The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649, Seattle WA 98124-4649
Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 479/19

MINUTES
Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
City Hall
600 4th Avenue
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room
Wednesday August 21, 2019 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present
Manish Chalana
Russell Coney
Rich Freitas
Alan Guo
Jordon Kiel
Kristen Johnson

Staff
Erin Doherty
Melinda Bloom
Rebecca Frestedt

Absent
Deb Barker
Kathleen Durham
Garrett Hodgins

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

082119.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES
June 5, 2019 Deferred.

082119.2 APPOINTMENTS

082119.21 Columbia City Landmark District
Reappointments of Amanda Keating, Brooks Kolb and Colleen Thorpe to the Columbia City Review Committee

Ms. Frestedt explained three of the Columbia City Business Association appointments to the Columbia City Review Committee are up for re-appointment. The seated members have been recommended for reappointment by the Columbia City Business Association and the members have agreed to continue serve on the Committee. She requested confirmation of reappointments for the Columbia City Review Committee members by the Landmarks Preservation Board:

Amanda Keating is an architect with over 20 years of experience. She is a partner at Weber Thompson. She has been a resident of Columbia City and the surrounding area since 2006. Amanda was initially appointed to the Columbia City Review Committee in April 2012. She has brought her technical expertise and experience as a resident to her work with the Committee. She has agreed to complete a fourth term ending April 30, 2020.

Brooks Kolb is a landscape architect, with over 40 years of experience, with Brooks Kolb LLC Landscape Architecture. He has been a resident of Columbia City for over 20 years. He is the former president of Friends of Olmsted Parks, from 2007-2011, and is the chair of the Landscape Committee of the Volunteer Park Trust. Brooks was appointed by the CCBA in March 2017. He has agreed to complete a second, 2-year term ending May 31, 2021.

Colleen Thorpe is an architect/landscape architect, who has worked with Jones & Jones for over 28 years. She has been a resident of Columbia City since 1992. Colleen was appointed by the CCBA in March 2017. She has agreed to complete a second, 2-year term ending May 31, 2021.

Action: I move to reappoint Amanda Keating to the Columbia City Review Committee for a fourth 2-year term ending April 30, 2020.

MM/SC/KJ/RF 5:0:0 Motion carried.

Action: I move to reappoint Brooks Kolb to the Columbia City Review Committee for a second 2-year term ending February 28, 2021.

MM/SC/KJ/RF 5:0:0 Motion carried.

Action: I move to reappoint Colleen Thorpe to the Columbia City Review Committee for a second 2-year term ending May 31, 2021.

MM/SC/KJ/RF 5:0:0 Motion carried.

082119.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

082119.31 <u>American Meter and Appliance Building</u>
1001 Westlake Avenue North
Proposed signage

Abigail DeWeese explained that signage is needed for the event planning business. Architectural Review Committee requested additional information. She said the existing building is trapezoidal; the sign will go on the southeast façade. She provided a historic photo showing a lot of signage on the building. She said the sign will identify use; it will be an on-premise sign which is allowed here. She provided a rendering and indicated where the proposed sign will be installed on the south wall that was replaced following a fire. She said that each business could have a projecting sign and wall sign, up to 300 square feet. She said the wall sign is a better option. She said they are not proposing a second sign nor is lighting proposed. She said they surveyed other on-premise signs of this scale at the Palladian and E. E. Robbins buildings.

Owner said they propose the same system as used at the Palladian and at Mohai. He noted preference for the CMU infill on the south wall which is the least intrusive.

Mr. Chalana arrived at 3:40 p.m.

Ms. DeWeese said the sign is a cable system with canvas; the canvas will be high quality material.

Mr. Freitas asked if they looked at painting the sign on.

Ms. DeWeese said that is costly.

Owner said they are struggling to get a return on the building; the event business is not profitable, and painting is costly.

Mr. Chalana asked about sign attachment.

Owner said it is cable system; at four points it is bolted into wall and sign is attached via stretch cable and zip tied all around.

Mr. Chalana said the impact will be minimal.

Mr. Kiel said it is reversible.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Deliberations:

Mr. Kiel said it is reasonable and reversible.

Board members noted support for the sign and noted the event planning business is on site.

Ms. Johnson said it is not overtly commercial.

Ms. DeWeese said that Steve Sampson, SDCI, helped with the language.

Ms. Doherty said they have demonstrated the business is in the building.

Mr. Coney said he was not opposed to what was proposed.

Mr. Chalana said it is rather large. He said he is no fan of the graphic but that he would support what was proposed.

Mr. Freitas supported the proposal.

Mr. Guo asked if trees will obstruct sign.

Owner said the sign is less than 14% of the entire wall and is larger because trees are in front.

Mr. Coney asked if review will be required if graphics change.

Ms. Doherty said it would be considered a new sign and would need board review.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed signage at the American Meter and Appliance Co. Building, 1001 Westlake Avenue North, 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 the Report on Designation 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/AG 6:0:0 Motion carried.

Ms. Doherty clarified no light will be installed.

Ms. DeWeese said that will be taken out of drawings.

Ms. Johnson said they didn't include lighting in their motion.

082119.32 <u>Lake Union Steam Plant</u>
1179 Eastlake Avenue East
Proposed scaffolding and temporary window sash removal

Taylor Warren, Turner Construction, proposed removal of windows from 1993 retrofit along the north façade. He explained they will erect scaffold to get equipment into building because it won't fit in elevator. He said there will be a hole in the concrete column. Windows will be moved, stored, and reinstalled. He said there will be two anchor holes at each level; when scaffold removed holes will be filled with non-shrink grout.

Mr. Freitas asked if the columns are painted.

Mr. Warren said they are painted beige.

Bill Ketchum, Turner Construction, said the windows are double glazed, aluminum frame.

Ms. Johnson asked if the whole frame will be removed or just the sash.

Mr. Warren said just the separation panes come out; all will be removed from inside as well.

Mr. Coney asked how all the steam plan equipment was installed.

Mr. Ketchum said at higher level some larger steel members asked as a track.

Mr. Warren said in 1993 additional upper floors were added.

Mr. Freitas asked how long the scaffold will be up.

Mr. Warren said a maximum duration of September 2019 through July 2020.

Ms. Johnson said ARC thought it reasonable; she agreed and said it is a good solution.

Mr. Kiel agreed and said it will have the least impact.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations at the Lake Union Steam Plant, 1179 Eastlake Avenue East, 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. 117251 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/KJ 6:0:0 Motion carried.

082119.4 SPECIAL TAX VALUATION

082119.41 RKO Distributing Co. Building
2312 Second Avenue

Ms. Doherty passed out photos of work to board members and explained the Special Tax Valuation program. She reported that submitted and eligible rehabilitation costs were $1,077,903.91; there were no disallowed costs. Work related to the designated

features of the property were performed in conformance with Certificates of Approval issued by the Landmarks Preservation Board.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: RKO Distributing Co. Building, 2312 Second Avenue, that this action is based upon criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; that this property 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/KJ/RC 6:0:0 Motion carried.

082119.5 TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS

082119.51 Ainsworth & Dunn Warehouse
2815 Elliott Avenue

Jessica Clawson said they preserved TDR which will be sold as soon as the document is signed. She said they have two purchase and sale agreements for 72,000 square feet.

Ms. Doherty explained the Board is requested to verify the eligibility of the Ainsworth & Dunn Warehouse at 2815 Elliott Avenue for the transfer of development rights (TDR); the Board is also requested to approve the required covenant. The code provisions require:

- Designation of the building(s) as a City of Seattle Landmark, pursuant to SMC 25.12;
- Execution of a Controls and Incentive Agreement regarding the Landmark and recording of same against the property;
- Receipt of a TDR authorization letter from SDCI, which establishes the amount of TDRs available for transfer from the sending site;
- Provisions of security to assure completion of any required rehabilitation and restoration of the landmark, unless such work has been completed.
- The owner must also execute and record an agreement in the form and content acceptable to the Landmarks Preservation Board providing for the maintenance of the historically significant features of the building, per SMC 23.49.014D(4). The owner has completed, and the City Historic Preservation Officer has approved, subject to final approval by the Board, a covenant that includes the commitment of the owner to maintain the Ainsworth & Dunn Warehouse consistent with Ordinance No. 125853**.**

