



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 262/16

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
City Hall
600 4th Avenue
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room
Wednesday, April 20, 2016 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Marjorie Anderson
Deb Barker
Nick Carter
Kathleen Durham
Jordon Kiel, Vice Chair
Kristen Johnson
Julianne Patterson
Matthew Sneddon
Mike Stanley

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Rebecca Frestedt
Genna Nashem
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Robert Ketcherside
Aaron Luoma, Chair
Jeffrey Murdock

Vice Chair Jordan Kiel called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

042016.1 SPECIAL TAX VALUATION

Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

042016.11 WA and OR Railroad and Navigation Building (C and H)
304 Alaskan Way S.

Ms. Nashem explained the Special Tax Valuation Incentive Program while board members viewed photos of improvements. She said the submitted rehabilitation costs were \$1,034, 730.55 all of which were eligible.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board members determined they had enough information to make a decision.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: WA and OR Railroad Building / C and H Building, 304 Alaskan Way S., that this action is based upon criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; and based upon the recommendation of the Pioneer Square Preservation Board which made the following findings at its meeting of April 20, 2016, that the property is a contributing building located in the Pioneer Square Preservation District, and has not been altered in any way that adversely affects those features that identify its significance or contribution to the Pioneer Square Preservation District; and that the property has been issued Certificates of Approval as required in the District; and has been substantially improved in the 24-month period prior to application, and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Landmarks Preservation Board and the owner.

MM/SC/NC/DB 9:0:0 Motion carried.

042016.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

042016.21 Harvard-Belmont Landmark District
800 East Aloha Street
Proposed alterations and replacement of windows

Alix Day explained the proposal to widen the south two windows and said it will only be somewhat visible from street. She said it is part of a kitchen remodel. She said they propose to change from two to four windows on the front façade; new will be an upgrade to match existing windows in character and form. She said that all brick will be salvaged and reused.

Ms. Nashem said the south elevation is the only one visible. She said that Committee, Mr. Luoma and Merrily Chick, noted the house is set back and uphill from the street. Work is minimally visible and the changes are in keeping with the character of the house.

Responding to questions Ms. Day said that the sill at the new four window location will be raised up.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Board members determined they had enough information to make a decision.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board issue a Certificate of Approval for revision to the window openings on the South elevation and replacement of windows with new Marvin wood windows with simulated divided lights at 800 East Aloha Street as proposed.

The proposed exterior alterations meet the following sections of the District ordinance and The Harvard Belmont District Guidelines:

District ordinance

The proposed restorations plans as presented April 20, 2016 do not adversely affect the special features or characteristics of the buildings as specified in SMC 25.22.

The other factors of SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable

The Harvard Belmont District Guidelines

2. CRITERIA AND VALUES

The category of the building shall be considered when changes are proposed. Category 1 buildings are the most important in the district and these properties shall, to the greatest extent possible, retain the intrinsic historic values recognized when the district was formed.

Building Categories

Category 2: Buildings or sites with less architectural significance. However, because of scale, design, use of materials, or location, these buildings make a positive and compatible contribution to the character and appearance of the area as a whole and to the Category 1 buildings in particular.

This building is Category 2

3. GUIDELINES

C. INDIVIDUAL BUILDINGS

1. Additions or renovations

Guideline: Additions should be sympathetic to the original design and should not, except as additions, change the character of the original structure which is being preserved.

Guideline: Preserve the visual quality of individual facades including use of materials, form and structure.

Secretary of Interior Standards

5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.

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

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

MM/SC/DB/NC 9:0:0 Motion carried.

042016.22

Columbia City Landmark District

4801 Rainier Avenue South

Proposed signs

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed installation of two signs: 1) an internally-illuminated wall sign to be located on the north façade. (Dimensions: 8' w x 3' 3.5"h) and, 2) an illuminated double-sided blade sign on the canopy along Rainier Ave. S. (Dimensions: 3' 8" w x 1' 8" h). Exhibits included photographs, renderings and samples. The Angeline is a non-contributing building located within the Columbia City National Register District. The Committee reviewed an alternate presentation on March 1st for a larger wall sign to be installed on the diagonal structural supports. That proposal was not supported by the committee due to concerns about placement and scale. The Landmarks Preservation Board approved a Certificate associated with Final Design in 2014. On April 5, 2016 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. Committee said the modifications to the size and placement of the sign on the north façade were a big improvement. They thanked the applicant for adding a blade sign along Rainier Ave. S. The Committee recommended approval of the proposal.

Applicant Comment:

Temple Voorhees, Berry Sign Systems, explained the proposed mounting for the sign on the north façade. He said the power will come through the supports. The sign is single faced, internal lit LED and push-through lettering. He said the blade sign will go under – and be suspended from – the canopy. He said the support rods and mounting will be painted to match the canopy. The sign is double-faced, internal lit LED, with push-through letter and graphics.

Mr. Carter asked if attaching into the mortar will be able to take the load.

Mr. Voorhees said that they may have to bolt into the structure behind the brick.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Sneddon said the building is non-contributing and the signage is in character with adjacent.

Ms. Barker said the scale is appropriate.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signs, located at 4801 Rainier Ave. S, as proposed.

This action is based on the following:

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

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

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

- a. **Window Signs and Hanging Signs.** Generally, painted or vinyl letters in storefront windows and single-faced, flat surfaced painted wood signs are preferred. Extruded aluminum or plastics are discouraged and may not be allowed. Window signs shall not cover a large portion of the window so as to be out of scale with the window, storefront, or facade.
- b. **Blade Signs.** Blade signs (double-faced projecting signs hanging perpendicular to the building), that are consistent in design with District goals are encouraged. Blade signs shall be installed in a manner that is in keeping with other approved blade signs in the District. They shall not hide, damage, or obscure the architectural elements of the building. The size should be appropriately scaled for the building.
- g. **Sign Lighting.** Sign lighting should be subdued and incandescent. Back-lit signs are prohibited. Signs that flash, blink, vary in intensity, revolve or are otherwise in motion or appear to be in motion shall not be permitted.

Secretary of the Interiors Standards

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

MM/SC/NC/MSN 9:0:0 Motion carried.

042016.23

Hiawatha Playfield

2700 California Avenue SW

Proposed site alterations for fitness area

Mike Schwindeller, DOPAR, explained the proposed installation of adult fitness equipment in what he noted is an Olmsted designed park. He went over a preliminary Olmsted plan noting use zones that talk about outdoor exercise for girls and boys in 1911. He said the fitness area is proposed for an area adjacent to the children's play area. He said that they will locate it to the south of the existing swing set and said that it keeps to the perimeter of the park in character with Olmsted design. He said it will be on a 25' x 35' pad with mow strip around; artificial safety surfacing will be used as required. He said a 21" x 33" sign "Welcome to Fitness Zone" will be similar in finish to the rest of the equipment.

Ms. Barker asked if the plan had been shared with the Admiral Community Council.

Mr. Schwindeller said there was a public meeting in 2015.

Mr. Carter asked if the Friends of Olmsted had been notified.

Mr. Schwindeller said he reached out to them.

Ms. Johnson said it is a small intervention in terms of the overall park and it will be located where there was an intent for play.

Mr. Kiel appreciated the location and ability for parents to watch their kids.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Sneddon asked if the 1984 map showed existing conditions.

Mr. Schwindeller said is it close; there is a service road and shot put zone.

Ms. Doherty went over designated areas of control.

Ms. Barker said she wished they had discussed with the community council and the Friends of Olmsted Park. She said she is familiar with the park and the location is appropriate. She worried about signage as a contrasting element in an area devoid of that.

Mr. Sneddon said his initial thought was that it was a departure from original Olmsted design. He said there are a lot of elements there and noted the loss of original geometry.

Mr. Kiel said this is a contemporary use of the park.

Ms. Barker said that there are no fitness zones in other Olmsted parks.

Mr. Schwindeller noted there are fitness zones in Paul Burette, Van Asselt, and Delridge Community Center; he noted there will be two in West Seattle.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the site alterations, equipment and signage at the Hiawatha Playfield, 2700 California Avenue SW, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed site alterations, equipment and signage do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 113090 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The proposed alterations are undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired, as per Standard #10 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/KJ/DB 9:0:0 Motion carried.

In response to Mr. Sneddon's question, Ms. Doherty said the 1948 field house was an expansion to the original.

042016.24

777 Thomas Street

Proposed revisions to previously approved design

Mike Lama explained they propose to substitute a glazed sliding door for the overhead door and add fire department connection to the 8th Avenue façade. He said the glazed overhead door will conflict with mechanical system required for the space and they propose a pair of sliding glass doors that will sit below the mechanical equipment. It will be supported by steel tubing and will site within the landmark structure. The doors are similar in scale and proportion and echo the adjacent historic windows and doors. He said that the fire code states that fire connection cannot be within 10' of an entry; the Fire Marshal approved this location. He said that ARC had some concern that it

might impact the decorative chevron patten and asked them to look at options. He said they looked at options including ARC suggested placement on the north side. He said it is not feasible for sufficient water pressure so they shifted from the pilaster north to get the connections without impact to chevron pattern.

Ms. Johnson said they are adding louvers above the door and the mullions below will be updated. She said that ARC concern was for the fire department connection and said the third option was more reasonable. She said the applicant responded to ARC comments.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker and Mr. Kiel said it made sense and appreciated response to ARC comments.

Mr. Sneddon asked about the original function of the space.

Ms. Sodt said it was a garage.

Mr. Sneddon said it is a shame to replace the overhead door even though not original; from a functionality standpoint it hearkens the original intent.

Ms. Patterson said she would typically agree if the door had always been there but it had been replaced with windows and even that function has changed over time. She preferred option 3 for the fire connection device.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application exterior alterations at 777 Thomas Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed exterior alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 124501 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is compatible with the massing, size and scale of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/KJ/NC 8:1:0 Motion carried. Mr. Sneddon opposed.

042016.25

Bon Marché / Macy's
300 Pine Street

Proposed revisions to previously approved design

Jack McCullough said they had a few modifications to a Certificate of Approval.

Brian Gowers explained the modifications are part of the re-tenanting plan. He said the small dedicated elevator lobby will be expanded and a fourth car added. The elevator lobby will be reconfigured and the shuttle elevator will be eliminated and the shaft changed to an overrun. He said the deck will be expanded slightly to the north. He said the proposed skylights will change in size and spacing.

Mr. McCullough said that Starwood Capital was going to have a single tenant and that drove the placement of the skylights; now it will be a multi-tenant space so that impacts placement.

Mr. Gowers said they propose to remove the modern aluminum door and steps and restore the chamfered corner entry at the existing café location. He said that it will merge the café space with the lobby. He noted the intent to bring in a coffee vendor / roaster and said that venting will be needed. He said that they propose modern Kawneer door to restore entry re-using original parts. He said that original ornate bronze pieces will be reused. He said that the mechanical rooms will move from 5 to 4; louvers and windows will be exchanged. He said that the 6th floor sky bridge will allow continued access to Macy customers and they will re-do the doors.

He said that a 50' x 50' roof deck will be for office tenants only. He said they will create two clerestory pop-ups to bring light down into the 8th floor. He said they will add plantings. He said that the elevator lobby will serve 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th floors. Small sky lights will be evenly spaced around the perimeter. He said that air intake sheds, elevator pop-up, and new chiller will be added.

Mr. Gowers said that on the exterior elevation on the north side they will add green windows with concrete sheer wall behind. He said that they will refurbish and install glass on 7th floor windows. He noted which windows would be changed to louvers and which louvers will change back to windows. He went over window refurbishing on 5th, 6th, and 7th floors. He explained a faux blind technique that has been used in the past to disguise blocked windows but noted venetian blinds are being phased out. He said they propose to paint the back side of windows to look like rolled blinds at varying heights in sheer wall areas.

He said that a new entry door will be added on Pine: Kawneer fixed glass panels with two swinging doors. He said that a flue will be added for the coffee roaster; they will use a special oxidizer on the coffee roaster so that

they won't have a sooty buildup. He said that above the entry they will center the flue in one of the stone panels just above the awning; it will be painted to match the limestone. He went over sight lines for the over-run and machine room and provided photos.

Ms. Johnson said that ARC had no concern with what is proposed for the roof. She said that she appreciated the reuse of existing material to remake the corner entry. She said that the changes to the louvers / windows are due to the sheer walls which have been placed where they are to keep Macys operating. She said ARC said to save the limestone panel that is being removed for the coffee roaster exhaust so that it can be replaced.

Mr. Kiel said that the elevator overrun is tall but there is other equipment there and it is stepped back.

Ms. Sodt said that the Ordinance anticipates that louvers will be added and removed and can be administratively reviewed but are being presented here to provide a holistic picture of the project.

Mr. Stanley said the vent seems a bit much.

Mr. Gowers said that it is the worst case scenario and they hope to make it less noticeable.

Ms. Barker asked why the duct can't be dropped so it is facing upward.

Mr. Gowers said it is fairly hot so some distance is needed per mechanical engineer. He said they could drop it a bit more but they want to stay in the center.

Ms. Barker asked if there is anything they can add that can act as a heat shield. She said it is a historic property and canopy and wondered if there were waivers.

Mr. Gowers said no that this is combustion and intense heat. He said he was code related and that he was not aware of any type of heat shield. He said they can't rotate it because the rain shield that helps shed water off.

Mr. Stanley asked about the sign shown on 7.

Ms. Sodt said she will make a note.

Ms. Barker said she was pleased with everything else – that it was thoughtful. She said she is not happy with the mystery coffee roaster destroying the side and said this is a very key façade.

Mr. McCullough said they want to activate the space.

Paul Brenneke said they want a local small coffee shop and to maintain a unique environment.

Ms. Barker said to really think it through – the vent marred the appearance.

Mr. Sneddon said he was excited the windows were being returned but was disappointed the louvers were returning.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application exterior alterations at Bon Marche/Macy's at 300 Pine Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed exterior alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 114772 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is compatible with the massing, size and scale of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/NC/MA 8:1:0 Motion carried. Ms. Barker opposed.

042016.26 Hamilton Middle School
1610 North 41st Street
Retroactive proposal to build parapet atop canopy

Tabled.

042016.5 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

042016.51 Seattle Times Building - 1947 Office Building Addition
1120 John Street

Ms. Sodt explained the request for a three-month extension and that she was supportive of that.

Ms. Barker asked for a status update.

Ms. Sodt said they have submitted a drawing for demolition. There have been four cycles and the most recent failed again.

Mr. Kiel said the building is still there even though the Board has been told there is immediate danger.

Ms. Sodt said she is hoping they will come before ARC with tower placement more compatible with landmark.

Action: I move to defer consideration for Controls and Incentives for the Seattle Times Building – 1947 Office Building Addition, 1120 Street, for three months.

MM/SC/DB/NC 8:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel recused himself.

042016.52 Seattle Times Building - Printing Plant
1120 John Street

Action: I move to defer consideration for Controls and Incentives for the Seattle Times Building – Printing Plant, 1120 Street, for three months.

MM/SC/DB/NC 8:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel recused himself.

042016.53 Kelly-Springfield Motor Truck Co. Building
1525 11th Avenue
Request for an extension

Ms. Sodt explained the request for three month extension.

Action: I move to defer consideration for Controls and Incentives for the Kelly-Springfield Motor Truck Co. Building, 1524 11th Avenue, for three months.

MM/SC/DB/NC 9:0:0 Motion carried.

042016.54 White Motor Co. Building
1021 E. Pine Street
Request for an extension

Ms. Sodt explained the request for a three month extension.

Action: I move to defer consideration for Controls and Incentives for the White Motor Co. Building, 1021 E. Pine Street, for three months.

MM/SC/DB/NC 9:0:0 Motion carried.

042016.3 DESIGNATION

042016.31 Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Exchange
1529 4th Avenue West

Susan Boyle presented the report (full report in DON file), she was accompanied by Dennis Reddinger (owner, SPL). She provided context of the building and site in Queen Anne and noted the basement and first floor of the building were constructed in 1921 and the second floor was added in 1929. She said the neighborhood is mostly residential properties with narrow lots. She said this was one of the early residential areas for the upper middle class. She noted the

connection to the role of young women in the workforce – switchboard operators called “Hello Girls”. She said their behavior was highly restricted and regulated. She said the earlier buildings were built heavy duty to support heavy equipment; they were fire proof and allowed in light. She said they are typically in residential neighborhoods. She said they are typically low scale buildings and provided photos of exchange buildings in other neighborhoods including West Seattle and Rainier Valley.

She noted the clarity of the formal entry with terracotta caps. She said the exchange building in Wallingford is very similar and still has its cornice. She said they were all built by the Office of Chief Engineer in the San Francisco. She said that 1929-30 drawings were by Seattle structural engineer Arthur Coddington; not much is known about his career. She said that later in the 1920s they used Bebb and Gould on other projects. She said there was no need for public use of the solid buildings. She said as time went by the buildings became more neutralized and functionalist. She said that the 1921 drawings show a C-shape with courtyard like space. The original one-story is tall floor to floor – 18’ 5” – and the addition replicates the details in the original design.

She said the library acquired the building, added an elevator and made revisions to stairs, installed bookshelves; they made few changes. In 1960s the cornice was still there. She said the exterior has been well-maintained and she noted the corbels, sills, and cap. She said the alley brick is more common and she noted the lift beam is still there. She said that the original entry has been removed and brick work at the entry has been damaged by a vehicle. She said the landscape envelopes the building and the terracotta isn’t really visible. She noted the strong deep mortar joints and the courtyard that brings light into the building.

Ms. Boyle walked the board through interior photos and noted the battleship linoleum, marble bays and thresholds, plaster cladding with some unclad wall areas, and several soldering niches including one at the main entry. She said the interior was never meant for public view or access.

Dennis Reddinger, Seattle Public Library, said the building was donated directly to the library from Pac Tel. He said the landscaping is overgrown and the grounds crew has planted a hodge podge of plantings over the years. He said the interior lighting has all been added and the building has been used for storage.

Ms. Doherty said the exterior and site were nominated and the board included the interior to explore it further at a tour.

Ms. Durham asked if the windows are original.

Ms. Boyle said they are although some have had wire glass added.

Mr. Sneddon said it is a concrete structure and asked about the interior framing.

Ms. Boyle said it is concrete columns and beams.

Mr. Sneddon asked if there are any remnants of the switchboards.

Ms. Boyle said they are all gone.

Mr. Reddinger said everything related to the telephone exchange use has been removed.

Ms. Barker said the niches are built into the wall.

Public Comment:

Leanne Olson, Queen Anne Historical Society, thanked the board for nominating the building and noted Michael Herschensohn's letter emphasizing the importance of the building to the community. She asked the board to designate.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Carter questioned if the building can convey what it is. He said it wasn't the first – it was the second in the neighborhood. He said the building has history and significance related to PT&T. He said the building has integrity. He said they wanted the building to blend into the neighborhood. He supported criteria C and D but did not support inclusion of the interior.

Mr. Stanley did not support designation. He said the building was made to blend in. He said it is utilitarian. He said it has integrity and some nice detail but doesn't rise to the level of significance to meet D.

Ms. Johnson said she was leaning toward supporting designation on criteria C and D. She said the building was intended to not convey what it was. She said the history of the business was interesting. She said it is a nice building and in good shape and noted the terracotta sills. She said she hoped it would be reused. She did not support inclusion of the interior.

Ms. Barker said the brick pattern is great as is the depth of thick reveals. She said addition melded perfectly with original building. She supported criteria C and D for the site and exterior, but did not support inclusion of the interior. She said she loved that it was designed for an introverted use. She said that women going into a building to talk to strangers and the issue of respectability and 'trust us'. She noted the friendly anonymity. She said the entry conveys strength. She said inside it is anonymous. She said the building needs a plaque explaining what used to be here and what the original use was.

Mr. Sneddon supported designation on criteria C and D. He said that it is an outstanding example of the development of the telephone industry in the west and the technology industry. He said that smaller shops were built and the architecture reflects the natural monopoly. He noted the tie with the labor history and the new working class of women. He said that the building needs something speaking for it to share the history. He said it reflects a significant aspect of the development of telephone history in Seattle and the location in Queen Anne. He noted the neoclassic language with subtle Beaux Arts elements, and said that the structure tells a story – the thick concrete columns and beams to support heavy equipment. He noted the massive scaling up and said the building was designed for expansion. He said the interior structural system is significant.

Ms. Durham echoed Mr. Sneddon’s comments. She said the building was designed to disappear. She said it was designed with details communicating what it was and to fit into the neighborhood. She said it was a utility building disguised to fit into a lovely part of the neighborhood. She supported designation on criteria C and D; she noted its relationship to the telephone industry and to the working class and introduction of women into industry. She did not support inclusion of the interior.

Ms. Patterson supported designation of the exterior and site based on criteria C and D, although she said she struggled with the double significance of C. She said each building and its siting in the neighborhood is important.

Ms. Anderson supported designation for same reasons expressed by other board members. She said that how a building was meant to blend in stands out. She said it needs assistance to tell its history but its architectural style and significance in its context are important. She said the interior structure is important.

Mr. Kiel did not support designation. He said it is a delightful building but not quite there as a landmark. He said it doesn’t have the double significance of C. He said it could be any building associated with a switchboard. He said Criterion D is interesting but the typology is all over the map.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Exchange at 1529 4th Avenue West as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C, and D; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the site; and the exterior of the building.

MM/SC/DB/NC 7:2:0 Motion carries. Messrs. Kiel and Stanley opposed.

042016.4

NOMINATION

042016.41

Firestone Auto Supply & Service Store
400 Westlake Avenue

Ellen Mirro, The Johnson Partnership, presented the report (full report in DON file). She provided context of the building and site. She did a virtual walk around of the building via photos and said the west and south are the primary elevations. She said on the south there are two wide bays and one narrow and on the west there are two wide bays and three narrower. She said the detail is painted terracotta and the original Firestone medallion. She said the southwest bay has been enclosed and the middle bay open. She noted the openness of the original first floor and explained that the 1949 Victor Voorhees remodel of the original salesroom created smaller bays, garage doors into exterior garage, bays opened up for gas pumps, terracotta and original medallion painted. She said the current signage was installed in 2010. The gas pump and drive through corner were removed.

She said the building didn't meet criteria A or B. She said it is casually associated with the development of South Lake Union and noted the auto related industry in the area at time it was built. She said this was a local office of a national company and noted style differentiation of offices in different locales. She said that this is one of the larger stores and it fit into Firestone's world without being regional in design. She said the building is associated with auto service and buildings that are often clustered together and noted the White and Kelly Springfield buildings in Capital Hill. She noted the more dispersed relationship in South Lake Union and said it was not an auto row as in Capital Hill. She said the upper floor is closed in and was used just for office. She questioned if it could convey its association.

Regarding Criterion D Ms. Mirro said that it is an eclectic terracotta commercial building of which there are quite a few in Seattle. She noted the Olympic Tower, Seattle Tower, 1411 4th, Federal Building, former Woolworth, Pacific McKay, among others. She said that in this building the terracotta is limited to windows and main floor. She said the paint detracts from the ability to convey its materiality. She said that the Austin Company designed and built the building; it was engineering, architecture, contractor combined into one and they had offices nationally. She said they build the Frye Building, Huston Swanson, and Boeing Administration Building among others. She said the Austin Company was innovative in their methods and materials and this is not an outstanding example of their work. She said there has been lots of development pressure in the area recently; she noted highlighted area landmarks on map. She said there are similarly scaled buildings and this one may not be prominent. She questioned the integrity and noted it was designed and built by a multi-national company.

Mr. McCullough said it is a utilitarian confused building and the office program doesn't work. He said there are significant integrity issues. He said it is a two story building and the character defining features were its large openings and with one exception all are closed in.

Ms. Barker left at 6:00 pm.

Ms. Patterson asked about the difference in auto type use here and on Capital Hill and why the switch to a retail focus.

Ms. Mirro said that service has always played a significant part of auto rows. She said the dispersal of auto rows all over the city happened because people wanted them local.

Mr. Sneddon asked the year of the map she used.

Ms. Mirro said it was 1905-50 version of South Lake Union area.

Mr. Sneddon asked if the spots represent 1950.

Ms. Mirro said they do.

Ms. Patterson said that Firestone original owned the building and sold it in 1943 but continued to lease it – she asked why.

Ms. Mirro said she thought it was a corporate restructuring when they merged with Bridgestone.

Public Comment:

Leanne Olson, Queen Anne Historical Society, said it is remarkable that it is still a tire store and has been since 1929. She said that despite the alterations which don't detract significantly its ability to convey what it is it has adapted over time to changes. She said it doesn't have to be high art.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, echoed Ms. Olson. She said she has led South Lake Union tours and there was an auto row along Westlake. She said that Pike Pine was the first but it expanded to Westlake by 1950. She said that many of the uses changes and she noted a 2014 context statement by Jennifer Meissner and Kate Krafft. She said the Cosmopolitan Motors building has been demolished and the Pacific Ford McKay buildings are a ghost of themselves – just facades. She supported the Staff Report and said the building is significant for its association with the significant development of Seattle and South Lake Union. She said that it is still used since the Depression is important. She said it has integrity and still looks the same. She said its second story adapted to tire use over time. She noted the landmarked Fashioncraft building. She said these buildings are all over the state and the Firestone building stands out; she said it is an identifier of what they were doing at the time. She said it still stands out.

Ms. Anderson said she hoped the presenter would clarify the significance of the building over time. She said it has an interesting context and utilitarian style and she noted it was situated in South Lake Union and is associated with the development of the motor industry. She said it has integrity despite remodeling and changes to convey what it is. She said it is an interesting story about South Lake Union as a whole. She wasn't sure.

Ms. Patterson supported nomination on criteria C and D. She said the most significant piece is that Firestone has occupied it almost 100 years. She said the changes over time met the demands of the same occupant and represent the history of the company. She said it is a shame the exterior terracotta is painted but the ornament is clear. The building has integrity to convey its significance.

Mr. Sneddon supported nomination and said regarding Criterion C the early 20th Century the auto had massive influence in a significant way the way commercial development shaped urban fabric. He said there was a new generation of auto row around South Lake Union that contributed to the growth of that area and also in Belltown. He said the whole regrade became new retail first was auto related. He said during the massive growth from 1910-30 Firestone was buying up farms in Liberia to supply rubber. He said this building fits within the national typology.

Ms. Johnson said she leaned toward not supporting nomination. She said it has Art Deco characteristics but is not distinctive. She said that regarding Criterion C there is no sense to how it fits into auto row in South Lake Union.

Mr. Stanley said he was on the fence but was willing to nominate to review more. He said it is an example of the rise of auto culture.

Mr. Carter said he was surprised it was not already a landmark. He said it has always been one of the more dominant buildings in South Lake Union. He questioned why they moved from Pike Pine to Westlake in the 1930s. He said it is not the best work of Austin. He said the building meets criteria D and F. He said the older buildings are becoming more prominent as we lost them. He said this has always been one of the more prominent buildings there.

Mr. Kiel said he was on the fence with the double significance of C. He said it is its own style – Firestone Style. He said it is a good example of that and he wants to see more around that to learn more. He supported nomination of exterior only.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Firestone Auto Supply & Service Store located at 400 Westlake Avenue for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the exterior of the building; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for June 1, 2016; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/JP/NC 8:1:0 Motion carried. Ms. Johnson opposed.

042016.6 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator