under current conditions, but looking out to 2030," Meredith said. "It's going to be a busy summer."

\*\*\*

#### **Upcoming Tacoma landmark nominations**

The Tacoma Landmarks Preservation Commission agenda for June 25, 2008 includes:

Public Hearing – Nominations to The Tacoma Register - 206 N J Street - Park Universalist Church

Preliminary Review – Nominations to The Tacoma Register:

A. St. Luke's Memorial Church (3615 North Gove St)

B. Dorothy Apartments (301 Tacoma Avenue North)

C. Frisko Freeze (1201 Division)

\*\*\*

#### **Federal Avenue E Open House Tour: A special event to benefit the Seattle Architectural Foundation and Historic Seattle**

When: Saturday, July 12 -- 1:00 to 5:00pm

Cost: Register online at [http://www.seattlearchitecture.org/tour\\_details.cfm?tlId=73](http://www.seattlearchitecture.org/tour_details.cfm?tlId=73) for \$30 per person

(Ticket/program required for entering homes.)

Day of Event Registration: Corner of Highland and Federal Avenue E, lawn of Trinity Lutheran Church

Nestled just west of Volunteer Park and east of Tenth Avenue East on Federal Avenue East is one of the city's most "stylish" streets – in more ways than one. It is chock full of beautiful houses designed by local architects in every imaginable traditional style popular in America in the first quarter of the 20th century.

Seattle Architecture Foundation and Historic Seattle invite you to stroll along beautifully manicured Federal Avenue East to experience this cornucopia of American residential styles and be privileged to see the interiors of a number of them. Those who participated in this special event in 2006 will see new homes added to the shortened route as well as a few special repeats for this year's open house tour. The houses will open at 1:00 and close promptly at 5:00. Each person must show the "official" ticket to enter each home.

Look for a special Larry Kreisman preview article on the Federal Avenue E open house tour in the Sunday Pacific Northwest Magazine. The article is expected to run Sunday, July 6.

\*\*\*

### **Fort Lawton Reuse Plan**

Upcoming planning workshops:

- July 12, 8:30 a.m.-1 p.m., Magnolia Lutheran Church, 2412 31st Ave W
- July 19, 8:30 a.m.-1 p.m., Liesy Center at Fort Lawton. The Liesy Center is located in Fort Lawton, 4570 Texas Way W. Park in south parking lot and follow the signs.

Community Relations Plan workshop: June 19, 6:30-8:30 p.m., Catharine Blaine School

View the June 16, 2008 Draft Community Relations Plan at:

[http://www.seattle.gov/neighborhoods/fortlawton/brac/pubs/ft\\_lawton\\_CRP\\_draft2.pdf](http://www.seattle.gov/neighborhoods/fortlawton/brac/pubs/ft_lawton_CRP_draft2.pdf)

\*\*\*

### **Modernism in the Northwest: Mid-century Architecture Identification and Evaluation**

September 4-5, 2008

Boise, Idaho

This two-day symposium features mid-century cultural resources experts from across the country with sessions on identifying, recording and evaluating Northwest architectural resources (1945-1975). Other events include a public lecture by Dr. Meredith Clausen on iconic Northwest architect Pietro Belluschi; a bus tour of Boise's mid-century architectural gems; and a session on mid-century interior design and furnishings. A final fun Friday night house party in a fabulous 1950s home will be a ticketed event. For more information, go to:

[www.northwestmodernism.org](http://www.northwestmodernism.org)

The symposium is jointly sponsored by Preservation Idaho, the Idaho Department of Transportation, National Trust for Historic Preservation, Modern Hotel and Bar, Idaho State Historical Society, and the US Department of Transportation.

\*\*\*

### **Three books for preservationists**

*The Place You Love Is Gone: Progress Took It Away*

by Melissa Holbrook Pierson

Publisher: Norton, W. W. & Company, Inc.

ISBN-13: 9780393057393

208pp, hardcover \$24.95

Has the future—ever more people with their houses, stores, roads, and sprawl—been wrecking your past? Every day brings evidence of dramatic change upon the landscape. It's called progress, but chances are you experience it as theft. For we are all deeply attached to the places we call home. Since the sixties, the pace of development has picked up, reaching a velocity today that signals an end to every place once held dear. Melissa Holbrook Pierson, with unalloyed insight, elucidates how it feels to lose that landscape of home. In the past twenty years, like countless towns it resembles, Akron, Ohio, has lost its singularity and much of what native-daughter Pierson loved about it. She then moves to Hoboken, New Jersey, a forgotten appendage of New York—until stockbrokers discover it. Finally, she speaks of rural areas, telling of the thousands of upstate New Yorkers displaced by city reservoirs. A unique book uniquely of our moment: This is what it feels like to lose the place you love.

*How To Read Buildings: A Crash Course in Architectural Styles*

by: Carol Davidson Cragoe and James Neal, illustrator

Publisher: Rizzoli

5 x 6, 575 illustrations, 256 pages, Softcover \$17.95

ISBN: 9780847831128

“Understanding buildings is like detective work: you need to look for clues that will lead you to recognize the building,” the author writes. First, however, one needs a background in architectural styles or at least a compact

reference guide. *How To Read Buildings* begins with building types such as religious, castle, palace, domestic, public, and commercial. Cragoe, an architectural historian, writer, and lecturer who studied in New York and London, next examines particular period-based styles: Greek, Roman, Christian, Byzantine, Romanesque, Gothic, Renaissance, Baroque, Rococo, Palladian, Neoclassical, Gothic Revival, Late nineteenth-century, and Modernism of the twentieth century. Another section discusses structural materials including stones, brick, masonry, wood, iron, steel, concrete, glass, and roofing, such as steeply pitched with dormer windows. These are what the author identifies as the three key aspects of the “grammar of architectural language.”

Within this grammatical language is a vocabulary of building parts such as arches, vaults, roofs, towers, doors, and windows. In discussing columns and capitals, for example, orders are delineated: Doric characteristics are its frieze with alternating metopes and triglyphs; Ionic with characteristic scrolled capitals and fluted columns; and Corinthian with its capital covered with rows of acanthus leaves. Also, Christian capitals are discussed with references to the fold capital with its textile-like pattern of foliage intertwining in a guilloche pattern. Interesting are descriptions such as small, decorative points projecting from a curve of an arch known as cusping; the grotesque and “fanciful motifs of stylized animals and bird heads chomping down on rolled molding,” and sculpted keystones that decorate the center of a vault.

With the architectural background presented, one is able to recognize key characteristics. For example, in a comparison of The Temple of Hephaestus, built in Athens in 449 BC using the Doric Order and St. Pancras Church built in London in 1819-22 in Greek Revival style, the row of six columns topped by a triangular pediment on the front of the church looks like the front of the temple. Borrowing architectural cues from the Greek results in Greek Revival.

The draftsmanship of the fine pen and ink drawings, the color-coding of sections, the compactness of trim size, and the quantity of material presented, makes for an illuminated text. A book of architecturally refined elegance on a small scale.

*A Field Guide to Roadside Technology*

ISBN: 1556526091

176 pages, paperback, \$14.95

Author: Edwin J.C. Sobey

Publisher: Chicago Review Press

Did you know the parking meter was created and first used in Oklahoma? And that an animal touching an electric fence actually completes the circuit, thus delivering the small shock? With *A Field Guide to Roadside Technology*, discover the purpose, history, and workings of more than 150 gadgets you see every day but take for granted.

If you've surveyed the modern landscape, you've no doubt wondered what all those towers, utility poles, antennas, and other strange, unnatural devices actually do. Devices are grouped according to their "habitats"-along highways and roads, near airports, on utility towers, and more-and each includes a clear photo to make recognition easy. Once the "species" is identified, the entry will tell you its "behavior"-what it does-and how it works, in detail. This fascinating handbook answers the questions of anyone who has ever wondered about the many strange devices found along the roadside, from utility poles to satellite dishes. Devices are grouped according to their habitats—along highways and roads, atop buildings, near airports, and on utility towers. More than 150 different roadside technologies are covered, and each detailed entry describes what the device does, how it works, and also includes a photograph for easy identification. With helpful sidebars describing related technical issues such as why stoplights are constructed with the red light on top, this handbook for curious readers provides carefully detailed descriptions and the history behind many of the devices that roadside travelers take for granted.

\*\*\*

**Activists Unite! Changing Guard, Grassroots Opportunities**

Date of Event: July 1, 2008

Time: 5:30pm

Location: First United Methodist Church Sanctuary, 811 5th Avenue

Heather MacIntosh, President of Preservation Action, the Washington, DC-based 501c4 grassroots lobby for historic preservation, will speak to urban activists about grassroots advocacy opportunities now, and after the November elections. This informal, interactive conversation with community members will take place in First United Methodist Church's vacated sanctuary in downtown Seattle. Daniels Development is hosting the event.

MacIntosh will share updates and insights about growing support for smart growth, historic and natural resource protection, affordable housing, urban revitalization, and cultural landscape conservation within Congress. She will explain how a growing network of nonprofit organizations nationwide is informing Congressional decision-making, and how the Northwest's urban activists can engage effectively during this historic moment in American history.

Before assuming her post at Preservation Action, Ms. MacIntosh was Preservation Advocate for Historic Seattle. From 1998 to 2000, she was Deputy Director of HistoryLink.org, the Seattle-based online encyclopedia of Seattle and Washington state history.

Preservation Action was established in 1974 to be the grassroots voice for historic preservation in Congress. Preservation Action is a national network of activists dedicated to adapting and protecting their community's most treasured assets. The network has helped save our national historic tax credit program and over the last few years has fought diligently to improve this credit. Preservation Action has helped increase funding for core programs established by the National Historic Preservation Act.

For more information, contact: Heather MacIntosh, <http://www.preservationaction.org>, 202-637-7873

\*\*\*

### **WSDOT Viaduct open houses in May drew 200 visitors**

More than 200 visitors attended one of three Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall open houses held last month in downtown, Ballard and West Seattle. Program staff was on-hand to answer questions about potential transit, I-5, and surface street improvements that could be included in a central waterfront solution. Staff also discussed how the central waterfront section of SR 99 could be replaced with an above-ground, surface or below-ground option.

Open house attendees also had the opportunity to view a short introductory video about the Moving Forward projects and the central waterfront decision making process. This presentation and other materials distributed at the meetings can be viewed at [www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/Viaduct/solution.htm](http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/Viaduct/solution.htm). Comments collected at the open houses were shared with the program team and the Stakeholder Advisory Committee during the committee's May 22 meeting.

WSDOT wants to hear from you about the Viaduct - On June 27, WSDOT will release the South Holgate Street to South King Street Viaduct Replacement Project Environmental Assessment to the public. Major construction will begin next year on this portion of the Alaskan Way Viaduct. In mid-2009, they will begin to remove and replace the southern mile of the viaduct from South Holgate Street to South King Street. The new road will improve safety and connections to and from SR 99, create an underpass for freight traveling to the Port of Seattle, and provide additional paths for bicycles and pedestrians.

Join WSDOT for two public hearings in July to learn about how the project will be built and how it will affect the surrounding area. You will have an opportunity to provide comments on the environmental assessment at the hearings. The public hearings will be held at the following locations:

July 10, 4:00 – 7:00 p.m., Town Hall, 1119 8th Avenue

July 15, 5:00 – 8:00 p.m., Madison Middle School, 3429 45th Avenue SW

You may also review the environmental assessment online at [www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/Viaduct/library-environmental.htm](http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/Viaduct/library-environmental.htm) beginning June 27 and submit comments to us by mail or e-mail. Please submit comments by August 11, 2008.

Mail: Washington State Department of Transportation  
Attn: Angela Freudenstein  
999 Third Ave., Suite 2424  
Seattle, WA 98104

E-mail: [southviaductEA@wsdot.wa.gov](mailto:southviaductEA@wsdot.wa.gov)

Central Waterfront update - While WSDOT makes progress on the north and south sections of the viaduct, WSDOT, King County, and the City of Seattle continue to work on a solution for the central waterfront section. The Governor, County Executive and Mayor plan to make a recommendation to the legislature at the end of this year.

The agencies are approaching the central waterfront project in a different way. Rather than focus only on SR 99, we are looking at the entire transportation system from Lake Washington to Elliott Bay, and from NE 85th Street to the city's southern limits. They are reviewing a number of options for SR 99, including above-ground, surface and below-ground concepts, as part of this new approach. Any solution will also consider improvements to I-5, transit service, and surface streets.

A Stakeholder Advisory Committee, made up of 30 community, business and interest group leaders, is providing input to help agency officials develop a recommendation for the central waterfront. Committee meetings are held on the fourth Thursday of the month and are open to the public. Beginning June 26, Stakeholder Advisory Committee meetings will be held from 4 – 7:30 p.m. at a new location:

Seattle City Hall  
Bertha Knight Landes Room  
600 Fourth Avenue

Additional information about the central waterfront can be found at [www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/Viaduct/centralwaterfront.htm](http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/Viaduct/centralwaterfront.htm).

\*\*\*

### **Livable Seattle Movement's Two Step Plan**

June 18, 2008

2 Step Citizens' Work Plan to Fix Seattle's Residential Land Use Emergencies and Prevent More

Step I Introduction - At the Seattle City Council's Planning, Land Use and Neighborhoods Committee Townhouse Forum, Councilmember Burgess, Planning Commissioner Eanes, and a citizen wondered if a "moratorium" would stop the townhouse invasion from destroying more neighborhoods and affordable housing. A moratorium is not the appropriate way to stop the bleeding: that's the role of Emergency Interim Controls.

Step 1 Proposal - Adopt "Interim Controls" on an emergency basis (3/4 vote) as is typically done in Seattle to halt and resolve serious errors. In this case, remove the over-encouragement of townhouses and in the "interim" figure out the most effective way to restore the townhouse's intended role as an important, but not domineering, housing type.

Step I Citizens' Tasks - Understand the difference between a moratorium and emergency interim controls:

~A moratorium stops development awaiting some missing condition, e.g. no sewers. Seattle avoids moratoriums. Former Councilmember Kraabel had a good explanation why this is so: "a total moratorium of all construction in specific zones is a significant disruption. With each special exception, our land use laws become more and more erratic. We must, therefore, have very substantial provocation for a moratorium."

~Emergency interim controls are another story: they stop the bleeding with a strong and certain fix and use the learning during the interim to inform the long-term fix, as measures somewhat less drastic become more apparent. Seattle uses them regularly: #113858 et al 1988-89, # 114428 '89, #114928 '90; # 116205 '92, #116616 '93, and Council Bill #113149 '00. <http://clerk.ci.seattle.wa.us/~public/CBOR1.htm>

\* Review with Single Family zoned neighborhoods whether they want to pursue emergency interim controls to stop megahouse abuses in Single Family while Councilmember Conlin's proposal is being reviewed, possibly amended and hopefully adopted late this year. (A PLUNC meeting takes an introductory look at Conlin's proposal on June 25th.)

\* Build the necessary support for a 3/4 Council vote by advocating the 2 Step approach to neighborhood government organizations (CNC, SNC, & SCCF's member councils), ad hoc issue-based or professional organizations, and the media.

\* Consider and reach agreement on what development standards, etc. to propose modifying to use as the interim controls. SCCF is holding a workshop on June 21 that will include this topic. See details at bottom of page.

Step 2 Introduction - At the Townhouse Forum, panelists from both ends of the spectrum suggested mutual respect: simple rules that assure prompt permitting of "everyday projects" and freedom to explore new directions and high quality work.

Step 2 Proposal - Strengthen the two-tier nature of the existing code. Create a more foolproof first track—clear, simple, and fast and a second departure track that more effectively achieves community goals. The present two tiers aren't working at all. The first tier is so complex nobody, including DPD, can understand it. The proposed updates are even worse. The departure track is similarly complex and, in addition, time-consuming, arbitrary, and totally ineffective at turning destructive projects back on course, much less enabling desirable ones.

Council directives may have gotten lost in all the fooling around, but the assignment is quite clear: Resolutions 29860 (11/98), 30075 (10/99) —ask for a code that is "understandable, user-friendly and can be administered and enforced in an efficient and effective manner;" Resolutions 30138 (3/00), 30161 (4/00)— set out to "reduce complexity and increase understandability of the Land Use Code."

<http://clerk.ci.seattle.wa.us/~public/RESN1.htm>

The 98-99 resolutions grew out of and reference a consultant's report "Land Use Code Simplification" Issues and Options 9/98 (Cedar River Associates, paper copy only). Similar, more abbreviated recommendations appear in the May 1997 conference report cosponsored by the Puget Sound Regional Council (page 38file://localhost/). <http://www.smartgrowth.org/pdf:LIVABLE.pdf>

- First tier— "As-of-right" procedures impose strict requirements in return for prompt permits. "As-of-right" is a legal term meaning entitlement upon compliance. To work well, as-of-right standards must be simple to understand and restrictive enough to assure that projects are in context with their current or envisioned surroundings (the latter is the case in urban villages). Environmental and design review would be required for projects that exceed designated thresholds. Guidelines and procedures would be improved (see also second tier).

Such standards would create needed more rational, predictable bases for a growing list of incentives and floating bonuses. This list nears epidemic proportions—already so many that the City is at serious risk of violating the "first-do-no-harm" and the equity principals of zoning.

- Second tier— "Optional design departure" procedures hold "better ideas" to clear and lucid tests we can all understand. "Clear and lucid" is plain talk for the legal term "rational nexus" (connection). To avoid being "arbitrary and capricious" and get intended results, individualized departure decisions must be managed for results. Design guidelines must prove themselves concise; review procedures must prove themselves sound; reviewers must prove themselves qualified; and outcomes must prove themselves effective at ensuring long term appeal and good manners, which means taking only one's share of sunlight, view, tranquility, streetscape and street use, etc.

Guidelines to consider in reconsidering existing guidelines: the Uptown CC's 1997 proposal to clarify Citywide Guidelines (paper only at the moment) and SHA's guidelines for developers at [HOPE VI @ Highpoint http://www.seattlehousing.org/development/highpoint/Images/HighPointDesignBook2.pdf](http://www.seattlehousing.org/development/highpoint/Images/HighPointDesignBook2.pdf) (a take off on the "standard plans" approach mentioned at the Townhouse Forum).

Citizens' Step 2 Tasks -

\* Persuade the City to make use of information learned during the interim periods in resolving final fixes that reliably and consistently achieve community goals and are much easier for citizens and applicants to use.

\* Persuade the City to leave the remainder of the Residential Land Use Code as-is and instead 1) simplify the as-of-right standards by gradually removing exceptions and classifications not worth the complication, and 2) improve the clarity of design guidelines and departure procedures to effectively deal with special situations.

\* Persuade the City to adopt and place in permanent memory the idea that land use codes need to accommodate change in the same way that nature limits and culls mutations—improving the as-of-right standards through regular and candid review of design departure, looking regularly for consistently better results from commonly requested departures.

Offered for Consideration, by the Livable Seattle Movement <http://www.livableseattlemovement.org/>

\*\*\*

### **Seattle Streetcar network community input opportunity**

Seattle is in the midst of a period of transformational change in both its transportation system and its urban neighborhoods. The need to replace major roadway infrastructure in the SR99 and SR520 corridors, and concerns about climate change, are driving examination of new approaches to providing urban mobility. Significant new transit investments, including Sound Transit's light rail system and King County metro's Rapid Ride bus network, will soon come online and several neighborhoods within or adjacent to the center city are becoming increasingly dynamic settings as they begin to realize the jobs and housing density objectives of the City's Comprehensive Plan for growth management.

Seattle opened its first modern streetcar line in December 2007 in this changing urban context. This 1.2 mile initial segment in the South Lake Union neighborhood is demonstrating that the advantages that streetcars have brought to other cities are transferable to Seattle, and has sparked renewed interest in a broader streetcar network in and around the center city. Four potential new lines have been identified that would connect such neighborhoods as Fremont, Ballard, Eastlake, the University District, and the Central District to Downtown and South Lake Union.

The Seattle City Council wants your input and ideas on these proposed lines, and will be holding a series of community forums on the expanded network in early July. Each forum will offer a presentation on the four lines, and then give community members a chance to view them up close and offer feedback. The forums are taking place as follows:

Wednesday, July 2, 4:00 -6:00 pm, Proposed Central Line, Seattle City Hall, 600 Fourth Avenue, Bertha Knight Landes Room, First Floor,

Tuesday, July 8, 4:00 -6:00 pm, Proposed Ballard/Fremont Line, Nordic Heritage Museum, 3014 NW 67 Street

Wednesday, July 9, 4:00 -6:00 pm, Proposed U-District Line, University Heights Center, 5031 University Way NE

Tuesday, July 15, 4:00 -6:00 pm,- Proposed First Hill Line, Yesler Community Center, 917 E. Yesler Way

For more information on the proposed Streetcar Network expansion, visit:

<http://www.seattlestreetcar.org/future.asp>

\*\*\*

### **Viaduct interest group briefings**

WSDOT, King County and the City of Seattle are hosting interest group briefings for the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program's central waterfront project. The first briefings will be for environmental and transit, bicycle and pedestrian interest group members. Future briefings will be held for business and freight groups.

Based on community feedback, we combined the environmental and transit, bicycle and pedestrian groups, since they are interested in similar information. We are providing two briefing times, and the same presentation will be offered on both dates.

- Tues., July 8, from 6 to 8 p.m. at Plymouth Congregational Church, 1217 Sixth Ave.
- Thurs., July 17, from 6 to 8 p.m. at Union Station, Sound Transit Boardroom, 401 S. Jackson St.

Due to room size, seating is limited to 50 for each briefing. If you would like to attend, RSVP via e-mail to [viaduct@wsdot.wa.gov](mailto:viaduct@wsdot.wa.gov) or by calling 1-888-AWV-LINE.

\*\*\*

### **Member Sought For International Special Review District Board**

Mayor Greg Nickels invites people to apply for one open position on the International Special Review District Board. An elected position (Position #2 - Resident, Tenant, Community Participant) has become vacant and, in accordance with the Board's Rules and Procedures, will be filled through a Mayoral appointment.

The appointee will complete the remainder of the elected term, which ends November 30, 2009. Individuals who live in the District, are a member of a community organization, or demonstrate active interest in the community and have an interest in historic preservation are encouraged to apply.

The 7-member International Special Review District Board reviews façade alterations, signs, new construction, changes of use, and street improvements within the International Special Review District. The goals of the board are to maintain architectural character, cultural heritage, social diversity, and through the use historic preservation, enhance the economic climate in the International Special Review District. The board is made up of five elected members and two members who are appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the City Council. The five elected members consist of: two members who own property in the International District, or who own or are employed by businesses located in the International District; two members who are either residents (including tenants) or persons with a recognized and demonstrated interest in the welfare of the Chinatown International District Community; and one member at large.

Board meetings are held 4:30 p.m. on the second and fourth Tuesdays of the month. In addition, board members may be asked to serve on an additional committee as the Board deems appropriate. Applicants must reside within the city of Seattle.

Those interested in being considered should send a letter of interest and resume by June 30, 2008. In keeping with Mayor Nickels' "Paper Cuts" program, electronic submissions are preferred, if possible. Please email your letter and resume to: [rebecca.frestedt@seattle.gov](mailto:rebecca.frestedt@seattle.gov) (please reference International Special Review District Board in the subject line). To send a paper submittal, please address to:

Rebecca Frestedt  
International Special Review District  
Department of Neighborhoods  
700 5th Avenue  
PO Box 94649  
Seattle, WA 98124-4649

The City of Seattle is committed to promoting diversity in the city's boards and commissions. Women, persons with disabilities, sexual and gender minorities, persons of color, and immigrants are encouraged to apply. For more information, please call Rebecca Frestedt, International Special Review District Board Coordinator, at 206.684.0226.

\*\*\*

### **City of Seattle Looking at New Rules for Unreinforced Masonry Buildings—Mandatory seismic retrofits contemplated for vulnerable structures**

The City of Seattle is considering possible new requirements for the city's unreinforced masonry buildings (URMs). The Reid-Middleton engineering firm recently completed a study commissioned by the City, which estimates there are up to 1,000 URMs in the city, most of which have not been retrofitted for seismic safety. The study, posted at [www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Unreinforced\\_Masonry\\_Buildings](http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Unreinforced_Masonry_Buildings), also summarizes the experience of several California cities which have instituted a similar requirement over the past two decades. Those cities offered ten years or more for building owners to meet the new requirements.

“This is a public safety issue,” said Mayor Nickels. “No one’s rushing into this decision, and we will deliberate over the coming months before reaching any conclusions. But Seattle is in earthquake country and URMs are our most vulnerable structures. We need to address the issue of safety in these structures in a major quake.” In the Nisqually earthquake of 2001, a relatively mild seismic event, two-thirds of the buildings in Seattle that were closed due to earthquake damage were URMs.

Currently, Seattle requires seismic retrofits when a building is undergoing substantial alterations or substantially increasing the number of occupants in the building. In the coming months, DPD will convene a technical committee to begin assessing what seismic standard would be required for URMs if the new mandatory fix is adopted. A policy committee will develop positions concerning how long owners would have to meet the new requirement, which structures it will apply to, and what the penalties might be for not complying within the set time period. The City will also be researching sources of funding support for owners of URMs, particularly those providing affordable housing and human services, as well as landmarked buildings.

If adopted, Seattle would be the first city outside California to adopt such a requirement. Scientific information in recent years has raised the projected risk of significant damage from earthquakes in Seattle.

\*\*\*

Christine Palmer, Preservation Advocate  
HISTORIC SEATTLE  
Dearborn House, 1117 Minor Avenue  
Seattle, WA 98101  
206.622.5444 x 226, Fax 206.622.1197  
e-mail: [christine@historicseattle.org](mailto:christine@historicseattle.org)  
website: [www.historicseattle.org](http://www.historicseattle.org)  
*Educate, Advocate, Preserve*