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board makes the determination that the Ainsworth & Dunn Warehouse at 2815 Elliott Avenue has fulfilled the requirements for transfer of Landmark TDR pursuant to SMC 23.49.014

and Ordinance No. 120443 – that the building is a designated Landmark with a Controls and Incentives Agreement pursuant to Ordinance No. 125853; that an authorization letter from SDCI has been received and has identified the number of transferable square feet to be 71,822.50 square feet; and, the building is not presently in need of rehabilitation, therefore no security is required.

MM/SC/KJ/RF 6:0:0 Motion carried.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approved the agreement entitled "COVENANTS FOR LANDMARK TRANSFERABLE DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS" as submitted to the Board as the legal agreement required as a condition to the transfer of development rights from the Ainsworth & Dunn Warehouse at 2815 Elliott Avenue, per SMC 23.49.014D(4).

MM/SC/KJ/RF 6:0:0 Motion carried.

082119.6 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

082119.61 University of Washington Eagleson Hall
1417 NE 42nd Street

Ms. Doherty said the agreement has been signed by the property owner and mailed to DON, but it has not yet been received.

Tabled.

082119.7 NOMINATIONS

082119.71 Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition (AYPE) Foundry /
University of Washington Engineering Annex
3902 East Stevens Way NE

Mr. Chalana disclosed he is on faculty at University of Washington. He noted he is not an owner nor an employee with any financial interest.

Mr. Kiel disclosed his firm works with the University of Washington; he is not related to these two properties.

Julie Blakeslee, University of Washington, said she had no concern with Messrs. Chalana and Kiel's participation.

Board members had no concern with Messrs. Chalana and Kiel's participation.

Spencer Howard, Northwest Vernacular, reported the two- and three-story building is a braced frame structure with brick cladding. Multiple lite wood windows provide day lighting and ventilation. A narrow, paved service court just over 30-feet wide separates it from the Mechanical Engineering Building. Built in 1909 as a typical commercial foundry for the Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition, it has had a few changes that are helpful to understand before working through the rest of the building

exterior and interior spaces. The 1909 portion was the foundry. The 1920 north and south additions added two bays to either end and continued the same basic design. These provided a machine and wood working shop on the north end Pipe shop, washroom and lockers, and drafting room on the south end The 1922 to 1935 additions provide the third story at the north end of the building and correspond to when the carpenter shop moved into the building (1923). The 1937 to 1947 addition occurred at the north end of the building and is attributed to a former elevated walkway that extended north to the former Shops Building. The 1958 alterations occurred at the south end of the building as part of connecting the Mechanical Engineering Building. More recent alterations and in-kind wood window replacement work was indicated on plan. Overall the building has a gable roof with a center clerestory and a small monitor roof providing additional daylighting towards the middle of the building. Several personnel and larger service doors provide access to the building interior. The north and south ends originally served as the main entrance and with the shift to shop and academic uses the north end became the primary access point. The interior layout generally consists of first floor workspaces with upper story offices. The main open work volume was the original molding and work areas for the foundry.

Mr. Howard explained that mechanical, electrical, and lighting upgrades to the building have worked to keep pace with the academic industrial needs. The open work volume consists of exposed structural framing with an overhead gantry and a painted bead board ceiling. Relites along the east side provide separation from the workspaces along the east facade while still allowing day lighting into the center work area. Clerestory windows provide day lighting and ventilation.

He said a mezzanine level projects out into the south end providing storage space. The south end of the first floor contains smaller workshop areas, a restroom and lockers. The north end of the first floor contains work areas though the framing has been clad with painted gypsum board. The original top hung sliding doors remain at the north end of the building. The second story at the north end consists of a lobby, hallway, and perimeter offices with updated finishes. The south end of the second story contains offices on either side of a central hallway that connects with the Mechanical Engineering building.
Added finishes enclose the walls and ceiling; however, the lower portions of the trusses remain visible. The third story at the north end of the building is accessed by an internal stairway from the second floor and like the second floor consist of a hallway and perimeter offices with updated finishes. This property and the next property to be presented have a connected history through the university's mechanical engineering department.

Katie Pratt, Northwest Vernacular, reported that engineering got its start at the University with the School of Mines in 1894 and sub-departments for Civil Engineering and Electrical Engineering were then established. At this time, mechanical and electrical engineering were grouped together in the Electrical Engineering Department and classes were held in the Administration Building (now Denny Hall). Mechanical Engineering became its own department in 1905 and was chaired by Everett O. Eastwood until 1947. Eastwood, a 1902 MIT graduate, also went on to establish the university's first master's degree program in mechanical engineering and helped found the Aeronautical Engineering Department in 1921. The

Power House was converted for lab use by the electrical and mechanical engineering departments in 1905.

By 1910, mechanical engineering classes and labs had moved from Denny Hall and were held in the Engineering Building and a "new shop building"—the Engineering Building was the AYPE Machinery Hall/Building and the shop building was the AYPE Foundry (Engineering Annex). The shop building contained the department's wood shop, machine shop, forge shop, and foundry. In the late 1930s, the mechanical engineering program was located in Guggenheim Hall.

In the 1920s, classes offered by the Mechanical Engineering Department included: woodwork, metalwork, marine gas engines, airplane gas engines, mechanism, steam engineering, machine design, engines and boilers, experimental engineering, engineering materials, steam turbines, heating and ventilation, thermodynamics and refrigeration, power plants, naval architecture, ship design, marine engineering, gas engineering, and gas engine design. The courses for mechanical engineering remained fairly consistent through the 1930s, but additional courses were added to the curriculum by the mid-1940s. New classes included: manufacturing methods, production planning, production management, factory cost analysis, and quality control.

The number of mechanical engineering graduates steadily increased over the years, with 50 graduates in 1946, 110 in 1956, and 140 in 1966. The Mechanical Engineering Department has continued to grow and flourish over the last several decades. When the Engineering Hall was demolished in 1958, a new building for mechanical engineering was erected in its place - the Mechanical Engineering Building which will be presented next. The Engineering Hall was deemed "dangerous," so efforts began in the mid-1950s to replace the building.

Subsequent alterations to the Foundry/Engineering Annex connected the Annex and the Mechanical Engineering Building to create a small complex for mechanical engineering. Additional engineering buildings were constructed in this part of the campus, including More Hall (1946), Loew Hall (1965), the Engineering Library (1969), Electrical Engineering Building (1998), and the Paul G. Allen Center for Computer Science and Engineering (2003). This area remains the epicenter of the University's College of Engineering.

Today, students and faculty in the Mechanical Engineering Department conduct research in health technology, energy, novel and automated manufacturing, clean and alternative energy, design for the environment, micro and nanotechnology, biomechanics, and advanced manufacturing and materials. Mechanical engineering graduates go on to work in biotechnology and health, environmental engineering and energy, transportation, and manufacturing and information systems.

In addition to landscape elements and circulation networks, 25 buildings were constructed for the AYPE, including the nominated. Many of these buildings were constructed of lath and plaster as empty shells anticipated to last only as long as the fair. A handful of buildings were intended as permanent structures and were funded by an appropriation from the Washington State Legislature. The state-funded buildings were to be turned over to the university after the fair ended: the Forestry

Building, Auditorium, Fine Arts Building, Washington State Building, and the Foundry.

The subject building was constructed in 1909 for use as a foundry with exhibit space for the AYPE. A foundry is a workshop or factory where metal is heated to a molten state and cast. During the AYPE, the building exhibited foundry supplies and equipment in the side bays with the central bay utilized as the molding floor for demonstrations. This building was one of the few fair buildings intended as a permanent structure, constructed for the AYPE with a post-fair use in mind. The building was constructed for use by the mechanical engineering department of the university; and, mechanical engineering professor O. E. Eastwood ran the foundry during the AYPE.

After the fair ended, the building continued to have a utilitarian function. It showed up on various plans as "Shops" (1915 and 1920 plans) and "Buildings & Grounds Shops" (1949 plan). In 1920, additions were made to the foundry building to extend it to the north and the south. Sometime after this renovation, the Mechanical Engineering department fully took over the building—which housed classrooms, offices, shops and study spaces—or at least its use of the building was more clearly documented on campus plans.

The building, now known as the Engineering Annex, continues to house the Mechanical Engineering Department, along with environmental studies and the Industrial & Systems Engineering's Integrated Learning Factory.

Washington Place (1850-1916) was born in New Hampshire on November 5, 1850. After serving in the Civil War and starting a family, Place moved to Washington State and was living in Seattle by 1889. His occupation in the city directories was listed as contractor, carpenter, and builder over the years. He eventually became a building inspector for the City of Seattle. Place's career as a building inspector began as early as 1900 and worked under City Engineer R. H. Thomson. By spring 1908, Place was no longer working as the building inspector for the city. Place formed an architectural firm with J. L. McCauley—Place and McCauley. Their partnership was short-lived, and they dissolved the firm in July 1910, each going their own way and Place maintaining an office at 2802 East Valley Street. As a designer and builder, Place designed a two-story apartment building for Henry Gobel at the southwest corner of Rainier Avenue and Walker Street. Place is also credited with designing an apartment building in the Central Area, three cottages in the University District, and an industrial building near Lake Union. Place died in 1916.

Frederick (F.W. or Fred) W. Elwell (1891-1954) served as the University's Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds during the 1920s. Elwell served for 10 years until his resignation in August 1929. He was also a member of the University's Building Committee. Elwell was listed on the construction drawings for the 1920 addition to the Engineering Annex (then referred to as the Shops Building). O.H. was listed as the draftsman. Numerous projects were constructed on campus under Elwell's watch as superintendent, including Suzzallo Library, Hec Edmundson Pavilion, and Physics Hall, as well as smaller projects like tennis courts. He also managed construction of the university's Biology Station at Friday Harbor and work at Meany Auditorium.

Mr. Kiel asked if the space is still used.

Ms. Blakeslee said it is used for shop space. The north bay is used for engines etc. She said fabrication can be done for anyone.

Mr. Coney asked if the original foundry equipment is there.

Ms. Pratt said it is not.

Ms. Blakeslee noted that some windows have been replaced, some are original.

Ms. Doherty noted that the new windows were replaced in kind.

Mr. Freitas asked about the building's relationship to the development of the engineering program.

Ms. Pratt said the program was already established and had strong leadership who probably had a say into what went in there. She said the Mechanical Engineering department needs the shop space; they have demonstrations of the latest and greatest equipment.

Ms. Blakeslee said they demonstrate how the equipment works.

Mr. Freitas asked if fixtures were built for the AYPE.

Ms. Pratt said no. She said companies would showcase their new equipment and demonstrate it.

Mr. Freitas asked the number of extant buildings from the AYPE.

Ms. Pratt said there are four buildings: present day Cunningham Hall, present day Architecture Building, former Michigan State Building, and the former model Dairy Barn (not the exhibition barn).

Mr. Kiel asked about 1909 plans compared to today.

Mr. Howard said plans are in the report.

Ms. Pratt said the building is tucked away because of the way the University has developed around it.

Ms. Blakeslee said it is down the slope and not visible.

Mr. Kiel asked why only half the windows were replaced.

Ms. Blakeslee said it was budget; they did the ones in worst condition.

Mr. Coney asked if any notable persons or patents came out of the School of Engineering.

Ms. Blakeslee said hundreds.

Ms. Pratt said the chair of the department, Eastwood, had a long career there.

Mr. Coney said he wanted more information about anything groundbreaking or impactful that may have come out of here. He asked if the building is sprinklered.

Mr. Howard said it is.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Deliberations:

Mr. Freitas supported nomination and said he was excited about the building. He said there are not many AYPE buildings left. He said there have been numerous additions.

Ms. Johnson said the conditions has changed dramatically. She said it was built for AYPE and is still used for its original purpose. She said the context may not tell the story; it is the interior that tells the story.

Mr. Chalana said it is an important piece of AYPE and it ties in with the institution and evolution of the campus. He said very few buildings can convey that. He said he supported nomination. He said the context has changes and newer additions dominate but the core building is solid and the AYPE material is still there. He noted the interest is in the story of UW and AYPE.

Mr. Coney agreed with Mr. Chalana. He said the core is there, the ends have been modified. He said it is an important piece of the campus and it has continued as a foundry. He noted the AYPE and the evolution of the University. He noted the post and beam and timbers.

Mr. Guo said the interior large open bay conveys its story and its continued use.

Mr. Kiel said a chunk of the building is well-intact. He said the interior conveys the original use and significance. He supported nomination. He said he would like a tour of the building and to see floor plans to understand how the volumes work.

Ms. Doherty said it is helpful to see it in person.

Mr. Chalana said it has nice scaling and texture and layers. He said it is hyper modern now but nice to retain what is there.

Ms. Johnson said staff recommendation included interiors.

Ms. Doherty said to refer to it as high-bay fabrication shop or double height space.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition Foundry / University of Washington MEB Annex at 3902 East Stevens Way NE for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the high-bay fabrication space, the exterior of the building; and a portion of

the site around the building perimeter measured thirty feet out from the base of the building, excluding the adjacent Mechanical Engineering Building; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for October 2, 2019; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/RC/KJ 6:0:0 Motion carried.

082119.72 University of Washington Mechanical Engineering Bldg (MEB)
3900 East Stevens Way NE

Spencer Howard reported that the four-story concrete frame building is an example of post-World War II modernist architecture on campus that bridges the transition from the Collegiate Gothic style buildings with the more contemporary styles popular on campus during the 1960s and 1970s. The building's design establishes the southwest corner as the prominent, vertically emphasized building mass, floating over a low plinth, and contrasting with the horizontal emphasis of the north and east wings. Brick veneer is laid up in a running bond with cast stone detailing at windows, doorways, and along the parapet. The building has a flat roof with a low perimeter parapet. Steel sash windows installed with the glazing bevel on the interior provide day lighting and ventilation. The main south entrance provides direct access to the department offices, the corridors serving each wing and vertical circulation.

Mr. Howard said the interior layout consists of a double loaded corridor in the north wing and both double and single loaded corridors in the southeast wing. The main entrance lobby in the southwest corner links the corridors and vertical circulation. Stairwells in the north and southeast ends and southwest corner of the building connect to the ends of the corridors. Interior materials and finishes are utilitarian, including exposed concrete ceiling beams, floors, and exterior wall framing, concrete block partition walls, and exposed mechanical systems along the corridor ceilings. Classrooms have been upgraded with drop ceilings that partially cover the windows along with ceiling mounted projectors, screens, and wall mounted conduit raceways, white boards and new light fixtures. The ground floor is partially below grade with low gypsum board clad walls with metal mesh above to separate the various labs. Vertical circulation within the building consists of three stairwells and an elevator. Stairwells consist of half-turn concrete stairs with quarry tile nosings and metal pipe railings.

Katie Pratt explained the Mechanical Engineering Building was constructed in 1959 to replace the former Engineering Hall, which was built in 1909 as the Machinery Hall for the AYPE. The new Mechanical Engineering Building directly connected to the adjacent Foundry (Engineering Annex). Local architectural firm Carlson, Eley & Grevstad designed the new building, which was constructed for approximately $1.5 million. The Mechanical Engineering Department has continued to grow and flourish over the last several decades. Students and faculty in the Mechanical Engineering Department conduct research in health technology, energy, novel and automated manufacturing, clean and alternative energy, design for the environment, micro and nanotechnology, biomechanics, and advanced manufacturing and materials. Mechanical engineering graduates go on to work in biotechnology and health,

environmental engineering and energy, transportation, and manufacturing and information systems.

Ms. Pratt said the Mechanical Engineering Building was designed by local architectural firm Carlson, Eley & Grevstad with support from structural engineers Stevenson & Rubens, mechanical and electrical engineers Bouillon & Griffith, and landscape architect Beardsley & Brauner. This firm was helmed by its three principals—Paul G. Carlson, Richard Eley, and Barney E. Grevstad who established the firm in 1946. The firm designed numerous buildings in Seattle and its surrounding communities during the 1950s and 1960s including commercial, religious, multi-family, and educational projects. On the university campus they designed the Mechanical Engineering Building and Physics Building/Mary Gates Hall and Bagley Hall. Their new construction projects for the firm included: Fairmount Park Elementary School; the Columbia Electric Office; First Church of Christ Scientist in Bellevue; a $1 million shopping complex in Northgate; and three theaters, Temple Theater in Tacoma, the Princess Theater in Prosser, and the Everett Motor Movie Drive-in.

She said this structural engineering firm was founded by John H. Stevenson and Boris Rubens by 1950. The firm continued until at least 1964. In addition to the Mechanical Engineering Building, Stevenson & Rubens' projects included: an air freight depot at Boeing Field, the Ernest Fortescue house at 1118 First Street in Kirkland, and the Queen Vista apartments at 1321 Queen Anne. They also worked with architects Carlson, Eley & Grevstad on their $1 million Northgate shopping complex.

This mechanical engineering firm was founded by Lincoln Bouillon and Herbert (H.T.) Griffith. Their partnership began in 1931 and in 1960 the firm reorganized as a corporation with Bouillon as president, Griffith as vice-president, L. F. Christofferson as treasurer, and R. H. Schairer as secretary. It appears Christofferson was working for the firm by the late 1950s and may have been involved with the Mechanical Engineering Building project. By ca. 1967 Griffith had left the firm and the firm reformed as Bouillon, Christofferson, and Schairer, Mechanical Engineers. Projects completed by the firm include a hot water system at the East Waterway Terminal, an office building for Bethlehem Steel Co., and the IBM Building in Seattle (in association with Jaros, Baurm & Bolles of New York City).

This landscape architecture firm was founded by Cassius "Cash" Marvin Beardsley and Raymond Brauner that existed from 1956 through ca. 1965. Beardsley & Brauner's projects include the grounds of the Les Connolly residence in Kirkland (with Cummings & Martenson); Central Library grounds, Seattle (demolished); Somerset subdivision, Bellevue; and Seattle Public Library Southwest Branch grounds, Seattle (with Durham, Anderson & Freed).

The end of World War II and returning veterans, supplied with the 1944 G.I. Bill, transformed the University of Washington and the nation's other higher education institutions. It soon became clear that the university lacked staff and adequate facilities to accommodate the ballooning student population. Temporary structures were erected to meet the needs of the growing university, but plans were underway for increased development to provide more classrooms and on-campus housing. Numerous buildings were constructed during the late 1940s and 1950s and reflect a

campus in transition as many of them continue design elements of Collegiate Gothic prescribed in the Regents Plan of 1915 while incorporating modern, mid-20th century architectural design. Buildings from this period include: Communications Building (1951, Collegiate Gothic), More Hall (1946, Modern), the Music Building (1950, Collegiate Gothic), and the Art Building (1949, Collegiate Gothic).

Ms. Pratt said design elements that are referential to the Collegiate Gothic style and evident on these 1940s and 1950s buildings include: material palette of brick with lighter trim, lighter stone or cast concrete banding and decorative trim , decorative features such as arches, finials, crenellation, buttresses, relief sculpture, and tracery. Modern design features that are blended with elements referential to the Collegiate Gothic style include modern materials in the windows (e.g. glass block or aluminum sash) and use of concrete instead of sandstone or terra cotta, and a streamlining of decorative features. As the 1960s dawned, Collegiate Gothic was no longer the mandated style for campus buildings and new construction reflected contemporary design trends and techniques. Fast-paced development continued from the 1950s in to the 1960s, mirroring the university's persistent growth.

Mr. Kiel asked if architects were pushing boundaries at this time.

Ms. Pratt noted it was more a swinging back and forth rather than a pushing of boundaries.

Mr. Chalana asked about Kane Hall.

Ms. Blakeslee said it was built in the 1970s.

Ms. Pratt said there are lots of examples from the 1960s; there was a sharp departure of styles and experimentation. She said this building is a tame Mid-Century style.

Mr. Chalana said Collegiate Gothic was reinterpreted in different ways based on materials and technology available.

Ms. Pratt said yes, and some retained the color palette.

Mr. Freitas asked if any Collegiate Gothic buildings were constructed after 1957-59.

Ms. Blakeslee said she didn't think so.

Ms. Pratt noted it wasn't mandated by the University anymore.

Mr. Freitas wondered when the last Collegiate Gothic – or what we consider Collegiate Gothic - building was constructed there.

Mr. Chalana said the transition is not clear, it moves back and forth.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Kiel said he would like to compare this building side by side with More Hall.

Mr. Chalana said the 1959 fabric is intact.

Mr. Howard said there have been some modifications to the windows.

Ms. Johnson said the building feels very influenced by More Hall.

Mr. Kiel said that More Hall is a better example.

Mr. Chalana said it is a well-preserved example of its time.

Mr. Freitas noted the interior is remarkably intact.

Ms. Pratt said the corridors have been modified and the upstairs is used for offices.

Mr. Coney asked if exposing the mechanical equipment was an intentional design element.

Ms. Blakeslee said because it is concrete block, the new equipment was just stacked on. She said originally it was all in the walls, the retrofit is exposed.

Ms. Pratt noted there is some surface mount.

Mr. Freitas noted the new ducting is more obtrusive.

Mr. Howard said a drop ceiling in classrooms hides it.

Mr. Kiel asked what was going on at this time at other campuses. He said that More Hall 'got there' first and did it better.

Ms. Johnson said it is a nice building, but More Hall is much more interesting. She said she was happy to nominate the building but wouldn't feel bad if it didn't go further. She said it is a nice, visible building but it is not the best example, even on campus.

Mr. Freitas said in the development of style on campus it is a transitionary building. He said More Hall, if we hold it up as an example, may never come before the board. He said given what is before us it may be the best shot of capturing the significance and context. He said it is a handsome building, of its time.

Mr. Chalana said More Hall is not the subject building, it is a reference only. He said the building fits nicely on campus and is a good example of modern building of its time. It sits nicely with other buildings on campus. He said he sees the interpretation of Collegiate Gothic with the same vertical proportions as Suzzallo Library. He said it sits nicely in its setting and it preserves the layers. He supported nomination.

Mr. Coney supported nomination.

Mr. Guo supported nomination. He said the More Hall is similar and is adjacent so there is some referencing.

Mr. Chalana wanted to hear more about how the building was received at the time; it is was considered innovative and was More Hall features.

Ms. Pratt said they didn't find much in the way of newspaper mentions; there was lots happening at the time. She said demand for housing was a theme at the time.

Ms. Johnson asked when the switch to Modernism occurred.

Ms. Doherty said it was post WWII. She said at this campus, you see a transitional period.

Ms. Pratt said there was movement back and forth and then the 1960s hit and it was 'anything goes'.

Mr. Chalana asked if there were mandates on campus design and if direction was given.

Mr. Freitas said the corridor was not typical.

Mr. Howard said this is mechanical engineering, they wanted straightforward program, flexible enough to allow labs and meet the growing changing needs of the University.

Ms. Blakeslee said the building provides offices, classrooms and labs.

Ms. Pratt said there was no corridor plan.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the University of Washington Mechanical Engineering Building at 3900 East Stevens Way NE 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 October 2, 2019; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/RF/RC 6:0:0 Motion carried.

082119.8 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator