



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 444/07

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Seattle Municipal Tower

700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor

Room 4060

Wednesday, November 7, 2007– 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Vernon Abelsen
Mollie Tremaine
Czarina Nicholas
Mark Hannum
Tom Veith
Christine Howard
Henry Matthews
John Schwartz

Staff

Elizabeth Chave
Sarah Sodt
Karen Gordon
Rebecca Frestedt
Joanne Walby

Absent

Ron Martinson
Stephen Lee
Alyce Conti

Vern Abelsen, Vice Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:35 pm.

110707.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Action:

To adopt the minutes of September 19, 2007

MM/SC/MT/TV 5:0:2 Minutes adopted. Ms. Nicholas and Mr. Hannum abstained.

Action:

To adopt the minutes of October 3, 2007

MM/SC/MT/TV 7:0:0 Minutes adopted.

Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

110707.2 SPECIAL TAX VALUATION

110707.21 5403 Ballard Avenue N.W.
(Ballard Avenue Landmark District)

Karen Gordon, City Historic Preservation Officer said this is a contributing building in the Ballard Avenue Landmark District. The rehabilitation period was January 1, 2007 to September 28, 2007. The submitted rehabilitation costs are \$ 989,560 and the eligible rehabilitation costs are \$ 989,560. There were no disallowed costs. The percentage value of the rehabilitation is 75% and the work was performed in conformance with Certificate of Approval issued by the Ballard Avenue Landmark District Board.

There were no Board comments or questions.
There was no public comment.

Action:

I move that the Ballard Avenue Landmark District Board recommend to the Landmarks Preservation Board to approve the following property for Special Tax Certification: 5403 Ballard Ave NW. This action is based upon the criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; and based on the review and approval of the building exterior renovation by the Ballard Avenue Landmark District Board; that the property is a contributing building located in the Ballard Avenue Landmark District, and has not been altered in any way that adversely affects those features that identify its significance or contribution to the Ballard Avenue Landmark District; that the property has been issued Certificates of Approval as required in the Ballard Avenue Landmark District; and has substantially improved in the 24-month period prior to application, and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Local Review Board as required by Title 84 RCW, Chapter 449.

MM/SC/JS/CH 7:0:0 Motion carried.

110707.22 5205 Ballard Avenue N.W.
(Ballard Avenue Landmark District)

Karen Gordon, City Historic Preservation Officer said this is a contributing building in Ballard Avenue Landmark District. The rehabilitation period was September 24, 2005 to September 24, 2007. The submitted rehabilitation costs were \$ 265,721 and the eligible rehabilitation costs were \$ 247,316. The disallowed costs, \$18,405, were costs incurred prior to September 24, 2005. The percentage value of the rehabilitation is 441% and the work performed in conformance with Certificate of Approval issued by the Ballard Avenue Landmark District Board.

There were no Board comments or questions.

There was no public comment.

Action:

I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: 5205 Ballard Ave NW, that this action is based upon criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; and based upon the recommendation of the Ballard Avenue Landmark District Board which made the following findings at its meeting of November 1, 2007, that the property is a contributing building located in the Ballard Avenue Landmark District, and has not been altered in any way that adversely affects those features that identify its significance or contribution to the Ballard Avenue Landmark District; and that the property has been issued Certificates of Approval as required in the District; and has been substantially improved in the 24-month period prior to application, and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Landmarks Preservation Board and the owner.

MM/SC/CH/TV 7:0:0 Motion carried.

110707.23 Medical Dental Building
509 Olive Way

Karen Gordon, City Historic Preservation Officer said this building is a City of Seattle Landmark, Ordinance # 122316. The rehabilitation period is July 1, 2006 – September 27, 2007. The submitted rehabilitation costs are \$15,011,655.72 and the eligible rehabilitation costs are \$15,011,655.72. There were no disallowed costs. The percentage value of rehabilitation is 49% and the work was performed in conformance with Certificate of Approval issued by the Landmarks Preservation Board.

Board comments: Ms. Tremaine pointed out holes in the terra cotta that still need to be patched and painted.

There was no public comment.

Action:

I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: Medical Dental Building, 509 Olive Way, 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/CH/TV 7:0:0 Motion carried.

110707.24 Bon Marche/Macy's

300 Pine Street

Karen Gordon, City Historic Preservation Officer said this building is a City of Seattle Landmark, Ordinance # 114772. The rehabilitation period is July 30, 2005- July 30, 2007. The submitted rehabilitation costs are \$3,966,718.31 and the eligible rehabilitation costs are \$3,966,718.31. There were no disallowed costs. The percentage value of rehabilitation is 32% and the work was performed in conformance with Certificate of Approval issued by the Landmarks Preservation Board.

There were no Board comments or questions.

There was no public comment.

Action:

I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: Bon Marche, Third & Pine Streets, 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/TV/MH 7:0:0 Motion carried.

110707.25

Chief Seattle Club/Monterey Hotel

406-410 Second Avenue Extension South
(Pioneer Square District)

Karen Gordon, City Historic Preservation Officer said this building is a contributing building in Pioneer Square Preservation District. The rehabilitation period is October 1, 2005 to October 1, 2007. The submitted and eligible rehabilitation costs are \$2,596,498.60 and \$ 2,596,498.60. There were no disallowed costs. The percentage value of the rehabilitation is 25,965% and the work was performed in conformance with Certificate of Approval issued by the Pioneer Square Preservation Board.

There were no Board comments or questions.

There was no public comment.

Action:

I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: 406-410 Second Avenue Extension South, that this action is based upon criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; and based upon the recommendation of the Pioneer Square Preservation Board which made the following findings at its meeting of November 7, 2007; that

these properties are contributing buildings located in the Pioneer Square Preservation District, and have not been altered in any way that adversely affects those features that identify their significance or contribution to the Pioneer Square Preservation District ; and that the properties have been issued Certificates of Approval as required in the District; and have 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/TV/CH 7:0:0 Motion carried.

110707.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

110707.31 4852 37th Ave. S.
(Columbia City Landmark District)

Application: Signage: The applicant is proposing to install a business identification sign on the face of the canopy along the 37th Avenue S. facade.

Staff Report: Rebecca Frestedt, Coordinator for the Columbia City Review Committee, presented the application on behalf of the building owner, Heidi Schloss. She said the proposed sign dimensions are 110” (approximately 9’5” w x 14” h). The sign will be constructed of 3 mm laminated aluminum, stabilized to a black plastic core and attached to the awning with sheet metal screws. The business is located on the second floor of the building and shares office space with Columbia City Acupuncture and Herbs. She said the Committee and LPB reviewed and approved a similar sign for the acupuncture business in May of this year. The sign was approved by the Review Committee at their June 8, 2007 meeting. On October 12, 2007, the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval of the proposed signage.

Board Questions:

Ms. Tremaine asked how the business would be accessed.

Ms. Frestedt said they would use the door below the arch.

Mr. Hannum asked if the door had been replaced.

Ms. Frestedt said it was replaced with Board approval. She said the photograph presented today was taken before that door was replaced.

Mr. Abelsen asked if there was potential for another business in the adjacent space that may also request signage in the future.

Ms. Frestedt said she does not anticipate this.

Mr. Veith asked why the businesses didn't apply for two signs at once. He said this signage application seems like an afterthought and none of the existing signage seems to meet the propose signage plan for this building. He suggested that the signs could be hung one under the other.

Ms. Frestedt stated that the business relocated to this space and wanted to use their existing signage for financial reasons. She said the Parcel Post does meet the signage plan. She said they didn't hang the second sign under the first because there were concerns about vandalism and height clearance.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion: Mr. Hannum said the CCRC had some concerns with the signage but knew any other configuration would create visibility and transparency issues.

Mr. Veith said this signage pattern is haphazard, but noted that this building is not very distinct in the District.

Ms. Tremaine remarked that the District rules were being followed. Other Board members agreed but said they would defer to the CCRC's recommendation, especially since the signage is removable.

Ms. Frestedt stated that she would endeavor to enforce the building signage plans.

Henry Matthews arrived at 4:00pm

Action:

I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for the proposed exterior alterations. This action is based on the following: The proposed alterations meet the following sections of the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines:

Relevant Code citations and guidelines

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

Design Guidelines11. Signs.

MM/SC/JS/MT 6:1:1 Motion carried.

Mr. Hannum opposed and Mr. Matthews abstained.

110707.32 900 Summit Ave. E.
(Harvard-Belmont Landmark District)

Application: Proposed exterior alterations, including alterations to windows, exterior cladding, decks, and the entrance canopy.

Staff Report: Ms. Chave said The Harvard Belmont Committee found the application to be in compliance with the rules, as the proposed alterations are sympathetic to the existing building and the materials proposed are consistent with the original building.

Applicant Comment: Katie Oman, project architects, said the apartment building has not been changed significantly over the years but the owner wants to change the paint color and give a more modern feel to the building. She said she proposes to replace the canopy, some windows and add some windows for views to the west. She said they also propose to change the northern decks' configuration. Ms Oman proposes to replace the siding with stucco which she said would relate to the surrounding buildings. She proposes to clad the chimney in slate; she said the existing lap siding is not original. The railings will be changed to cable railing.

Board Questions:

Ms. Tremaine asked for more information on the window replacement plan.

Ms. Oman said the existing window is a single pane, with a metal frame with vinyl sides.

Ms. Chave noted that the 1970s survey shows this building to have exterior wood shingles and were perhaps changed out.

Mr. Veith said that lap-type shingles were common in the 1970s.

Mr. Abelsen noted that the front elevation would be changed significantly with the new windows.

Ms. Oman said there had been many changes over the years.

Ms. Chave said that Category Two buildings in the Harvard Belmont District are not treated like individual landmarks and its overall character is considered to be "contributing".

Mr. Veith asked for context photos of the surrounding neighborhood. She provided photographs of the surrounding buildings.

For the canopy replacement, Ms. Oman said they propose a glass and steel modern design and will remove the arch, as well.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Chave noted that Harvard Belmont Review Committee members reviewed this application and felt it was appropriate since this is not a significant building in the District. She noted that this building was included in the District because both buildings on either side of it are considered significant.

Mr. Matthews, a Harvard Belmont Committee member said he agreed, although he said he was not enthusiastic that these changes would add different colors and textures to a building that is relatively “simple and unified.”

Other Board members agreed that these changes call attention to the building but agreed to approve the application because the building is non-contributing.

Action:

I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the proposed exterior alterations, including alterations to windows, exterior cladding, decks, and the entrance canopy, as per the applicant’s submittal. The Board deferred any potential changes in material or color to the Board’s Architectural Review Committee for review and approval. This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed exterior alterations meet the following sections of the Harvard-Belmont District Development and Design Review Guidelines:
C. 1. and C.2.

MM/SC/JS/MT 6:2:0 Motion carried. Messrs. Hannum and Veith opposed.

110707.33 New Pacific Apartments
2600 First Avenue

Application: Proposed storefront alterations

Staff Report: Ms. Sodt reported that the application is to alter the non-historic center storefronts in an attempt to make it more sympathetic to the flanking historic storefronts. She said the ARC had suggested some minor revisions to the proposed design and had requested that these other option to be brought to the full Board.

Applicant Comment: The applicant, Chris Linker, said the ARC suggested they try an angled vestibule that would reflect the angle of the historic

vestibules on either side. He said that he and his partner decided they liked this design better and they have amended their drawing to reflect the angled vestibule, per the recommendation of the ARC. He said that he also incorporated the suggestion that the mullions be narrower to be more consistent with the historic storefronts.

There were no Board questions or comments.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action:

I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed storefront alterations.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 106348 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is 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/TV/CH 8:0:0 Motion carried.

110707.4 DESIGNATIONS

110707.41 Fitch/Nutt House
4401 Phinney Avenue North

Staff Report: Ms. Chave reported that on September 19, 2007, the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board voted to approve nomination of the subject property and scheduled a public meeting to be held on November 7, 2007. She recommended designation of the following features or characteristics: The exterior of the building and the site.

This recommendation is based upon satisfaction of the following designation standards of SMC 25.12.350 D and F.

Applicant Comment: Paul Fellows, Board member of the Fremont Historical Society, Carol Tobin, architectural historian and Greg Lange, historian, presented the designation information.

Mr. Fellows said they represent neighborhood residents and nonresidents and business owners interested in Fremont history. He said they began

discussions and research in 2005 to learn whether this house might warrant landmark status. He said they contacted the home owner at that time and he said he was not interested in landmark designation for this house. Mr. Fellows said City landmarks in Fremont are all commercial or public buildings and this would be the first residence with landmark status. He showed some slides of other residences in Fremont that may qualify for landmark status. He said the house's condition is very good considering the age of the house. He said it needs a paint job and some board replacement on the south side. He showed slides of other historic homes in Seattle that were in poor condition when they were landmarked and have since been restored, such as the 23rd Ave Group houses.

Greg Lange, former Pioneer Square Preservation board member and History Link staff member, reviewed the history of Fremont and the construction of this house. He referred to a written report he submitted to the Board. He said the Fitch Nutt house was built after Seattle's second building boom after 1897 when the Klondike Gold Rush brought thousands of new people to Seattle. During this time Mr. Fitch arrived from Kansas and bought the lot and constructed the house in 1899. Mr. Nutt purchased the house soon after and built the front addition. In 1906 the trolley line was laid in front of this house and was the main north/south transportation line in Seattle. By 1910 there were 43,000 homes built in Seattle. Mr. Lange said he completed the City's survey of pre-1905 structures, most of which are vernacular design. He noted it is unusual to know the name of the builder of a vernacular home.

Mr. Lange said he believes this house meets criterion F because it is located on the arterial's turn on the street car line, the Interurban railroad and today, the #5 bus route. The house is situated on a slope with a territorial view behind it. He said it also meets criterion D because of its interesting design style.

Carol Tobin, former Landmarks Board member, said she conducted the neighborhood survey of Fremont. She said she would review the house's integrity. She said there are seven factors one should consider when reviewing a structure's integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association. She said this house retains its integrity because, 1) it sits on its original site, 2) the basic element of the original design remain, 3) its setting is prominent with views to the east, west and south, 4) the original wood materials remain, 5) the workmanship shows attention to detail, 6) it expresses its aesthetic sense or period of time, and 7) it has an association with its owner, who lived here.

Ms. Tobin reviewed how she believes this property and structure meet the landmark criterion D. She said it was built in the Folk Victorian style with unique handcrafted elements, such as the three-gable dormer, barge boards, deep eave returns and original trims on the main part of the house, the turned porch posts are the porch windows have a distinct configuration. She said the

details are quite similar to the Radford 1903 pattern book. She said the main alteration to the primary elevation is the addition of the railing and the change to the roof line, both of which she said could be reversed.

Ms. Tobin said that the Folk Victorian design is known for having simplified detailing, and a symmetrical façade and a lack of textured surfaces. She showed photographs of other examples of Folk Victorian houses in Seattle. She said one might consider the Fitch Nutt house to be a “transition” style of folk Victorian. She said vernacular buildings are those that are built with local materials in a functional style and not built by an architect. She said Fitch Nutt House is characteristic of the neighborhood at the time it was constructed. Ms. Tobin said this house was included in three city surveys: Historic Seattle Survey, 1970, the 1979 City of Seattle citywide survey which remarked on the Fitch Nutt houses’ architectural originality, and the 1905 City survey of pre-1905 buildings.

Ms. Tobin said she believes the Fitch Nutt house meets criterion F because of its siting and views of Ballard and its age contrasts with surrounding structures. She said this house is a well-known icon and has stood the test of time.

Mr. Fellows noted that the Board has received 27 letters in support of designating the Fitch Nutt house a City landmark.

Mr. Veith noted that he is affiliated with the Fremont Historical Society and although he was not involved in the creation of the applicant’s designation report he offered to recuse himself if requested to do so by the owner.

The owner representative, Richard Hill, said it was not necessary for Mr. Veith to recuse himself.

Board Questions:

Mr. Matthews asked if something is missing from the central dormer. Ms. Tobin said she didn’t think so and said the earlier photograph they have is from 1937. Mr. Fellows noted that all the material on the east side is original.

Mr. Abelsen asked what might be considered “strategic” about the house’s location.

Ms. Tobin said the house is sited to take advantage of the views and it is also along the trolley and bus lines.

Mr. Veith asked why they identified it as an I-type house, since the two parts of house were built separately. Ms. Tobin said the 1902-built eastern portion of the house is an I-form and is predominant.

Owner Comment:

Richard Hill of the law firm, McCullough Hill, spoke on behalf of the owner, Kirk Gronvold. He said this house has been in the owner's family for 35 years, mainly as a rental property. He remarked that there seems to be a momentum towards designating this property and while he may agree with the facts set forth by the designation report, he said he does not believe the house meets the designation criteria. Also, he said designating this property would "set precedent" for landmarking other residential properties in Fremont, which he said could be problematic for residents who have their life savings in their homes.

Mr. Hill reviewed the landmark threshold criterion related to "whether the property has significant character, interest or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the city state or nation" and said the second criterion states that the property should be over 25 years old. He said it obviously meets the latter, but he had questions about the first. Also, noted that according to the landmarks ordinance the property should retain integrity and have the ability to convey its significance.

Mr. Hill reviewed the landmark criterion and singled out D and F, which the nominators cited in their report. He said he does not believe it meets criterion D, noting that the nomination report on page two asserts that the Fitch Nutt house design has a "vernacular style and Queen Anne decorative details". He said this could be called an eclectic design, or as Ms. Tobin wrote, a "transitional design", and as such could not meet criterion D.

Mr. Hill said the fact that the house enjoys "great views" is irrelevant. He said the prominence mentioned in criterion F is related to the public's perception of the building. He said it is also important to note that the western side is not particularly visible because of the slope. He said this structure is not architecturally significant, nor is it the work of a significant architect. He also noted that the house has been moved twice since its original construction and is not on its original site. Mr. Hill stated that this house has no association with any historical events or the development of Fremont in any significant way. Also, he said this house is listed in historical surveys, but only because of its age and architectural style and not because there was anything particularly significant about the latter, as is required by the Landmark criteria. He said it may be an I-house, but he said this is not architecturally significant enough to meet the landmark criteria. He noted that there few I-houses were built in Seattle.

Mr. Hill reviewed the alterations to the house: porch railings have been replaced, the mansard roof removed; the first floor roof trim has been removed; the post along the upper deck replaced with taller posts; windows replaced or closed off and the chimneys have been removed.

Mr. Hill stated that there are several other houses in Fremont that are in better condition, but he said “significance” is a relative term and should be defined in terms of the community as a whole. He said the Board should determine if this house should be considered more significant than other similar structures.

Mr. Hill said this is a fine old home but he doubted that it rises to the level of significance required for landmark status. Mr. Hill said he did not believe its “eclectic or transitional” architectural style, nor the method of construction, was distinctive enough to merit designation. He said the barge boards are attractive but he did not think this would warrant landmark designation. Further, he said he did not think it meets criterion F simply because it is on a bus line, as many homes in Seattle are. Also, he said this house has been moved twice.

Kirk Gronvold, building owner, said this is not a commercial structure and the Board’s decision to potentially landmark a residence could affect every home owner in Seattle and will place a burden on him and his family. He said he doubts that any of the neighbors ever heard of this house before the 11”x 18” color posters were posted around the neighborhood alerting people to the landmark proceedings. He said he also lives in a 1917 house and he wondered if it should also be landmarked because it is on the bus line. He said most people who knew this house because they rode by it on the trolley line are probably dead now. He said he is working class himself and landmarking this house could hurt his business. He said it probably has termites, mice and rats and is significant need of repair. He said its prominent location on the hill and its siting on a corner lot should not be enough to make it a landmark. He added that the house blends into the hillside when viewed from the west and is not prominent. He noted that this house probably wasn’t built with good materials because it was built after a depression and it was built by an unknown, insignificant builder, Mr. Fitch.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked if the windows on the west and east sides had been replaced.

Mr. Gronvold said the south side windows had been boxed in but the east windows were screwed shut. He said the interiors have been nearly completely replaced.

Public Comment:

Char Eggleston of the Queen Anne Historical Society noted the three surveys in which this house is included. She said very little of the front façade has been changed and this makes it a real rarity for a 100 year old building. She said she supports the designation.

Kate Krafft said she supports the landmark designation because the exterior alterations have been minor and the deterioration has been a result of poor

maintenance. She said many landmarks have been in poor condition, but this should not be considered in the Board's decision. She noted that vernacular architecture varies based on the region or locale and is made with local materials and is usually built by a carpenter.

Christine Palmer, Preservation Advocate for Historic Seattle, stated for the record that the Fremont Historical Society has no official position on this designation.

Leanne Olsen, of the Queen Anne Historical Society, noted that one could consider that there is little difference between a "commercial" structure and a long term rental, as they both generate income. She said the views behind this structure are very important and part of the site.

Cathy Wickwire from the Washington State Trust for Historic Preservation referred the Board to the letter in support of the designation that she submitted earlier.

Toby Thaler, neighborhood resident, said he has been aware of this house long before the posters went up. He said there are many fine houses in Fremont but none as prominent and old as the Fitch Nutt house.

Eric Pihl said the Fitch Nutt house is an important structure. He noted that of the 350 City landmarks, 50 are residences, some have been in even worse condition at the time of their designation. He said the Board needs to preserve the "thread of history" related to this house and its construction in Fremont. He said it is prominent on Phinney Avenue, which was the main north/south connector before the City built the bridges. He said its siting on the hill is also significant.

Helen Divjak said she supports the designation because it is a good example of vernacular architecture and she said it was one of the first houses she noticed when she moved into the neighborhood.

Donna Gronvold said she is married to the building owner. She said they are a family five with three kids to put through college. She said this building does not meet the landmark criteria and she asked the Board not to designate because this is how her family makes a living.

Amy Klosterman said she is also a working class resident of Fremont and she believes this house's architecture and method of construction are distinctive. She said it is prominently sited and noted that while the house had been moved, it was not moved off the original site and this was likely done in response to the city growing around it.

Brian Doshier said he is a former resident of the house. He said it had direct view of both mountain ranges and the Space Needle. He said there are very old boards in the basement and noted that these boards were probably milled in Fremont. He said this house is often hit by strong winds but it is solid. He noted that it is prominent and easily recognizable by visiting friends. He said the windows in the front are not rotten and they were operable when he was there.

An unidentified man said he walks by this house often and said it stands out. He said its prominent location and transitional style make it significant.

An unidentified man said he immediately recognized this house when he heard it was up for a landmarks designation. He said “significance” is relevant and since 1972 Seattle has lost so many beautiful homes. He said this home’s link to its builder/owner is also significant. He said it is important to keep the links between the architectural styles that change with time.

Marty Holden said he has known this house for decades and while he has sympathy for the owners, the community needs to preserve these homes.

Heather McAuliffe said this house has changed over time in order to adapt to families’ needs. She said the house is sited prominently near the Light House Coffee House and is very unique in the City.

Karin Link said there are only two I-shaped houses in the City and if we lose this one we’d lose the connection to the past.

Kay Edmonston asked the Board to please designate this property. She said she recently sold her property in Fremont and made a profit but said it is important to preserve the character of old homes.

Unidentified woman said her friend lived in this house and the yard is small in front so the house is sited close to the sidewalk. She said the sunset views from this house are spectacular.

Marshall Studeval said he lives near this house and would miss it if it were gone.

Ann Danbeck said she lives near this house and would also miss it if it were gone.

Mary Revard said her family lived in this house in 1975 and confirmed that the windows were screwed shut. She said she would love to see it stay but the owners need to keep up the front yard.

Mr. Schwartz departed at 6:00pm

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hannum said he agrees with the staff report and believes the house should be designated under criterion D and F. He noted that the alterations to the house are reversible and it has enough integrity to convey its significance.

Mr. Veith said although he was concerned about the loss of the mansard roof, but he was only aware of one other structure that is one-room wide. He noted that the other changes to the back end of the building had been done early on in its life. He said it is prominently located, with unique gables and style. He said he thought it was a Queen Anne House with pre-classical design. He said he supported the designation under criteria D and F.

Mr. Matthews said he also supports the designation and feels it is important to designate vernacular structures as landmarks. He said it is common for structures of this period to have eclectic architecture.

Ms. Tremaine stated that this building retains its integrity and conveys a simplicity and strong character. She said she supports the designation under criteria D and F.

Ms. Nichols said she is impressed by the neighborhood support and said she supports the designation under criteria D and F.

Ms. Howard said she believes it meets criterion F and said it is evocative of Seattle's history.

Mr. Abelsen said he believes this house stands on its own merits and it meets criterion D and F.

Action:

I move that the Board approve the designation of the Fitch/Nutt House at 4401 Phinney Avenue North, a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards D and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the exterior of the building and the site.
MM/SC/HM/MH 7:0:0 Motion carried.

110707.5 NOMINATIONS

110707.51 Norton Building
801 Second Avenue

Staff Report: Ms. Sodt said she recommended the nomination of the Norton Building at 801 Second Avenue based on the following designation standards: C, D, E and F. Staff recommends that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include the exterior of the building and the site. She said this building is a category one building in the City's 2007 Downtown Building survey.

Designation Report: The Report was presented by Kate Krafft on behalf of the City.

Ms. Krafft said this 21 story modern high rise building was built 1959 in the Internationalist style and is located in Seattle's banking center along Second and Third Avenues. She said this was the first modern office tower in Seattle, built 30 years after the Depression. She said it was the first building over six stories to incorporate a pre-stressed concrete structure. She said it was intended to be an addition to the Exchange Building and was initially referred to as the United Exchange Building. It was designed by Bindon & Wright, proponents of the modern style. She said Marvin Goldsmith served as the structural engineer and was Mies van der Rohe's most distinguished student. The building's floor-to-ceiling glass design took advantage of Puget Sound views and good natural light. She said the building has a monument base with terraces and plazas, a reflecting pool and landscape planters around the first floor. She said the curtain wall was innovative in that the pre-fabricated panels were installed without scaffolding. The upper floors were designed with moveable partitions that would allow it to be very flexible in design and with regard to its electrical, mechanical and telephone systems. When the Norton Building was built, it was mentioned in all major architectural periodicals. Ms. Krafft noted that Mr. Matthew G. Norton was an early lumberman. She noted that it was interesting that the ventilation slats in the Norton Building First Avenue façade match the window bays of the Exchange Building next door.

Ms. Krafft reviewed the changes to the structure: the reflecting pool was removed; the bank wall made flush with the original west wall of the base of the tower; ivy added to the entry in the 1980s; a sculpture installed, and a new non-skid flooring was installed in the lobby. She noted that the marble around the elevators is the original Alaskan marble. She said Victor Steinbrueck acknowledged this building in his 1976 survey, stating that, "the elegant new Norton Building is a sharp and definite addition to the Seattle skyline..."

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked if the flooring beyond the original lobby was changed when the non-skid flooring was added. Ms. Krafft said the flooring was changed throughout. She noted that the original tiles remain along some of the perimeter.

Mr. Veith noted that Bindon & Wright were fairly well-known and built the Seattle Public Library and Seattle City Light, both now demolished. He said the Norton building was the only new high rise built until 1963. He asked of the architecture firms associated with this building, which was the subcontractor. Ms. Krafft said she did not know.

Owner Comment: Donald Marcy, of Cairncross Hempelmann and Joe Kinney, CFO of Northwest Building LLC, represented the building owners.

Mr. Marcy asked that the Board to decline the nomination for landmark status. He said this building has managed to remain a class A office building because they can adapt to their tenants' needs. He said they altered the ground floor space in order to accommodate a bank's needs and he worried that having landmark status would hamper their ability to make changes when necessary.

Mr. Kinney said he first came to this building when it housed the offices of his former employers, Arthur Andersen Accounting. He said Mr. Norton-Clapp was an investor who owned the Seaboard and Exchange buildings and he built the Norton building as a "spec-building" and as an investment property. He said he thought this building was fairly non-descript and he didn't see what would be gained by landmarking it. He said the owners have no intention of tearing it down, but want to have the flexibility to alter the building to meet their tenants' needs. He said although it is located downtown, it is not prominent or well-known by many people in the public.

Mr. Kinney noted that all the single-paned glass had been replaced in the 1990s because the building would get very hot in the summertime. He also said the doors on First Avenue and Columbia Street had been changed out.

Mr. Marcy reviewed the alterations to this building: he noted the 21 stories include four stories of parking; pedestrian plaza was fenced in and public is no longer allowed in the plaza; the reflecting pool removed, signage changed and over 50% of the building skin changed to double-paned glass. In response to a Board member's earlier question, noted that Bindon & Wright received the initial contract to build the structure. He said that Mr. Goldsmith, the structural engineer, did not consider this to be one of his significant works.

Board Questions:

Mr. Matthews suggested to the owners that if this building were to be designated they could discuss any future changes with the Landmarks Board Staff. He said the Board is conscious of building owners' need to keep their structures alive and flourishing.

Mr. Veith noted that many landmarked structures have been altered.

Public Comment:

Christine Palmer, Preservation Advocate from Historic Seattle. She said they strongly support this nomination and she hoped this process would help building owners understand that different types of designs can be considered to be historically significant.

Leanne Olsen of the Queen Anne Historical Society said she supports the nomination because it has integrity and she thanked the building owners for their excellent stewardship over the years. She said it would be a shame if some day in the future the first modern high rise structure in Seattle would be torn down.

Kathy Wickwire of DOCOMO WEWA: said it is important to designate modern buildings and the Norton Building is first of the significant modern buildings. She said she supports the nomination.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Howard said believes this building might meet criterion D, although somewhat weakly.

Ms. Nicholas said she would support the nomination because of its curtain wall design, Internationalist style and the fact that it is the first high rise building in downtown and it contrasts with other buildings.

Ms. Tremaine agreed, citing the association with Mie van der Rohe's construction and design methods.

Other Board members agreed.

Mr. Abelsen remarked that he understands the owners' concerns but said this Board works with owners to allow sensitive alterations to structures allowing it to remain vital and adapt to changing needs.

Action:

I move approval of the Norton Building at 801 Second 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 site; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation is scheduled for December 19, 2007; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/TV/CH 7:00 Motion carried.

110707.52

Central Waterfront Piers
Piers 54, 55, 56, 57 and 59

Staff Report: Ms. Sodt recommended the nomination of the Central Waterfront Piers based on the designation standards C, D and F. She recommended that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include the pier and pier pilings from the west edge of the right-of-way of Alaskan Way (the seawall) to the outer harbor line, and from the north edge of piling piers of Pier 59 to the south edge of the wooden piling piers of Pier 54; the exterior pier sheds; and the currently exposed interior ceilings and truss systems.

Applicant Comment: Karin Link, architectural historian, presented the application on behalf of the City. Ms. Link said these piers were built between 1900 - 1904 and are heavy timber structures with monitor roofs and are the last vestiges of the piers that ran between Broad and Massachusetts Ave S. She said these piers serviced the “mosquito fleet” that sprung up between Seattle and Tacoma after Tacoma was became the terminus of the railroad in 1973. Ms. Link reviewed the history of each pier and their tenants. When the railroad arrived in Seattle she said the piers were re-sited diagonally in 1904 to allow easier access.

Ms. Link said the common elements of the piers are their parallelogram shaped platforms, heavy timbers, knee-bracing and free standing posts. She said there had been few alterations to Pier 54. She said Pier 55 collapsed in 1901, rebuilt in 1902 and was rehabilitated in 1985 and new bay windows added on the west elevation. Pier 56, the site of President Theodore Roosevelt’s arrive in 1903 on the steamer *Spokane*, has had changes to its fenestration and the interiors have been recently restored by Mithun Architects. Pier 57 served as cold storage until 1907 when it was converted to fish processing. It was purchased by the City and renovated in 1971.

Ms. Link stated that she believes the piers meets criterion F because of their prominent location and the contrast related to its siting, age and scale. She said although the piers have been altered somewhat, they are still in use and retain their original workmanship. She said they also could be designated under criterion C because of its association with Seattle’s economic development and international trade, the transportation infrastructure and the fishing industry. She said it could also be designated because of its association with the grain and hay business of Gailbraith and Bacon, one of the piers’ most prominent tenants. She said President Roosevelt’s arrival in 1903 at Pier 56 also associates it with a significant person and event in Seattle’s history.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked if the designation should only include the currently exposed ceiling and truss system. Ms. Sodt said that is what is recommended in the staff report.

Ms. Link noted that the rehabilitation in the 1960s was done differently than it would have been done today. She said the exterior is the most important elevation but it would be nice to preserve the interior wood truss system.

Ms. Tremaine asked if Seattle was the only city with angled piers. Ms. Link said no.

Public Comment:

Kathleen Conner said the Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation owns Piers 59 and Waterfront Park. She asked if this nomination includes Waterfront Park/Pier 58. She said the Parks Department would be happy to have Pier 59 as a part of the pier group City Landmark.

Ms. Sodt said the nomination does not include the Waterfront Park.

Christine Palmer, Preservation Advocate from Historic Seattle, said they have wanted to landmark the piers for decades and lends its support to this nomination. She suggested the trusses be landmarked in Pier 57.

Owner Comment: Bob Donegan, the owner's representative of Pier 54, introduced Mark Astor and Mickey Smith of Martin Smith Inc, owner of Pier 55 and 56 and Kyle Griffith, Pier 57 owner's representative.

Mr. Donegan said they recognize the historic importance of these piers and will be happy to work with the City to landmark them. He said the piers represent a very powerful economic sector in Seattle's economy and are visited by 3 million people every year. He said this economic engine of these businesses on the piers allows them to reinvest and keep the piers viable. For example, he said they spend \$290,000 just on pilings each year.

Kyle Gil represented the building owner, Hal Griffith who was out of town. He said his father founded the Seattle Waterfront Historical Society and purchased Pier 57 in 1978 and developed the boardwalk. He said the owner supports the preservation of the piers but he said they also need the flexibility to maintain the piers' economic viability. He said because they are located on the waterfront, there is already a lot of red tape involved in maintaining the piers.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Matthews said he supports the nomination and said the diagonal pattern is striking.

Other Board members agreed.

Action:

I move approval of the Central Waterfront Piers, Piers 54, 55, 56, 57 and 59 for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include the pier and pier pilings from the west edge of the right-of-way of Alaskan Way (the seawall) to the outer harbor line, and from the north edge of piling piers of Pier 59 to the south edge of the wooden piling piers of Pier 54; the exterior pier sheds; and the interior ceilings and truss systems; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation is scheduled for December 19, 2007; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.
MM/SC/MH/MT 7:0:0 Motion carried.

110707.6 CONTROLS AND INCENTIVES

110707.61 Dearborn House
1117 Minor Avenue

Staff Report; Ms. Chave said the agreement has been signed, and copies of the signed agreement were sent to the Board members.

Action:

I moved to approve the Controls and Incentives agreement.

MM/SC/TV/CH 7:0:0 Motion carried.

110707.62 Eitel Building
1501 Second Avenue

Staff Report: Ms. Sodt reported that the building owner requested a 60 extension for the consideration of the Controls and Incentives agreement while they work with DPD on other permitting issues.

Action:

I moved to approve a 60-day extension for the consideration of the Controls and Incentives agreement.

MM/SC/TV/CH 7:0:0 Motion carried.

BOARD BUSINESS

Christine Palmer reported that Historic Seattle will host a Centennial party in December.

Meeting adjourned at 8:35 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator