



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649 Seattle WA 98124-4649
Street Address: 700 5th Ave Suite 1700

LPB 583/08

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Seattle Municipal Tower

700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor

Room 4060

Wednesday, October 1, 2008 – 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Stephen Lee
Jerry Finrow
Henry Matthews
Tom Veith
Czarina Nicolas
Christine Howard
Vernon Abelsen
Mollie Tremaine
Mark Hannum

Staff

Elizabeth Chave
Sarah Sordt
Melinda Bloom
Rebecca Frestedt

Absent

Ron Martinson
Alyce Conti
Marie Strong

Chair Stephen Lee called the meeting to order at 3:35 PM.

100108.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meeting of July 16
MM/SC/MH/VA

8:0:1 Minutes approved as amended. Ms. Howard
abstained.

Mr. Matthews arrived at 3:37 p.m.

Mr. Finrow arrived at 3:38 p.m.

August 6, 2008
MM/SC/TV/CH

9:0:2 Minutes approved as amended. Mr. Hannum
and Ms. Tremaine abstained.

**Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods**

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

100108.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

100108.21 Royal Esquire Club
5016 Rainier Ave. S.
(Columbia City District)
Proposed paint colors

Rebecca Frestedt presented the application on behalf of the applicant, who was not in attendance. She explained the application and reported the applicant was seeking retroactive approval for exterior paint colors. She distributed paint samples and “before” and “after” photographs. She said the Columbia City Review Committee (CCRC) reviewed the application at its September 19th meeting and did not reach consensus. She stated that CCRC members agreed that the base color was acceptable; members were concerned that the accent color was too bright and not compatible with the District. CCRC members stated that the current paint scheme masks some of the architectural detailing of the façade. Ms. Frestedt noted that the majority of the glazing has been replaced with plywood, including each of the transom windows. This work predated the painting. The majority CCRC members agreed that the current application of paint colors changes the vocabulary of the building and therefore would not recommend approval.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked when the “before” picture was taken. Ms. Frestedt didn’t know.

Mr. Hannum noted it was taken fairly recently.

Ms. Frestedt explained the accent color was chosen by the applicant to match the existing canopy over the primary entrance.

Ms. Tremaine asked specifically why the CCRC did not support this, if it was the color or that the transoms and windows were filled in.

Ms. Frestedt said the CCRC members stated that the new paint covers architectural detailing and that the previous color scheme allowed architectural accents to express themselves.

Mr. Hannum stated the previous scheme alluded to the former transom windows with painted mullions and the new paint job obscured the details with a solid color and highlighted building elements that didn’t need to be as prominent. He explained the canopy had previously been approved by CCRC.

Mr. Abelsen asked if the painted windows were filled with plywood or if the glazing had been painted.

Ms. Frestedt confirmed that they were all infilled panels.

Mr. Hannum said the original paint scheme gave the allusion of being glass.

Mr. Finrow asked for clarification what would happen if the Board voted no.

Ms. Frestedt replied they would be required to reverse the colors to the previous paint scheme or return to the Board with an alternative color scheme because they would

be out of compliance with the land use code for not having received approval for work that was done.

Mr. Hannum noted the applicant had not finished the work.

Ms. Frestedt said she gave the applicant the opportunity to submit a new paint color scheme before coming to the full Board, but that the applicant chose to have the Board decide.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Lee stated the body of the building was acceptable but the red accent color was not.

Mr. Abelsen agreed and raised the concern about the application of the paint to the brick. Although it has been painted previously, through a review process the Board would look at what product they are applying to see if it creates a problem or not for the brick which tends to want to breathe and potential damage to the historic structure is possible. He said he would like to see some alternatives.

Mr. Lee recommended voting on the application with the comment that they continue to work with the Columbia City Review Committee.

Ms. Sodt suggested that the Board move to grant the Columbia City Review Committee final approval over an alternative paint scheme.

Mr. Veith cited the guidelines "...paint with subdued colors that are appropriate and consistent with the building..." and the General Guidelines # 8 "Emphasis should be given to maintain the character of and enhancing the compatibility with contributing buildings."

Mr. Matthews stated that one of the characteristics of this District is that a lot of the buildings do show their transom windows. The old paint alluded to that but the new paint scheme does not. In a building that doesn't have a lot of character, it seems to be one of the character defining features; if they had come to ARC he would have recommended that they emphasize the frames of the transom windows.

Mr. Hannum confirmed that the CCRC thought it could be tweaked a bit.

Mr. Veith noted they've changed the character of the building with paint. That is obvious at the transom windows but the frameworks below the larger windows and the casings makes it look like punched openings in a solid wall where in fact it is a storefront that has been filled so it has completely lost that character. He stated the applicant should come back with a scheme that responds more to the character of the building.

Mr. Lee said it is only paint which they could fix easily. He suggested making a motion to deny it but delegate the authority CCRC for final approval.

Ms. Chave noted it could be approved with the condition that certain elements, as defined by the Board, must go back to the CCRC.

Ms. Frestedt agreed and said it is consistent with the discussion at the CCRC meeting.

Mr. Abelsen proposed the following motion:

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for paint colors with the understanding that the Columbia City Review Committee will review proposed changes that the applicant will provide for review at some later date. This action is based on the following:

The proposed alterations meet the following sections of the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines:

Relevant Code citations

SMC 25.20.070 – Approval of changes to buildings, structures and other property

Relevant guidelines

3. Building Surface Treatments. Approved surface treatments shall be consistent with the historic qualities of the District. No paint shall be applied to unpainted masonry surfaces. Painted surfaces shall be:

- a. Repainted with the original historic color(s) of the building, provided that the business or property owner obtains a professional color analysis; or
- b. Repainted with subdued colors that are appropriate and consistent with the building and other buildings in the District. Local paint stores have an historic colors palette which may be useful as a guide.

Secretary of Interior Standards referencing “New Additions – Exterior alterations or related construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, proportion and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

There was no second.

Mr. Hannum asked for clarification if this approval included detailed enough language about the paint color and suggested that the wording be amended.

Staff recommended revised phrasing for the motion that included a condition requiring CCRC approval on a revised paint scheme.

Mr. Veith stated he would probably vote against a motion to approve one part of it and then have a huge paragraph explaining all the things that have to be fixed.

Mr. Hannum thought it might be confusing to the applicant who might think it is an approval.

There was Board discussion about the best way to word the motion to be clear and whether it should be a denial or approval.

Mr. Abelsen recanted his motion.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board deny a Certificate of Approval for paint colors at 5016 Rainier Avenue South, Royal Esquire Club. This action is based on the following: The proposed alterations do not meet the following sections of the Columbia City Landmarks District Guidelines:

Relevant Code citations

SMC 25.20.070 – Approval of changes to buildings, structures and other property

Relevant guidelines

3. Building Surface Treatments. Approved surface treatments shall be consistent with the historic qualities of the District. No paint shall be applied to unpainted masonry surfaces. Painted surfaces shall be:

- a. Repainted with the original historic color(s) of the building, provided that the business or property owner obtains a professional color analysis; or
- b. Repainted with subdued colors that are appropriate and consistent with the building and other buildings in the District. Local paint stores have an historic colors palette which may be useful as a guide.

Secretary of Interior Standards number 9.

MM/SC/VA/MH

9:0:0 Motion approved.

100108.22

1041 Summit Ave. E
(Harvard –Belmont District)
Proposed porch enclosure

Ms. Chave explained the project and stated that the house is a Category 1 building in the District. She said because there is so much vegetation in front of house it is difficult to see the side of the house from the street. Ms. Chave provided a photo from the file which shows the house.

Larry Johnson, Johnson Partnership, introduced Ellen Mirro who would present the proposal. He explained the proposal is basically enclosing portions of the rear porch.

Ms. Mirro showed the existing paint colors of the house: the stucco, the body and window sashes and stated they will be matching those colors. She explained that one bay would be made into a breakfast nook and one arch would be infilled with a window. She said the Harvard-Belmont committee recommended keeping a little opening as shown in photos she passed around to the Board. She referred to drawings and stated they wanted to keep the opening and just fill it in with stucco so that it could be removed in the future should the use revert back to porch. She explained the siding from the pantry wall would be salvaged; it is a milled board about 8 – 9”. She said new boards like that will be milled to fill in under the window. The little head pieces on top of the existing window and door will be saved and reused over the window and the door because they have to be repositioned. She said

one window goes away and the door has to be repositioned. She said the sills will be saved and reused.

Ms. Chave stated the Harvard-Belmont committee had an on-site meeting about this project and supported it.

Mr. Veith asked if this is the back porch.

Ms. Mirro concurred and said there is also a side porch. She explained the arched window is new. She said the existing door is aligned directly behind a column and they want to move it over. She shared the mullion piece, sash detail and said it has the same ogee as the original windows only it is smaller because the thickness of the glass is bigger so there less space.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Matthews, who attended the Harvard Belmont Committee on-site meeting, explained the house has strong architectural elements like the broad and unusual roof overhang, river rock etc. He said the house is very dark and is very visible but what one can see is the form of the arches on the porch which will remain. He said the Committee felt the changes were acceptable and would not greatly alter the character of the house.

Mr. Veith stated the changes make the porch look busier than it needs to be. He said this is a house in a landmark district and the house itself is not a landmark and the main concern is the character that it presents to the viewer walking through the district. It doesn't really change the character of the house very much and it is acceptable from the standpoint of the district and its guidelines.

Mr. Lee agreed and thought it was compatible and fits in.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for the enclosure of the side (north) porch, as per the submittal. This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations meet the following sections of the Harvard-Belmont District Development and Design Review Guidelines:

C. 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: The exterior materials used for additions shall be similar to exterior materials used in the original building and should be finished in ways that are consistent with the original building.

MM/SC/MT/CH

9:0:0 Motion approved.

100108.23

Decatur Building

1527 6th Avenue

Proposed storefront alterations

Ty Hamlet, T-Mobile Project Manager, explained the project to expand into an adjacent store. They will continue the same look of the store front as they expand.

Ms. Sodt explained that ARC reviewed this application and said the one question they had was what the existing store front system is in the bay that is not going to be changed.

Mr. Hamlet stated it is identical. The storefront into which they are going to expand does not currently feature the granite that matches the rest of the building; they proposed to put the granite there. The storefront is not in keeping with any of the other storefronts; they will tie it in with the others and it will be a big improvement. The bulkhead on the expansion space is about one foot lower than the two spaces around it and they will raise it up so it ties in with the rest of the building. Where the granite carries across they will bring it across where it is currently in porcelain tile. The granite is an exact match for the granite that is on the building at the base of all the columns and under the current store front glass.

Ms. Sodt passed around material samples for the Board to review.

Ms. Tremaine asked if there was an automatic door opener.

Mr. Hamlet agreed and stated it is an ADA requirement.

Mr. Lee stated that doorway doesn't comply with ADA requirements for dimensions on the strike side of the door so it would have to have that opener.

Mr. Hamlet concurred and said the opener was added a year ago to meet those requirements. There is a lift in the doorway and T-Mobile and the architects decided that since they had already gone to the expense to install the lifts on that side it would make more sense to just fill in the other store front and leave the existing as is. They will do a little bit of construction on the expansion side before they have to close the current space to finish the construction; if they were to alter the doorways it would potentially conflict.

Mr. Veith clarified that the lift is inside.

Mr. Hamlet concurred.

A representative from Eastside Glass reported the existing store front frame is 4 ½ x 2', the same as the frame they will put in. The difference is it has a thermal break in the new frame which is not visible.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

The Board concurred that it was a good change that is sympathetic to the historic features.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed storefront alterations, based on the following:

1. The proposed work does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance #112275 because the proposed alterations do not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and are compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features 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/HM/MH 9:0:0 Motion approved.

100108.24

MGM Building
2331 Second Avenue
Proposed signage

Ms. Sodt introduced Ted McKnight and passed out drawings. She said that ARC reviewed the application and made some suggestions for making the drawings accurate.

Ted McKnight stated the color scheme does not reflect the actual colors of the existing building fabric; the colors are noted on the drawing. The letters will be reverse pan channel letters with 3" returns; they will be illuminated and attached through the mortar joints only so it will not disturb the brick at all. A material sample was passed out to the Board. He explained the method of attachment as detailed on the drawing. The transformer will be placed on the wall. He provided specifications for the front entrance sign and provided a material sample as well. It is a light plastic which will be mounted to an aluminum panel and painted black; the panel will be mounted through the mortar joints. It is not illuminated so there are not electrical going through. Above will be surface mounted gooseneck lamps with 3/4" conduit running through the mortar joints. He explained they are trying to respect the integrity of the building. The bracket for the blade sign will be removed and placed on the front elevation; it will not damage the building and they called out the mounting technique.

Mr. Lee requested the dimensions on the drawings and asked if the flexible conduit was really 3/4" and thought it seemed oversized. He expressed concern that the joints are actually 3/8".

Mr. Abelsen noted that even if put in where the joints meet it might still damage the brick.

Mr. McKnight noted he verified this with headquarters and thought the conduit was larger due to the voltage.

Mr. Lee stated the voltage should actually be lower because LEDs use less voltage, not more.

Mr. Veith asked what the mortar joint dimension is; he asked if the 3/4" flex is the outside diameter or the inside?

Mr. Abelsen noted the mortar joints looked bit large so it is possible it could be as much as 1/2".

Mr. Lee expressed concern that the dimensions drawing on page 3 do not line up to the Photo Shop image of the "Buckley's" sign. He thought the graphic is 8'6" wide and wasn't sure if the drawing or the Photo Shop image was correct. He wondered where an installer would install the sign.

Mr. Veith said the large detail of the gooseneck was good but the image from the catalog showing a recessed junction box is still shown low. He stressed that the importance of the technician installing the sign having correct dimensions and knowing which drawing to use.

Mr. McKnight stated the dimensions were called out; it is the installer's job to measure out and it is his job to be on site when it is installed.

Mr. Lee requested that some dimension or some instructions as to where the sign is going be included.

Mr. Veith recommended taking out the Photo Shop image so there is only one image to look at.

Mr. Lee noted the drawing does not relate to the building and is not to scale.

Mr. Abelsen said one of the details about the light fixtures on page 3 shows it as a recessed box.

Mr. Finrow requested an accurate drawing.

Mr. Lee said the drawings describe work and none of it agrees with the other. It is very dangerous to have drawings out that don't agree with themselves.

Mr. Finrow asked why the sign on the side of the building is so big.

Mr. McKnight explained it is the restaurant's preference. Originally it was larger.

Ms. Sodt stated that the landlord convinced the business owner to reduce it by half.

Mr. Lee noted above the entrance now is a vine and beneath the vine is lettering and asked if that would be removed.

Mr. McKnight concurred.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Lee stated ARC thought it was elegant signage but was concerned about documentation of what was proposed and that it needs to match what is actually intended to be installed. He asked Board members if they thought the sign was too big or if they had concerns about the general concept and the Board indicated no to both. He recommended the applicant come back before ARC with accurate drawings.

Mr. Matthews asked if the approval could be made conditional on the size of the conduit.

Mr. Lee agreed and wanted the applicant to come back to ARC with more information about the conduit and electrical requirements. He is pleased to see the building be reused in this way and thought the proposal was elegant.

Mr. Veith asked the applicant to also check the width of the mortar joints and to make sure all connections are small enough to go into the joints.

Action: I move that the Board approve the application for the proposed signage and lighting at the MGM Building at 2331 2nd Avenue with the condition that the applicant will return to ARC for details of attachment and alignment of signage features; this action is based on the following:

1. The proposed work does not adversely affect the features and characteristics specified in the Nomination Report because the proposed alterations do not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and are compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features of the property, 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/VA/MT 9:0:0 Motion approved

100108.25

Arctic Building
700 Third Avenue
Proposed storefront alterations

Ms. Sodt explained the application and introduced Patrick Chatfield who would present the proposed storefront alterations.

Applicant Comment:

Mr. Chatfield explained the purpose for the project on the retail level of the building and said they will adjust two doors, paint the storefront system, and infill the spandrel panels. On door no. 1 they will remove a 3' door and installing an operable side light which will allow the owner to move equipment in and out of the building and provides more room for ADA accessibility. On door no. 2 they will reverse the swing of the door to swing outward. They will paint the storefront system brown to match the other portions of the storefront. The granite will match what had been approved on the other side and will be a dimension stone that is thinner and recessed back from the face of the existing storefront.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked if the detail at the corner had been changed – detail C - and asked what the existing condition is.

Mr. Chatfield stated that is the existing condition.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Lee noted the applicant addressed two concerns he raised at ARC.

Ms. Tremaine agreed it had been thoroughly discussed at ARC and accepted.

Mr. Lee advised that the color on the photocopy was not a good match to the original and stated it was reassuring to see samples.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed storefront alterations. This action is based on the following:

4. The proposed work does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 116969 because the proposed alterations do not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and are compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features of the property, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.

The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/MH/JF 9:0:0 Motion approved

100108.26

Rainier Cold Storage and Ice Buildings
6000 Airport Way S
Proposed bottling plant alterations

Ms. Chave explained this application pertained to the Bottling Plant which is at the northern end of the site and not near the building that had the structural issues. She said the applicants are coming in for some work that is related to seismic upgrades as well as site work and door replacement. She said the ARC reviewed the proposal and supported it.

Kara Anderson of Sabey explained the three things that they were asked to address at ARC. She said regarding the brick infill they need to do because of the seismic upgrades on the upper level of the west elevation they will put in existing brick that has been salvaged. There is a 13” masonry wall and they have 4” of CMU going in to provide seismic upgrade; they will put in existing brick that they were able to salvage from the building that was taken down. It will leave about 4” of a recess that is matching what is in existing windows. From the shadowline standpoint and will be consistent shadowline. Ms. Anderson explained there are old porches and steps on the east side; they want to clean that up and provide better access for use of building. She

said the grade line is 30” at its highest point that they would be adding and it slopes down in both directions on each side. She said the ARC wanted to ensure that where the grade touches the building, dirt was not being pushed up against the old wall. Ms. Anderson stated they will use an eco-block which will act as the retaining element along the building. Asphalt will continue over that block so it will not be visible. An asphalt pan will be put in to make sure water is not building up against the building and a liquid waterproofing membrane will be applied. She explained they would remove a door that is in a state of disrepair and replace it with a custom built door to match an existing door.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Tremaine thought it reasonable and asked if the Board should require the specifications of the membrane.

Mr. Lee thought it was fine.

Mr. Hannum stated the applicant met his concerns.

Mr. Abelsen agreed.

Mr. Veith stated for the record ARC reviewed this and the door replacement is utilizing a more original detail than the detail of the door that is being replaced and seemed appropriate. He said the ARC commented that the small windows at the top of the west elevation should be similar to the remaining windows or if it was masonry they masonry was set back; the applicant made clear that they are going to do that in their drawing. He said the two small windows that are low in the elevations will be matched to the existing detail elsewhere. He said the back is already a piecemeal elevation that regularizing they are proposing seemed appropriate.

Ms. Tremaine said the door being removed has a curved arch on top and asked if that will remain.

Ms. Anderson concurred and said they would go from the horizontal down in terms of matching the door style.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

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

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations, including window infill, replacement of one door, and grade change to the east of the building, as per the applicant’s submittal.

This action is based on the following:

5. The proposed work does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance# 116973 because the proposed alterations to the Bottling Plant do not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and are compatible

with the massing, size, scale and architectural features of the property, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*. The door replacement also meets Standard #6 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*: Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/JF/MT 9:0:0 Motion approved.

100108.3 DESIGNATION

100108.31 MGM Building
2331 Second Avenue

Mimi Sheridan, Architectural Historian, explained the building was built as the MGM Film Exchange and was converted to offices and then to a store and restaurant. It is part of Seattle's early "film row". She described the other film row buildings from the mid 1920s. She said that Art Deco style was ideally suited for the movies as movies were new at that time as was Art Deco. She pointed out key characteristics of the building that make it Art Deco. Even though it is a very small building it has setback features and has an extraordinary color scheme with the yellow brick and rare black terracotta. It has arrow shaped ornaments and the draped effect around the windows. Even though there are thousands of Art Deco movie theaters around the country there are not very many here; the Guild 45th may be the only one existing. Metro Goldwyn Mayer was the major studio during the 1930s. She provided photos of other Art Deco and Film Row buildings. The gate doesn't match the Art Deco style and was likely a later addition.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked if Ms. Sheridan agreed the building should be designated based on Criteria C and D.

Ms. Sheridan agreed.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Veith asked if the courtyard space is included in the nomination.

Ms. Sodt stated the site was not included in the nomination.

Mr. Veith supported designation based on C and D. The building is significantly associated with the film industry and it does embody distinctive characteristics of an architectural style. He noted the peculiar black terracotta and that the bay structure of

the building is interesting; the decorated front and the back of the building are expressed somewhat separately. The miniature courtyard with the gate is distinctive.

Mr. Hannum agreed and said it is clearly a landmark. It is a beautiful little jewel box building. He likes the low scale which there isn't enough of in the downtown corridor. He encouraged exploration of the film district. He supported designation based on C and D.

Mr. Abelsen agreed with Mr. Veith and Mr. Hannum.

Ms. Tremaine agreed with C and D; there are so few Art Deco building and this is an exceptional one.

Ms. Nicolas agreed with C and D; the Art Deco accentuates the building well. The scale of the building adds to the neighborhood and the history is very important.

Ms. Howard agreed with C and D for the reasons given in the Staff Report.

Mr. Matthews agreed with the Staff Report, C and D.

Mr. Finrow agreed with the Staff Report, C and D.

Mr. Lee stated it is a fantastic building and significant. He is thrilled the building owner is supportive of designation. He supported designation on C and D.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the MGM Building at 2331 Second Avenue 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 exterior of the building.

MM/SC/MT/TV 9:0:0 Motion approved.

100108.4 NOMINATION

100108.41 Securities Building
1904 Third Avenue

Kate Krafft, Architectural Historian, provided the context of the site. The primary entrance is at 3rd and Stewart. The original wing was built in 1913; the lower floors of an addition were constructed in 1925 and the upper floors of the addition were constructed in 1947. The 1913 portion of the building has a three part façade is made up of a prominent base that extends up to the 3rd floor, shaft and cap. The cornice has been removed from the cap. The 1925 base is oriented to 4th Avenue and the tower ascending from it to the full ten story height. She pointed out on photos the different fenestration between the two ten story wings. There is a major entrance on the 3rd Avenue side, two stories, terminated by an intermediate cornice, very prominent detailed cornice that is further accentuate by the terracotta treatment at the corners. The north side of the base is rich with classically derived ornament indicative of the Beaux Arts inspired design. The interior shows continuity between the exterior detailing and the interior. The 9th floor windows on the shaft terminate with

segmental arches, keystones and the banding treatment with green terracotta that corresponds to the base.

Ms. Krafft explained the second major entrance that is part of the original 1913 wing is oriented to Stewart Street. She pointed out where the 1925 wing connects to the 1913 wing and showed a pre-1925 photo which illustrates the difference in fenestration and while the floor plates correspond, the later addition is clearly a more modern design from the 1920s. She provided more detail of the Stewart Street entrance which showed the rusticated treatment of the terracotta and the rich detailing. The 3rd Avenue entrance has Vermont marble base and Honduran mahogany sidelights and the original granite tiling. The Henry Bittman designed canopy was altered in 1940. The lobby vestibule is clad with Mexican onyx that is throughout the entire lobby. The dramatic corridor is flanked by store fronts that have been reconstructed, glass tile flooring and marble and onyx materials. The stained glass relites are artificially lit now were reconstructed but utilized the original frames. The cove ceilings are very ornate and indicative of the Beaux Arts design. The light fixtures were reinstalled and are not original; she noted they are in character with the rest of the historic materials in the space but she believed they were installed during the remodel. At the end of the corridor is the elevator lobby with ornate elevator doors and surrounds. The space had been altered prior to the rehabilitation, the ceilings had been lowered.

Ms. Krafft explained the original design for the 1913 wing was done by architect Frank P. Allen Jr. and both of additions were design by Henry Bittman. She said the building appears to meet Criterion B as it is associated in a significant way with the life of a person important in the history of the City, State, and Nation. James W. Clise arrived after the great fire and formed Clise Investment Company. He played an important part in the post-fire reconstruction era and the subsequent expansion of the downtown commercial district. He handled real estate activities for himself and for other investments for eastern interests who were actively developing business blocks during the post-fire era and after the turn of the Century. Among those interests included L. C. Smith. He was very involved in land transactions that facilitated the construction of Union Station in 1911. One of his early real estate developments was the Globe Building – now the Alexis Hotel – for the Globe Navigation Company. In 1904 he bought property with a group, the Washington Securities Company.

Mr. Clise was involved in a number of other real estate transactions as well as the Alaska Yukon Pacific (AYP) Exposition; Ms. Krafft showed a photo of him with President Taft. He played an important role in the agricultural exhibits at AYP; he had background in agriculture and operated a gentleman's farm which is now Marymoor Park. Mr. Clise was an opponent of the Bogue Plan and facilitated the sale of land to L. C. Smith (Smith Tower) prior to the development of the Bogue Plan; he promised Mr. Smith the Civic Center would remain near 2nd and Yesler. Mr. Clise played a role in the Bogue Plan failure.

Ms. Krafft explained the architect for the Securities Building was Frank P. Allen Jr. He worked in Chicago for Daniel Burnham and came to the Pacific Northwest after the turn of the Century. She said it may have been at the AYP where Mr. Allen was the Director of Works that Mr. Clise and the Washington Securities Company may have connected with Mr. Allen. The drawings for the Securities Building call it the

“Smith Building” and list Frank Allen as the architect and engineer. Mr. Allen was associated with the construction of the Perry Hotel, designed by Heinz and LaFarge. In 1908-09 Mr. Allen designed the Rector and Oxford hotels on First Avenue. A 1912 article noted that after a number of efforts to get a building constructed on this site the project proceeded with Mr. Allen as the architect; the article states the project was delayed because “the Bogue Plan had to be defeated first.” Earlier designs had been done by John Graham of Graham and Myers in 1907; Myers went on to be a proponent of the Bogue Plan. Mr. Allen departed Seattle at the time the permit was issued for the Securities Building and became the Director for the Panama California Exposition in San Diego in 1915. He was credited with the design of the Cabrillo Bridge and a couple of the exposition buildings and some of the garden areas.

Henry Bittman, architect, worked on this building in 1925. In 1923 he had designed the Terminal Sales Building and later the United Shopping Tower. He did a number of exquisite terracotta buildings. His offices were in the Securities Building for many years. He designed the new wing and the plan was to add four more wings like this and to develop the entire block. In 1957-58 other important offices buildings were built – the Logan Building, the Norton Building – with the goal being met to develop the rest of the lot. By 1962, the Securities Market Building at the north end of the lot, which had been designed by Henry Bittman, had been altered with the construction of a parking garage that is interconnected to the buildings to the north and south.

Ms. Krafft said the Securities Building is also significant under Criterion C; it is associated in a significant way with the cultural, political economic heritage of the community. The Securities Building in 1913 was major construction after the Denny Regrade; it was the only major office high rise to be constructed north of Virginia Street until relatively recently. The Securities Building is tied to the presence of the City/County building and the Civic Center concept which stayed near 2nd and Yesler and the construction of the Smith Tower.

Ms. Krafft said the building meets Criterion D and embodies the distinctive visible characteristics of an architectural style, or period, or method of construction. She identified the Beaux Arts detailing on the building and shared other Beaux Arts buildings in Seattle: the old Frederick and Nelson building, and the former Post Office and Library buildings.

Ms. Krafft noted the building sits at a pivotal bend on 3rd Avenue and meets Criterion F.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked if the base of the original 1913 building had been painted because the pictures show a darker base.

Ms. Krafft said the storefronts had been altered. Part of what happened is the canopy that wrapped the building from 1940 obscures some of the details at the storefront level. She said the cast iron is still there.

Owner Comment:

Jack McCullough, attorney for the owner, stated the owner supports nomination and while most is original there are parts that are not and wanted to focus for the record on what is new and what is not. He introduced Lyn Krizanich, owner's representative.

Mr. Krizanich explained Clise Properties is a 100 year old family owned company. The building is a treasure and has served as a home base for Clise properties for over 80 years. In addition to its historical significance everyone who works in and visits the building loves its character and its soul. They are proud of all their building but this one holds special significance and are proud of the care and maintenance that has been given to this building over the years not just to respect its character but also they have managed and operated the building in a sensitive way so they can keep up with changing business demands. She introduced Michael Whalen.

Mr. Whalen went through the Clise drawing and photographic archives to show how the building has changed over time. There was a fire in which some drawings were lost but there is enough to show how the building has changed over time. He showed the original more expansive design by Allen and pointed out the portion that was actually built. The original 3rd Avenue first floor plan was seen as a huge banking hall with high ceilings and the 4th Avenue side with office bays and light wells. The darker coloration on the lower portion of the building is called out on the drawings as cast iron and was likely painted at some point to match the terracotta. He pointed out the 2nd story line on the original building; the 1st story had high ceilings and clerestories which later turned into a mezzanine. He showed photos of the original wing, the 1920s addition and the 1940 addition. A small addition on the back was probably added in the 1960s.

Mr. Whalen pointed out the lower portion of the cast iron storefront zone that had been removed as well as the entry. Some windows were replaced to match the old ones when the mezzanine was added; the sash and casements are a different style from the rest of the building. The lower portion on the street level was completely removed and replaced with new storefront at some point. The original entry bay has been changed in the 1960s; the original doors and finishes were removed but the placement of the entry was moved toward 3rd Avenue so the depth of the entry was decreased. In 1990 new doors, sidelights, base materials were added in the spirit of the original building; they don't believe they are original materials. He said the base of the 1920s wing is essentially intact except for the storefront zone. The terracotta column cladding is intact and the granite bases at the bottoms of the columns are intact but in between the frames it appears to be all new storefront. On the Stewart façade of the 1913 building the arched window is original but others have been replaced. At the time the mezzanine was added the original cast iron was removed and new terracotta spandrels put in. The granite column bases are original but the bulkheads that go between them are relatively new. The majority of the upper portions of the building are all intact and in great shape.

Mr. Whalen went on to describe changes to the interior of the building and said much of the original material is intact – the ornate plaster, the stone pilasters, the base, the floor. When the lobby was modernized in the 1960s fortunately they just built below and left the original finishes in place so it didn't damage the plaster ceiling. In the 1990s it was returned to its original look – a new mahogany glass store front system, sconce lights, pendants were added. The elevator doors and transoms were originally

glass and there were eight elevators serving the upper floors. In the 1960s the elevator system was modernized and reduced to four and new doors replaced the glass doors. The cast metal surrounds and transoms are original. The Stewart Street entrance had been modernized in the 1960s; original finishes had been covered up. Some kind of clerestory had been added that obscures the arched window which he believes is still in place but the interior was covered and doors were recessed. This was restored in the 1990s.

Mr. Whalen explained they support the nomination and want to be specific about changes that have occurred and that the lobby will likely change in the future. The canopy on the front is a later addition and is in very poor shape and they think is not sympathetic to the overall design of the building and they would like to remove it and replace it with something else that is more in keeping. The c. 1960 stair enclosure that connects to the garage in the back is not a part of this structure.

Board Questions:

Mr. Lee noted it was interesting that the changes made in the 1960s could be removed and it might be possible that historic features are behind that material. He asked if this might be true on the outside as well. He referred to the green marble that was removed from the Joshua Green building and original material was beneath.

Ms. Kraft stated they definitely removed the balustrade and cornice.

Mr. Whalen stated it would be interesting to investigate to see what is there.

Mr. Veith asked if the stain glass skylights in the lobby were original or not.

Ms. Krafft stated the frames are still in place but it is new colored glass and that originally the skylights were naturally lit and they are artificially lit now.

Mr. Hannum asked about the green “S” on the building.

Ms. Krafft asked Mr. Whalen what their archives said about the name of the building; the drawings she has seen all call it the “Smith Building”.

Mr. Whalen wasn’t sure but would go back and look.

Ms. Krafft added that it was “C. J. Smith” and she thought it was a relative of Lyman C. but she found the Lyman didn’t have any children and thought that perhaps it was a brother. She was unable to find anything about C. J. Smith but he was in all the press coverage; the drawings are for the “Smith Building” and the “S” stands for “Smith”. The green terracotta is unique; the terracotta fabricators may have more information on it. She asked if the applicant had the specifications.

Mr. Whalen stated they have just drawings.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Sodt advised she tried to break down what the original features of the interior are and there isn't much mahogany and window trim that is original. She recommended nominating the lobby interior for now without specifying individual features but left it up to the board.

Mr. Lee recommended being broader in nominating and then narrow it down after site visit and specific details can be worked out in Controls and Incentives.

Mr. Finrow said it is a terrific building and commended Clise Properties for keeping it in great shape. He questioned C and F but agreed with B and D as both are significant and warrant nomination.

Mr. Matthews supported nomination on all Criteria and found the architectural information interesting and said definitely D.

Ms. Howard agreed with the Staff Report and supported nomination.

Ms. Nicolas supported nomination.

Ms. Tremaine stated she had no idea the building was so beautiful inside and supported B, C, D and F.

Mr. Abelsen supported nomination and said it is a fantastic structure with a wonderful history.

Mr. Hannum said it is a landmark in every sense of the word and supported B, C, D and F.

Mr. Veith supported nomination but hadn't sorted out which criteria. He thought C was hard because of the double significance and wondered if it was being associated with the northward march of the City or with specific aspects of how was the building used in that commercial district. Regarding the association with a person he stated the building has to be actually associated with the person rather than just be an interesting coincidence. He agreed with F and stated the building has a great advantage because of its location at 3rd and Stewart Streets and it embodies several distinctive technologies and the combining of those into an interesting style. He agreed with D and F and as far as what to include he noticed the Stewart Street lobby was not included but noted the arched window. He suggested including both lobbies now and then can pare down later and note the non-historic features at Designation.

Mr. Lee noted what he thought interesting about the lobbies is that they are connected and the elevators can be viewed from both vantage points. He recommended nominating the entrance lobby/lobbies to include. He said it is a fantastic building and supported B, C, D and F. C is awkward sometimes because it is often related to B which is similar. The building does stand out because the grid changes. He supported nomination.

Action: I move approval of the Securities Building at 1904 Third 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, and the Third Avenue and Stewart Street lobbies; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation is scheduled for November 5, 2008; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/TV/MH 9:0:0 Motion approved.

Mr. Finrow left at 6:10 p.m.

100108.5 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

100108.51 Colman Elementary School
2300 S. Massachusetts St.

Ms. Chave presented the signed agreement.

Action: I move to approve the Controls and Incentives Agreement as signed.

MM/SC/MJ/CH 8:0:0 Motion approved.

100108.52 Brasa/Metropolitan Press Printing Company
2107 Third Avenue

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

Action: I move to approved to approve a three month extension for Brasa.

MM/SC/MT/VA 8:0:0 Motion approved.

100108.6 BOARD BUSINESS

Ms. Chave thanked Get Engaged member Czarina Nicolas for her service on the Board. She introduced Sean Peterfreund, who will be the new Get Engaged member of the Board as soon as he is confirmed by City Council.

100108.7 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator