



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 343/17

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

600 4th Avenue

L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room

Wednesday, May 17, 2017 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker

Russell Coney

Garrett Hodgins

Robert Ketcherside

Jordon Kiel

Kristen Johnson

Julianne Patterson

Steven Treffers

Emily Vyhnanek

Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Rebecca Frestedt

Melinda Bloom

Absent

Kathleen Durham

Matthew Sneddon

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

051717.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

April 5, 2017

Deferred.

051717.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

051717.21 Columbia City Landmark District

4903 Rainier Ave. S. – Hastings Building

Signs

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed installation of white vinyl window decal signage to show pricing. Exhibits included plans, photographs, and samples. The Hastings Building was constructed in 1905. The building is considered an historic non-contributing building. The Landmarks Preservation Board approved the existing signage in September 2016. On May 2, 2017, the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. Committee members recommended approval of the proposal.

Jeffrey Calkins, Rudy's Barbershop, explained the white vinyl decals will be affixed to the window to advertise haircut prices.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker asked if decals would be applied to window only.

Mr. Calkins said yes.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signage at 4903 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:

Guidelines/Specific

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.

Secretary of the Interior’s Standard #10

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

051717.22 Seattle Center House / former Seattle Armory
305 Harrison Street
Proposed exterior alterations and sign

Jody Fox explained they will re-do the storefront system keeping the same configuration but matching the more historic system and what is at MOD Pizza. He said that they will update the logo on the blade sign – it will remain the same size. He said they will add a second curved railing to match existing on opposite side of building entry.

Ms. Doherty said the canopy is non-original and the proposed removal simplifies the storefront.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations at the Seattle Center House, 305 Harrison 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. 123298, 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/EV 9:0:0 Motion carried.

051717.23 The Exchange Building
821 Second Avenue
Proposed storefront alteration

Michelle Losenski explained Mosaic Salon will move into vacant space. Historic doors will be moved to another location. They will restore doors to match entrance doors and add an automatic door opener with wireless push button. She said they will add signage per building signage plan.

Ms. Sodt said that all doors along 1st Avenue are original.

Andy Wattula, owner, said the storefronts have changed but he doors are original.

Ms. Sodt said that it is possible that the doors have been in other locations at some point.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed storefront alterations at the Exchange Building, 821 Second Avenue, 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. 115038 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/RC/RK 9:0:0 Motion carried.

051717.24

Magnolia Elementary School

2418 28th Avenue West

Proposed building rehabilitation, addition, and site improvements

Mr. Kiel recused himself.

David Mount, Mahlum, walked board members through the presentation package and cut sheets (details in DON file). He explained that it is a capacity project that will include addition of a gymnasium, eight classrooms, and library. They will demolish existing library that was a later addition. He provided context of the school buildings, site and went over topography. He said they will address accessibility and will maintain as much open space as possible. He said they will maintain and restore the west and north landscape. He said they will rebuild the current entry stairs and raise the landing one step to match the inside floor level. He said they will be shortening the sidelights and door to do this. He said they will add a ramp and adjust stairs to the north entry. He said they will rebuild the steps as they are at the south entry. He said they have limited parking to maintain open space. He said the new gym structure will have hall that connects back to the main building.

He said that they will keep the classrooms intact and they will have similar use. He said that administration space will take over a classroom. The main mechanical systems will remain where they are now in the existing building. He said that the ramp and handrail will follow the slope up. He said that the landscape follows the diagonal and mimics the other side for symmetry. He went over the language for the new addition and noted they borrowed from existing buildings – brick. He noted the language of the historic building, rhythm of the windows and cornice and said that a gap allows the historic building to stand out. He said the quoining of the historic building turns corner. He said three exceptional trees will be maintained. He provided material palette for board perusal.

Mr. Mount said that they had a window survey done and is part of the submittal. He said it indicates condition of windows, where they will be preserved, and where they will be replaced. He said that windows in the classrooms, administrative area, and occupied areas will be replaced with new. He said they will replace existing door in-kind with custom wood to match details.

Mr. Coney asked about the window sill.

Mr. Mallet said they have maintained the slope. He said they propose a consistent, neutral palette of existing finishes. He noted the contrast of the dark wood and white walls and said they will bring in warm new materials. He said they will refinish wood trim a dark brown. He noted the added vestibule will provide security. He said they have maintained the wainscot and trim. He said the stairwells and new space will use replica of school light fixture. He said they will simplify the handrail detail on stairwell. He said they will level and cover stairs. He said they will furr out wall along stair to add structure. He said they have maintained the height in classrooms but lowered ceiling a bit in hallways with 'clouds' to hold equipment.

He said they will retain and restore classroom cabinetry. He said mechanical systems will be in soffit. He said they will replace classroom doors; they will be 6" smaller. He said upstairs they will restore the flooring and trim and will furr out and insulate exterior walls. He said the meeting room proscenium, detailing, stage, wainscoting, trusses will be preserved. He commented that ARC had reviewed the project seven times.

Mr. Treffers asked about the reconstruction of the primary stairway.

Mr. Mountt said that they will add new cast in place concrete, maintain and restore the guard rail, and add one more step.

Mr. Coney asked about window coverings in classrooms.

Mr. Mountt said they will be roller shades.

Mr. Coney asked about mechanical systems.

Mr. Mount said that there will be duct work and sprinkler pipe crossing. He said the lighting will be LED.

Ms. Vyhnanek asked about the fixture at the end of the interior stair.

Mr. Mountt said that it extends a little further to allow extension of handrail for Code.

Mr. Ketcherside said the board guided the applicant in this direction.

Ms. Patterson said that she looked at the window survey and more than half are in minor to moderate condition yet all classroom windows will be replaced.

Mr. Mount said that it is for student and staff comfort.

Ms. Barker said that the west façade is a different condition and what they propose makes sense.

Mr. Treffers said the most significant windows will be retained and restored.

Mr. Coney said the replacements are spot on.

Ms. Patterson asked about the south elevation overhang.

Mr. Mount said they wanted to keep the transparency and the new portion is set back a bit from the historic building.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board discussion:

Mr. Ketcherside appreciated the changes and noted the respect shown for interior elements. He said the applicant took great care to meet the needs of the school district, families and children.

Ms. Johnson said the new building is nicely compatible.

Mr. Treffers said it is a successful renovation and the new addition doesn't overwhelm the historic building.

Ms. Patterson said the interior walls are furred out to accommodate insulation.

Ms. Barker said the character defining features were retained carefully.

Mr. Mount said that cabinetry was retained in all classrooms.

Ms. Johnson said the kids are there all day and there is no air conditioning so the window plan makes sense.

Ms. Barker said the renovation has set the bar high for other school projects and she is happy with the result.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed building additions, exterior and interior building alterations, and site improvements at Magnolia Elementary School, 2418 28th Avenue West, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed additions, exterior and interior building alterations, and site improvements do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Report on Designation (LPB 435/15), as the proposed work 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/RK/KJ 8:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel recused himself.

051717.25

Loyal Heights Elementary School

2501 NW 80th Street

Proposed changes to previously approved building addition and site improvements

Jonah Jensen, BLRB Architects, provided context of the site and said they are protecting the historic features. He said that there have been cost reconciliation issues which resulted in the reduction of square footage in the addition. He said they removed the childcare space which will leave room for future portable. He said they simplified the fenestration and got rid of the colored glazing. He said they will round off corners to play area. He walked board members through the design drawing package. He said that on the second floor there are four classes per grade level and a flexible commons space. He said the roof form has been extended to provide weather protection. He said they removed all colored glazing which makes it more complementary to the historic building. He said that lightboxes at entry demarcate the entry.

Ms. Barker asked if they looked at extending the canopy any further south.

Mr. Johnson said that it was a cost issue. Responding to clarifying questions he explained that only the courtyard elevation has colored windows and noted that the glass is not visible from the street.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Johnson said she missed that the entry was framed. She said what is proposed is not hugely detrimental to the historic building.

Mr. Treffers said his preference would have been to see the brick carried through but the board's jurisdiction is the impact on the historic building. He said what is proposed is differentiated, reversible, doesn't impact the historic building, and is consistent with the Secretary of Interior's Standards. He supported the application.

Ms. Barker said that ARC worked hard to get a façade rhythm and tonality to balance the historic building. She said the removal of the brick opened a big can of worms; she said more is needed on the newly exposed gym.

Ms. Patterson didn't like the panels and noted the use of cheaper materials.

Mr. Jensen appreciated comments. He said by not being brick they will still meet SOI; the CMU was associated with cast stone of historic building and is removable.

Mr. Coney asked if childcare could be built in the future.

Mr. Jensen said not as planned. He said the childcare space was a bone of contention with the community. He said the associated childcare and play area were removed.

Mr. Hodgins asked if they considered brick along the gym.

Mr. Jensen said no, what they show is the look they were going for.

Ms. Vyhnanek asked about the removal of colored glazing at windows.

Mr. Coney said adding the gym structure was a challenge and noted that it was set back from the main entry and that they took the opportunity to hide it.

Ms. Barker suggested adding landscaping to screen it and integrate it better in to the site.

Mr. Treffers said the primary entry is not the historic entry; the new entry is on a secondary elevation. He said what is proposed meets the SOI and the addition is where you would want it – set back and not on the same plane as the historic building. He said the mass and scale is what we would expect.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for changes to the proposed building addition and landscape plan, as previously approved under Certificate of Approval (LPB 573/16), at Loyal Heights Elementary School, 2501 NW 80th Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed additions, and site improvements do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Report on Designation (LPB 171/15), 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/ST/KJ 6:2:1 Motion carried. Mmes. Barker and Patterson opposed. Mr. Kiel recused himself.

051717.3 NOMINATIONS

051717.31 Sheridan Apartments 2011 Fifth Avenue

Ellen Mirro, The Johnson Partnership, prepared and presented the nomination report (full report in DON file). She said the I-shape building has two light courts, one on the south and one on the north. She said the east façade is the only major façade. She walked board members around the building via photographs and noted the painted terracotta base and the painted entry section. She said the windows have been replaced; only one or two original windows remain in the basement lightwell. She said the terracotta is intact and she noted the elaborate cornice and corbels. She said there is a parking lot north of the north façade. She said the alley is utilitarian and the roof deck is a modern addition. She said the entry doors have been reconfigured and

replaced and do not meet code. She noted the original marble, plaster work and mailboxes. She noted the main staircase, modern elevator, double loaded corridor, and typical apartment unit.

Ms. Mirro said original windows were 8/1 wood sash and they have been replaced. She said the intact terracotta is character defining. She said the building does not meet criteria A or B. She said it is tangentially associated with the Regrade and apartment building history; the building was completed just after the second Regrade. She said that the development of the apartment buildings was associated with the development of hotels. She noted area landmarked apartments: Windham, Palladian, Ace Hotel, Franklin Apartments, Castle Apartments, among others. She said the building is a Beaux Arts / American Renaissance style and was building in 1914-15. Beaux Arts came out of the Ecole des Beaux Arts; she noted the Pioneer Square pergola, Frye Hotel, Arctic Building and Dexter Horton Building as examples. She said that terracotta is not common on Beaux Arts building and this building is a good example of that. She said the building is a good example of David Dow's work although he is best known for the Eastern Hotel; he and his brother, Matthew, were significant contractors in the Pacific Northwest. She said the building does not meet Criterion F.

Ms. Johnson asked if one has to walk up the stairs to take the elevator.

Ms. Mirro said yes.

Ms. Barker asked where the name came from.

Ms. Mirro didn't know.

Ms. Barker asked about the link between hotels and apartments.

Ms. Mirro said it was common to stay at a long-term hotel but at the turn of the century people wanted kitchens so they started to develop apartments with wall beds and kitchen.

Mr. Ketcherside said there were travel hotels, residential hotels, apartments, and boarding houses.

Mr. Coney asked if the building were marketed to women.

Ms. Mirro said it was woman-friendly. The building was promoted for business people, professionals.

Mr. Coney asked if there were other hotels in the area with similar occupants.

Ms. Mirro said there were more men at the Franklin. She said that here there was a female manager/housekeeper, Hazel Bloss, who was a champion of affordable housing.

Ms. Vyhnaneck asked about tenant employment.

Ms. Johnson said there was a variety.

Mr. Coney asked for more information about Hazel Bloss.

Ms. Mirro said that she was also a member of the Yacht Club and high society.

Mr. Treffers asked about interior alterations and the lobby entry rails.

Ms. Mirro said they are intact.

Ms. Sodt said the interiors were not included because it is not significant and it isn't public space.

Mr. Ketcherside noted the tall buildings around this one in a 1925 photograph. He said he would like to know what else was built around this time and noted the Metropolitan Tract and department stores on Pine. He said there is the same level of terracotta façade. He noted the city's movement north.

Ms. Mirro said the elevator was a big deal at the time.

Mr. Treffers said that the Eastern Hotel is Dow's only designated landmark.

Rich Hill said that it is a nice building but doesn't meet any of the criteria for designation.

Public Comment:

Brooke Best, Historic Seattle, supported nomination of this building and the Griffin, which will be discussed next. She said that no one should purchase a building and think they can throw it away. She said the building has high integrity.

Tiffany Jorgenson, Friends of Belltown, spoke in support of nomination. She said that Griffin Business College – which was significant to Belltown's workforce - was next door. She said the Sheridan was an SRO for men but kitchens and bathrooms were added for women. She said the terracotta is prominent and she noted the significance of terracotta as fire-proofing. She said the building meets criteria C, D, E, and F. She said it is associated with the commercial expansion of 1902-20. She said that architecturally it is rare to have apartment house property in classical design. She said it is taller and fancier than others in Belltown. She said that Dow was important. She said that it meets Criterion F in that it is distinct historical block at a neighborhood crossroads.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Ketcherside supported nomination and said he would like more information on the connection to other buildings at the time. He supported inclusion of exterior, entry lobby, and mailbox area.

Ms. Johnson supported nomination and said the terracotta is in great shape. She commented on the composition of the façade. She said it meets Criterion D.

Ms. Patterson supported nomination and echoed Mr. Ketcherside's comments, noting the lobby and marble.

Mr. Hodgins supported nomination and said he would like to learn more about how it fits into Criterion C. He said he would support nominating the interior but said it would be too tough to make that accessible.

Ms. Vyhnanek supported nomination.

Mr. Treffers supported nomination, noting Criterion C. He said terracotta was advertised for its durability and being fireproof. He said the building was market to women which could be notable and meet double significance. He said it meets Criterion E. He supported inclusion of interiors but noted accessibility issues.

Mr. Coney supported nomination and commented on the trend to cater to women workers. He said the terracotta is in great shape and he supported inclusion of interiors mentioned by other board members.

Ms. Barker supported nomination and noted criteria D and E. She said that this building is so much better than the landmarked Eastern Hotel. She said she wants to know more about the building's association with the regrade; it was built four years later. She said she wanted to know more about what else was built around this time. She said the building has huge integrity and she supported inclusion of interior elements – marble stairs and floor, railing.

Mr. Kiel supported nomination.

Mr. Ketcherside said to include the entry stair, original service elevator, seating area, mailboxes.

Ms. Barker requested a floor plan.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Sheridan Apartments at 2011 Fifth 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, entry stair, entry hall, and stair to next level; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for July 5, 2017; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

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

Griffin Building
2005 Fifth Avenue

Ellen Mirro provided context of the neighborhood and site. She said the main entrance is on 5th Avenue and has a terracotta entry surround. She said there are storefronts at street level and three floors over. She noted the cornice and pinnacles, pilasters clad in terracotta, vertical ornament, wood window mullions. She said the entry looks original. She said the alley façade is utilitarian. She said there are north and west lightwells. She said there is a chimney, parapet, asphalt shingle roof. She said everything inside has been remodeled; the front doors are original but nothing else inside is. She noted the dropped ceiling, concrete column, replaced skylights. She said the original egress stairs are in the alley.

She said that the open-air balcony was drawn as plate glass. She noted the transom windows. She went over changes and said the glazing has been replaced. She said the quatrefoil in the spandrels are gone, the flagpoles are gone. She said the glazing remains in the arched entry. She said the terracotta and front door are left. She said that the terracotta on the Virginia Street Façade is intact. She said that patching and repair have been done on façade and an engineering report notes some condition issues. She said the transoms are gone; quatrefoil ornament is gone. She said that 75% of the storefront material is gone but the storefront door furthest east is original. She said there are decorative wooden pieces around the glazing. She said that there has been patching done on terracotta. Door which led to mezzanine has been removed. She went over floorplan and how the space had been arranged with a pharmacy, and three other retail spaces.

Ms. Mirro said the building does not meet Criterion A. She said that regarding Criterion B there were different owners of the business college over time – Wilson, Racine, Griffin. She said that Webster and Stevens, photographers for the Seattle Times occupied space in the building for a time. She said regarding Criterion C, the building housed a vocation school and noted there were ten others in Seattle including the Metropolitan, ACME, and Cornish. She questioned if the building's typology is that of a school or urban office. She said it is an urban infill building; vocational schools rented in urban buildings. Regarding Criterion D, she said it is of concrete construction and cited the Gothic Styled Terminal Sales Building with its large windows as closest to this building. She said Frank Fowler designed the Bucklin Apartments, residences, Wilsonian Apartments, the Cornelius Apartments, Cornell Apartments, among others. She said the building does not meet Criterion F.

Mr. Kiel asked about the spandrel material.

Ms. Mirro said it is stucco.

Larry Johnson said it is original stucco.

Ms. Barker asked about applied decoration.

Ms. Mirro said the wood pieces at windows are original.

Mr. Treffers said the upper floor openings are the same, just the windows were replaced.

Ms. Patterson asked if there are any other vocational schools in the Gothic style.

Ms. Mirro said this one was purpose-built; the rest were in already-built buildings.

Ms. Johnson asked if there were many vocational schools.

Ms. Mirro said there was a lot of competition.

Mr. Coney said they were in business a long time and served a needed niche. He said there was loss of glazing and asked about terracotta.

Ms. Mirro said there is an engineering report; there has been some loss and some patching. She said the owners are concerned about the condition.

Ms. Johnson asked about concrete issues.

Ms. Mirro said there is spalling on structural part.

Ms. Barker asked how the south facing stucco is doing.

Ms. Mirro said it has been re-done.

Mr. Kiel said the backing to the stucco must be concrete.

Ms. Mirro said she didn't know how high up it goes.

Ms. Vyhnanek asked how this compares to other Collegiate Gothic buildings.

Ms. Mirro said this Collegiate Gothic style started here in 1915; it was firmly established by 1925, when this building was constructed.

Ms. Vyhnanek asked about the chimney.

Ms. Mirro said it is perhaps for the boiler but she didn't know.

Rich Hill said the building doesn't have integrity and that 75-90% has been changed. He said that there are problems with what is left – terracotta, stucco, concrete. He said it would be faux history at this point.

Public Comment:

Tiffany Jorgenson, Friends of Belltown, said there are no representatives of Neo-Gothic architecture downtown. She said to consider the neighborhood, which was a prominent, workforce environment and the school was here. She said there are no other vocational schools in Belltown. She said the building has integrity of terracotta and of significance to the neighborhood and its history. She said it meets criteria C, D, and F. She said its location adjacent to the Sheridan Apartments is important. She said it is at the crossroad to Downtown and Belltown and it presides as a neighborhood gateway entry to Belltown.

Brooke Best, Historic Seattle, said to look at the criteria, then look at the integrity. She supported nomination.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Patterson supported nomination and noted criteria C and D. She said it is the only purpose-built vocation; it embodies the Gothic style and conveys integrity. She noted the vertical wood mullions.

Mr. Hodgins supported nomination on criteria C and D. He said it was interesting that the school was established to fill a void in the rising industry of office jobs. He said there is enough ornamentation.

Mr. Treffers supported nomination on criteria C, D, and E. He said the vocation college was part of the significant economic heritage of the community and city. He said it was the only school that built its own building which was not common. He said it was unique in 1928 to advertise about the building's windows providing light and ventilation. He said the openings are a major character-defining feature even if the original windows are gone. He said the wood vertical members are there. He said there are some structural issues that are independent of what the board looks at. He said the board reviews if it can convey significance. He said it is a fairly outstanding work of the designer. He supported exterior only.

Mr. Coney agreed the criteria should be C, D, and F. He wanted to know how significant this was compared to other vocational schools.

Ms. Johnson said the criteria should be C and D. She said it was a purpose-built building; they picked a style that said 'important'. She requested a condition report.

Ms. Barker said the applicable criteria are C, D and maybe E and F. She wanted exploration of terracotta themes in ornate entry – if they were copied from somewhere. She said it was a purpose-built educational school.

Ms. Vyhnanek supported nomination and also noted that it was a purpose-built vocational school. She noted the Collegiate Gothic style.

Mr. Ketcherside supported nomination and said that nothing would change his opinion of the building. He said it is a union of Collegiate Gothic and Office Loft. He said the school prepared students for the work force and those who were attracted by the lure of college. He asked Ms. Mirro if she considered Chicago vocational schools.

Ms. Mirro said she had.

Ms. Barker said the architecture is large and flat and said only the Bittman Mann Building had that. She noted the longer upper level architecture and banded windows.

Mr. Kiel supported nomination on Criterion D. He said it has integrity. He noted the Collegiate Gothic style and defining characteristics are there. HE said the wood elements at windows were re-applied. He said the spandrels are intact. He said the basic feel and critical components are there.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Griffin Building at 2005 Fifth 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 July 5, 2017; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/ST/RK 9:0:0 Motion carried.

051717.4 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator