



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 515/07

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Seattle Municipal Tower

700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor

Room 4060

Wednesday, December 5, 2007– 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Stephen Lee, Chair

Mollie Tremaine

Alyce Conti

Mark Hannum

Tom Veith

Christine Howard

Ron Martinson

Vernon Abelsen

Henry Matthews

Czarina Nicholas

John Schwartz

Staff

Elizabeth Chave

Sarah Sodt

Rebecca Frestedt

Joanne Walby

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

120507.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES November 7, 2007

The approval of the minutes deferred until next meeting.

120507.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

120507.21 4916 Rainier Ave. S.
(Columbia City Landmark District)

Application: The applicant is proposing to install business identification signage on the west and south sides of the building.

Staff Report: Ms. Frestedt reported that the following signs are proposed for the west elevation: two painted 20”h x 90.5”w MDO panel signs, including decorative elements; one painted 20”h x 80” w MDO panel sign; and one 16”h x 24”w MDO blade sign, attached to a wrought iron bracket (the sign

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

“Printed on Recycled Paper”

and bracket will extend 30" from the wall). On the south elevation the following signs are proposed: one painted 36"h x 144" w MDO panel sign, with two decorative caps on either end of the sign (24"h x 24" w). All signs will be attached into the mortar with wood and lag screws. The panel signs will project approximately 1.5" from the masonry. Ms. Frestedt distributed drawings and attachment details.

Ms. Frestedt said the sign plan will replace an existing vinyl banner located above the main entrance. She noted that current proposal includes design modifications that were made in response to the Review Committee's feedback. She said that the Columbia City Review Committee recommended approval of the proposed signage at their September 27, 2007 meeting. She added that the Landmarks Preservation Board approved a Certificate of Approval for exterior paint colors on March 21, 2007. Ms. Frestedt introduced the applicant, Crystal McMeans from the Columbia City Theater.

Board Questions:

Mr. Hannum asked for clarification about the height of the panel signs. Ms. Frestedt stated that the sign was initially 24"h but has been reduced in height to 20", in response to concerns raised at the Review Committee meeting.

Mr. Abelsen asked about the proposed number of signs on the Rainier Ave. façade.

Ms. McMeans explained that their building entry is recessed which creates poor sight lines along Rainier Avenue. She said customers have complained about not being able to find the theater.

Mr. Hannum noted that he didn't have any concerns about this number of signs.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Schwartz said he wasn't thrilled with the floral decorative elements and their relationship to the brick, but would approve the application since the installation is reversible.

Mr. Abelsen agreed and commented that the scale was appropriate in relation to the building.

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

SMC 25.20.070 – Approval of changes to buildings, structures and other property; Relevant guidelines 11. Signs, b. Blade Signs.

MM/SC/MH/CH 10:0:0 Motion carried.

120507.22

Satterlee House

4866 Beach Dr. SW

Application: Preliminary Design for proposed new construction of three houses

Applicant Comment: Richard Hill, Attorney for the property owner William Conner, stated that at the last meeting the Board had requested information on the reasonable economic return issue and he submitted to the Board a letter detailing background data on costs incurred since the house was purchased by his client. He noted that he also responded to questions he received by email from Ms. Chave. He introduced Susan Busch, project architect.

Susan Busch, project architect, recalled that the Satterlee House was designated a landmark in 1981, and in 2000 Historic Seattle received an easement for the view corridor to the house from the street. She said a short plat was executed for the front lot with a resultant three parcels. She said the application is to build three homes that respect the nature of the location and meet the owner's requirements for a reasonable economic return. She said the homes will provide the size, style and amenities that future owners will expect, including 3-4 bedroom homes with a 3700 square foot interior space, including garage and patio. She said they would be situated on less than half the width of the lot and on 25%-30% lot coverages, which is less than the 35% allowed by code. The lawn will be maintained as shared open spaces and she said the landmark will be enhanced rather than obscured. She said she believes this meets the guidelines for additions to historic buildings, which states that, "*The architecture should be clearly differentiated and the addition should not appear to be part of the historic structure.*" She said to this end she used the International architectural style with a palette of materials and color that relate to modern contemporary buildings in Seattle from the 1950s and 60s. She said the style could be loosely described as Northwest Contemporary style. She said this is meant to differentiate it from the classic four-square Seattle Box design and Classical Revival detailing of the Satterlee house.

Ms. Busch stated that the applicant's design had not changed much since the ARC meeting because of the constraints and the applicants' philosophy of design. She said although ARC wanted the homes to be smaller in scale and size, she said they (the applicants) weren't able to do this because of their need to receive a reasonable economic return for the property owner. She said the ARC's comments tended to be the same and the applicant's presentation tended to remain the same each time. She recalled how at a previous meeting, John Chaney, Executive Director of Historic Seattle, said these proposed homes could be "landmarks of the future". She said the applicant's intent to build homes that will complement the Satterlee house and attract buyers that would appreciate living next to a landmark.

Mr. Hill commented that his responses to the Board's questions sent by email from Ms. Chave were sent without consultation with his client who was out of town at the time; his responses were based on the information he had available at the time.

Board Questions:

Mr. Abelsen made some wording corrections in the Comparative Market Analysis distributed by Mr. Hill. He said *Item 1 "Results: Right of First Refusal"* should refer to "Historic Seattle" and *Item 2* states that, "*Landmarks designation has proven to be a deterrent to buyers*" and *Item #3* states that "*no buyer has been willing to purchase [a landmark].*" Mr. Abelsen said these were strong words and asked whether Mr. Hill could provide evidence to back up these statements.

Mr. Hill said the property has been on the market for four years and has not been purchased because buyers don't know if it is developable land.

Mr. Abelsen pointed out that this was not stated as such in the analysis document.

Mr. Veith commented that it is not so much that the house is a landmark that prevents it from selling, but that the issue of what might be developed on the site is not resolved.

Mr. Hill agreed and said once this was resolved it would probably sell at some price but he believes this would not be a reasonable economic price.

Ms. Conti pointed out that the \$2.2 million price for the Satterlee house may be too high, especially for a house purchased at \$900,000 seven years ago.

Mr. Hill said seven years ago there were not three developable lots.

Mr. Hannum said the appreciation since 2000 is 92%, and that would make the value \$1.8 million.

Mr. Hill said the increased value is the fact that there are now four lots for sale.

Mr. Hannum asked how much of this increase in cost goes to legal and design expenses for subdividing the lots.

Mr. Hill said they have determined the price based on what they consider to be a reasonable economic return after calculating the investment in the property. He said the \$900,000 purchase price is not relevant anymore and they are considering what its use could be today when determining a reasonable economic “use”. He clarified that “Reasonable Rate of Return” is one aspect of this.

Mr. Veith asked why the eastern portion of the site is only worth \$750,000 according to Mr. Hill’s documentation.

Mr. Hill said this is the price that a house on this lot could be sold for in this neighborhood and an additional \$200,000 or \$300,000 would be necessary to upgrade the property to make it comparable to other homes being sold for more than \$1,000,000.

Mr. Veith noted that the house sits on a view lot across the street from the waterfront and smaller houses on smaller lots are worth more in Wallingford.

Mr. Abelsen read from the Secretary of Interior’s Standards, “the new use shall be used for historic purpose or place in new use that requires minimal change to site and environment.” He stated that this is the reason that a Board member may have commented that the design should be more “subservient” to the landmark. As was presented to the Board at a previous meeting, the green space would be narrowed to less than its current width by half. He asked how this would be in keeping with the idea of requiring minimum change.

Ms. Busch said this depends on whether or not it is determined that the front lawn can be developed and what the bounds of the site are.

Mr. Hill noted that there is a disagreement (between his client and the City) on what portion of the site was actually designated 26 years ago. He said the lawn is part of that but they are seeking to preserve 50% of the view corridor to and from the house in a way that is consistent with the way it was during the years it was developing its “historicity”. He noted that an 8’ hedge was there during this time and it is now gone and the public’s ability to appreciate the lawn and the view has been increased. He acknowledged that taking up 50% of the lawn is not a minimal impact but the proposal does seek to respect the historic aspect of the lawn.

Mr. Lee remarked that the Historic Seattle's view corridor is not part of the Board's purview and the Board is taking into consideration the property's contrast with the surrounding area. He read from the Designation Report, "*the property is in significant contrast to the surrounding, and rather crowded atmospheric area, with its long front yard extending back up the slope and climaxed by the location of house and the top of the slope.*"

Mr. Schwartz said one of the new lots appeared to include part of the original lot on which the house is situated.

In response to Mr. Schwartz's question about the location of the original lot Mr. Hill pointed out the boundary of the original lot.

Mr. Schwartz asked if the original designation included both lots.

Ms. Chave answered yes, that this is City's interpretation.

Mr. Hill said this is under dispute. He added that he has submitted a declaration of Mr. Satterlee, the previous owner when the house was designated, stating that he was told by the former City Preservation Officer that one could build on the lot in front of the house and the Landmark designation would not impact this.

Mr. Lee remarked that the Landmarks Preservation Board often reviews changes to existing buildings, such as Douglass Truth Library, but it is the nature of that addition that is under review. He said the Board needs to decide whether the development is compatible with the landmark and whether it is a fair economic use.

Mr. Veith noted that in his documentation, Mr. Hill states that the "land" cost is \$900,000, but Mr. Veith said he thought Mr. Hill meant that the land and the house are worth \$900,000.

Mr. Hill said this is correct, but only if they can get a Certificate of Approval.

Mr. Veith asked Mr. Hill to confirm that in his analysis, paragraph 9, the land on the other lots could be sold for \$400,000 per lot, but that this does not include any proposed houses.

Mr. Hill said this is correct.

Mr. Veith asked for clarification that the owner wants to make it possible to build on these lots but would not be building the homes himself.

Mr. Hill said this has not been determined yet. He said the lots are for sale and if the lots aren't sold Mr. Conner might build the houses.

Mr. Veith asked if someone were to purchase these lots would Mr. Hill make the same claim that Mr. Satterlee made to this current owner, that these are “developable lots”.

Mr. Hill said he hopes they will have Certificate of Approval to build three homes on the lots.

Mr. Veith asked Mr. Hill to clarify that at the end of this process the owner expects that there would be either three lots with three houses or simply three lots.

Mr. Hill said this is correct.

Mr. Veith stated that the owner wants to make a change to the site but there is no guarantee that the owner will build on these sites.

Mr. Lee said it seems to him that this is like an exploratory land use approval process.

Mr. Veith asked if the property is currently rented.

Mr. Hill said yes.

Mr. Veith noted that according to Mr. Hill’s analysis the total rent collected amounts to rent that would be collected less than half the time Mr. Conner has owned the property.

Mr. Hill said it has not been consistently rented.

Ms. Conti asked whether they had done an analysis of their return scenario and area comps if they reduced the square footage of the houses. She said the area comps for that neighborhood are on average \$351 per square foot.

Mr. Hill said this has been done and he said he understands that it is more or less proportional so the value of lots would go down proportionately with the size of the home on the lot.

Ms. Busch added this would go down to a point until they start to lose bedrooms and it would decrease more.

Ms. Conti noted that these proposed homes, at 4060, 3655, 3560 square feet, are much larger than surrounding homes.

Ms. Busch said this is the total volume including terraces, patios and garages.

Mr. Schwartz noted that the actual footprints are 2270, 2189 and 2234 square feet.

Ms. Conti noted that this does not include the second floor, which would still make the homes larger than what is typical in the neighborhood.

Mr. Hill said he understands from the owner's real estate agent that these homes are mid-size or smaller in comparison with surrounding homes.

Mr. Veith asked whether the owner received a loan when they purchased the property. Mr. Hill said yes.

Mr. Veith asked the rate on the loan. Mr. Hill said he did not know.

Mr. Veith asked if it was a 30-year conventional loan. Mr. Hill said probably not as it was not purchased to be residence.

Mr. Veith pointed out that Mr. Conner purchased the property for \$900,000 assuming they would be able to subdivide it.

Mr. Hill reminded him that their original plan was to build six model cottage homes on this property, authorized by an ordinance that has since expired.

Mr. Veith commented that \$500,000 for interest payments seemed high. He said one could get a 30 year loan for 6% interest six years ago, and the total outlay would be close to \$500,000 and include interest and principle payments.

Mr. Hill said these figures were based on Mr. Conner's computations and interest is on \$900,000 and other expenses incurred. He said Mr. Conner calculated the interest at 5% once the loan is paid off, but Mr. Hill would have used an 8% figure.

Mr. Hannum asked when the loan was paid off. Mr. Hill said he was not sure, but stated that it was probably in the documents.

Mr. Veith asked if Mr. Conner got a loan to pay off the other expenses.

Mr. Hill said he is imputing it.

Mr. Veith asked what that means.

Mr. Hill explained that this means if the owner were to spend \$10,000 to hire a lawyer to get a permit from the Landmarks Board, he could put this money in a Treasury bill and receive 5% interest.

Mr. Veith said it seems that Mr. Conner is charging the interest twice, since he is investing money to increase the value and get a return at the end of the process.

Mr. Hill stated that the investor would hope to get a rate of return on the money invested at the end of the process.

Mr. Veith commented that the owner complains that the rate of return is too low and at the same time is reducing this rate of return by including the imputed interest from a competing investment.

Mr. Hill said in this scenario the owner will barely break even.

Mr. Veith said he would dispute this statement.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Abelsen asked what it would mean if the Board approved a Certificate of Approval today.

Mr. Lee stated that since the site has been platted there is an assumption that something will be built there. The Board needs to approve or deny a Certificate of Approval for the preliminary design review and the economic issue.

Mr. Abelsen asked if the Board were to approve the Certificate of Approval today would they have further purview on the size and scale of the proposed new buildings.

Ms. Chave said for Preliminary Design the Board reviews height, bulk, scale, mass; she said that fenestration details, railing details, roofing materials, color scheme and patio layout would be reviewed by the Board for the Final C of A.

Mr. Schwartz said the imputed interest “wouldn’t hold any water” with the IRS or the Hearing Examiner; the owner has substantial investment in the property beyond the purchase price and Mr. Schwartz said he probably wouldn’t disagree with the costs detailed by the owner.

Mr. Matthews said he did not recall a Board member suggesting that the new homes look like “servants quarters” in comparison to the Satterlee House, as stated by Ms. Busch, but he did remember that the ARC asked for design strategies that show a reduced home size, even minimally.

Ms. Howard said she was not on the Board during the whole (ARC) process. She stated that this proposal would have a significant impact on the landmark but does preserve some aspects of its historic features. She said she might reluctantly support the application but was still undecided.

Mr. Abelsen said this was difficult because the property has been replatted and allows for potential construction and this “muddies the water” in terms of what should or could be placed on this site. He said he didn’t have a problem with the proposed building style or detailing but felt the buildings and landscaping encroaches on the existing landmarked site, although it retains the views to and from the site. He said the Board has not seen enough to demonstrate that these design proposals are appropriate and he did not support the application.

Ms. Nicholas said she was still undecided.

Ms. Tremaine stated that she feels the proposed building design intrudes on the landmark, which is no longer visible from the south. She added that although the Northwest modern design does not mimic the Satterlee house, it is also not compatible, in her opinion. She said the driveway would likely encroach even further on the Satterlee house once people move it. She said she did not support the application.

Mr. Veith said he did not support this proposal because the design compromises the property’s contrast in siting, scale and size with surrounding community. He said the new buildings take up a large part of the site and will change one’s perception of the site and will ruin the property’s contrast with the surrounding neighborhood. He felt this change was significant and not sympathetic. He noted that he did in fact use the word “subservient” at previous ARC meeting when describing how development should look on this site. He said per SMC 25.12.740A, a development should look like it is part of the property, but the size of the new buildings make them too distinctive, especially since their footprint is larger than the existing house. Also, he said SMC 25.12.740 B requires that the proposal be “reasonable” in view of the alternatives. He noted that since he has been on the Board he has only seen one proposal, although the ARC has requested alternatives with reduced square footage. He said he cannot say this is the most reasonable alternative when there have been no other alternatives presented. He cited SMC 25.12.750 D. He said regarding the economic numbers he said he did not think he had enough information to make a decision because the numbers are confusing as they are presented. He said he did not doubt the numbers’ accuracy, but felt they were misleading. He noted that in real estate when one looks at “comparable prices” it is typical practice to look at recent sales, rather than asking prices, as has been done by the applicant. He said the applicant has not studied smaller houses in the neighborhood and he would like to see what the sale prices for houses in the neighborhood have been for the last six

months to properly consider his economic alternatives for new development. He said when one purchases a property assuming there will be no restraints, even though one knows it is a designated landmark, he said one is liable to pay too much money for the property. He said he doesn't think the Board should save the owner from his mistake at the expense of the landmark.

Mr. Martinson agreed with Mr. Veith that the presentation of the financial analysis was unclear. Also, the purchase price isn't a "given" and is based on many assumptions. He said the new houses would begin to overwhelm the landmark and the applicant has made no attempt to decrease the size.

Mr. Hannum said he agreed and noted that he did not think the economic use has been proven, per SMC 25.12.750 and that the proposed change is not necessary in order for the owner to receive a reasonable use for the property. He felt there are other alternatives, such as making the buildings smaller and making the height, bulk and scale more sympathetic to the Landmark.

Ms. Conti said she did not think the Secretary of Interior's Standards had been met and the proposed design overwhelmed the historic structure and the front lawn. She said she was also perplexed by the economic analysis and suggested the applicant complete a development scenario with square footage analysis and provide comps in the area.

Mr. Lee said he agreed with Mr. Veith. He said he has not seen any alternatives proposed for the new development on this property. He said the design is too large and does not enhance the existing landmark. He regretted the finality of today's meeting but encouraged the owner to explore other avenues of development. He said the Board has worked successfully with other landmark building owners to accommodate new additions.

Action:

"I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board deny a Certificate of Approval for Preliminary Design for the proposed construction of three houses, as described in the application submittal and submitted plans, for the Satterlee House at 4866 Beach Dr. SW based on the following:

1. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 A, the proposal, because of the massing and scale of the three houses, in comparison to the landmark Satterlee house, would adversely affect the features or characteristics described in the Report on Designation.
2. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 B, the proposal is not reasonable, based on an alternative to build houses of a smaller scale and massing that could also achieve the objectives of the owner:

3. With regard to SMC 25.12.750D, the information presented to the Board is not sufficient to determine if the proposal is necessary for the owner to receive a reasonable use for the property. The owner's representative has stated, both in his letter of November 14, 2007 and his e-mail on December 3, 2007, in response to the Board's questions that Mr. Conner reserves his right to submit additional information and analysis on the issue of reasonable economic use before the Hearing Examiner. If information is submitted to the Hearing Examiner that was not presented to the Board, the Board would certainly entertain a remand from the Hearing Examiner to consider that information.
4. The factors of SMC 25.12 .750 C and 25.12.750 E are not applicable.

The Board also finds that the proposal is not consistent with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation., particularly Standard #9 which states:

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

MM/SC/TV/MH 11:0:0 Motion carried.

120507.23

Hamilton Middle School

1610 N. 41st St.

Final Design of exterior and interior alterations, addition, and associated site alterations

Applicant Comment: Don Gilmore, Seattle School District, thanked the ARC members for their helpful comments throughout this process and stated that they have helped with the overall evolution of the design. He said the District's goal has always been to create a 21st century learning environment as well as to protect the historic features of the building. He noted that besides the addition of the library and the loss of the auditorium in the 1970s, the building is basically intact. He said their proposal will reorganize the interior and expand the building area by 2500 square feet, add onsite parking and enhancing the play area. He said they want to improve pedestrian circulation and car access to the site.

Tom Bates, project architect, reviewed the propose changes. He said the busses will now arrive along Densmore street, where they will enhance the walkway and landscaping. They also plan to construct underground parking with a play court on the roof. He said the administration offices will flank the lobby, the library will be relocated to the first floor and the former space converted into a multi-story atrium known as a "student commons". The two gym spaces will be converted into a performing arts classroom (former girls'

gym) and a fitness center (former boys' gym). A kitchen will be added, as well as additional classroom space and a parking structure at the north end of the building. He said the classrooms overall have been reorganized into small learning communities with two per grade level. There will also be a community entrance for the performance hall on the east side of the building and an exit to the playground at the north end of the building. He said on the exterior of the historic building he said they will retain all the windows as they are in good condition and the sashes will be reglazed and painted. The stone detailing is in good shape but the brick will be cleaned and repaired and about 15-20% of the brick will be tuck pointed. He said there will be new detail on gym, including roof monitors and light scopes to give it modulation. The masonry on the gym will continue on the north façade and will have windows on the east and west sides. He presented material samples of the gym's red brick and yellow accent brick and lobby glazing that he said would be a transition space, along with samples of the metal roof and cement board panels.

Mr. Bates said there will be a protective glazing outside the lobby windows, the linoleum flooring will be removed and replaced with epoxy, terrazzo floor. The fir window casings and radiators will be removed. The fir display cases will remain in the main lobby and the historic clock will be restored. Mr. Bates noted that the Library is landmarked but they plan on reusing it as a science classroom he said the entry woodwork will be retained as well as the windows, exposed beams, detailing and volume. The new countertops will be a fire-resistant epoxy. He presented materials and colors scheme for this room. He said the new first floor library entrance will have the wood entrance surround from the old library and a three panel door with glazing. He said the existing doors are in bad shape and need new hardware.

Mr. Lee noted that the door's vision panels are a code requirement.

Mr. Bates stated that in the gym they want to bring back the historic replica skylights and change the boys' gym to a fitness center and the girls' gym to a performing arts center. The flooring will be changed from maple to athletic floor with mondo-type cushioning and MDF wainscoting. He said the windows will be restored and trusses exposed.

Board Questions:

Mr. Abelsen asked if the Swisspearl panel is fiber cement.

Mr. Bates said yes it is a cementitious material.

Mr. Kit Burns said it is on Cleveland High School gym.

Mr. Lee commented that the location of the telephone trunk line under the gym determined the height of the gym.

Mr. Kit Burns said to relocate this line would have cost \$2 million.

Mr. Abelsen noted that the Board received public comment that disagreed with the School District's assertion that the monitors were added to the gym by request of the community.

Mr. Bates explained that the monitors were discussed at a community meeting in which members said they did not like the gym roof and expressed a preference for more modulation on this façade.

Mr. Abelsen asked the status of the lot boundary adjustment.

Mr. Gillmore said this would be discussed at the City Council meeting next Monday.

Ms. Chave stated that if the Council requires the School District to change the plan they will have to apply for another Certificate of Approval for the change..

Mr. Veith asked if the requested departures have been decided. Mr. Gilmore responded by saying they are waiting for a decision from the Hearing Examiner.

Public Comment:

Sue Raney said she has been a Wallingford resident for 25 years and is on the Design review team. She said this design meets the goals of the Wallingford Neighborhood plan on the rehabilitation of Hamilton School, namely to preserve its historic value and its role as a community center.

Lee Elofson said he is a 31 year resident of Wallingford and supports this design. He thanked the Board for their work. He said he is Treasurer of the Wallingford Community Council and voted to support the renovation of the Hamilton School. He said he encouraged the mediation between Hamilton School and the park. He read from a letter he had submitted to the City Council:

Tom Veith stated that he is involved with the Wallingford Community Council (WCC). He said the WCC is split in regards to their support for this project and the previous speakers' comments should not be considered an endorsement by the WCC. He said his involvement with the WCC should not affect today's process.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Schwartz noted that this has been a very good experience working with the School District and that he felt the design was sympathetic.

Action:

I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for Final Design for the proposed renovation and addition, including associated site alterations, and including approval of all construction drawings, finishes and details, including window treatment, as described in the application submittal and submitted plans. This action is based on the following:

1. With regard to *SMC 25.12.750 A, the extent to which the proposed alteration or significant change would adversely affect the features or characteristics described in the Report on Designation*: The exterior of the landmark school and the significant interior features will not be adversely affected by the proposal.
2. With regard to *SMC 25.12.750 B, The reasonableness or lack thereof of the proposed alterations or significant change in light of other alternatives available to achieve the objectives of the owner*: The applicant has provided information to the Board that explored in more detail other alternatives that were available in terms of design for the renovation and addition. This information was provided to the ARC and the Board at their meetings prior to the approval of the Certificate of Approval for Preliminary Design on January 2, 2007, and subsequently to the Board's Architectural Review Committee on February 16, 2007, March 16, 2007, June 1, 2007 and September 28, 2007. The applicant provided information showing that the other alternatives do meet the needs of the School District and the program for the school.
3. With regard to *SMC 25.12.750 E., For School District property that is in use as a public school facility, educational specifications*. The applicant has provided information to the Board on how the current proposal meets the educational program for the school.
4. The other factors of SMC 25.12 .750 C and 25.12.750 D are not applicable.”

The proposed renovation and addition proposal meets the following Standard of the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:

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

Amendment: The LPB recognizes that this proposal is dependant on the execution of the lot boundary adjustment affecting the adjacent park and on a series of proposed departures from the land use code, the final decision of which has not been made. The LPB will be happy to review revisions to the proposal should they become necessary in order to address the final disposition of those issues.

MM/SC/TV/MT 11:0:0

Amended Motion:

MM/SC/TV/MT 11:0:0 Motion carried.

120507.3 NOMINATIONS

120507.31 Bon Marche Stables 2315 Western Avenue

Staff Report: Staff recommends the nomination of the Bon Marche Stables Building at 2315 Western Avenue based on the following designation standards *C: It is associated in a significant way with a significant aspect of the cultural, political, or economic heritage of the community, City, state or nation; and D. It embodies the distinctive visible characteristics of an architectural style, period, or of a method of construction.*

Staff recommends that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include the exterior of the building.

Applicant Comment: Karin Link, architectural historian, presented the nomination report. She said the Bon Marche Stables was built in 1908 near the site of William Bell's cabin. It is now known as the Compton Building because it housed Compton Lumber Company for many years. She showed Kroll maps from 1891 and gave an overview of the development of other buildings in the neighborhood.

The Bon Marche Stables is a three story stone framed building with a 60' x 120' footprint and an interior structure of wood posts and beams with wood clapboard siding. She said the siding on the alley has since been replaced by vinyl. She said it is the last of the clapboard-sided structures in the area.

She said distinctive elements include the cornice and the six-over-six windows which are typical of this type of turn of the century building. The windows may have been replaced but the configuration is original. Changes to the exterior façade include the addition of a new door and the window bay left of the main door has been replaced many times.

In 1908 this structure housed the Bon Marche Stables. She showed a Seattle Post-Intelligencer story detailing Bon Marche holdings and featuring a

photograph of the structure. Ms. Link said the Bon Marche/Nordhoff and Co. store was built at First and Cedar in 1890 by Mr. Edward Nordhoff and Josephine Brennan and was modeled on the Bon Marche in Paris. It doubled in size in 1912 when it moved to a new location on Second and Pike Street. The current building was commissioned in 1928. By 1930 the taxes on the stables building were being paid by Mr. Compton who may have been a co-owner of Bon Marche after Ms. Brennan's earlier death. During the 1930s the stables became the headquarters for the Compton Lumber Company and were owned by them until 1986. It is home to offices and craftspeople's workshops today.

Ms. Link said this building is significant because it is the last wooden livery stable in this part of the city. She said she believes it meets criterion D. Also it's associated with the economic development of Seattle and cultural history of Belltown and she believes it meets criterion C. She said it is associated with the owners of Bon Marche, who helped establish a Seattle institution and therefore meets criterion B.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked how many such wooden livery stable structures remain.

Ms. Link said there may be two left in Belltown, including the cannery cottages.

Ms. Sodt stated that the subject property is in Category 1 of the Downtown Building Survey.

Mr. Abelsen asked whether Ms. Link felt the architectural style or the method of construction was more significant.

Ms. Link said she felt the method of construction was most significant, she noted that there are very few wooden buildings left downtown.

Mr. Veith asked if Mr. Compton could be considered significant in local history.

Ms. Link said she didn't find much information on him.

Owner Comment:

Boris Costianos introduced himself as the representative for the Moscatel family. He said the Moscatels are longtime owners who invested in the Denny Regrade including Gary Schillestad Building. He said they have rented the interior offices as artists studios and lofts but that overall the building is not in good condition and the south side is no longer accessible.

He introduced Susan Boyle, architectural historian, to review the landmark criteria.

Susan Boyle said this property housed the Bon Marche stables from 1908 -11 when Bon Marche was located at First Avenue and Cedar Street. She said livery stables were common in downtown until 1910 when development around the Bell Street Wharf became more vehicle and rail related. She showed photos of other stables, such as the Union Stable which still remains and features a terra cotta emblem on its façade. She noted that in 1900 there were 54 stables listed in the Polk's Directory and by 1911, there were only eight left including those in Renton and Redmond. These livery stables were characterized by a wide center aisle, cells and a tack room. A 1938 photograph shows a ramp on the south side of the Bon Marche stables and three part window and multi-light transom. She noted that the transom no longer aligns with the windows above. Potlatch Lumber Co and Modelow Co. was also located in this building at one time.

She reviewed some changes to the first floor: the garage door was replaced, and on the north facade on property line she said she believes there was a loading dock that provided access to the elevator that has since been closed up. The front facade cladding is highly weathered although most windows appear to be original windows; the cladding and windows on the back façade and have been replaced and the south wall is no longer visible as it abuts a new building next door. She said the current owner has invested in new mechanical and heating systems and added some new flooring. The exterior siding on the alley façade was replaced with vinyl siding and windows.

Questions:

Mr. Martinson asked if there were any other existing wood framed livery stable in the area.

Ms. Boyle said she didn't look at this but she felt this structure was somewhat generic.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Conti said she supports the nomination under criteria D and C.

Mr. Martinson agreed, noting this was likely one of the last livery stables in the area.

Mr. Veith said the changes to the property were not significant, but that there appear to be few character-defining features.

Ms. Tremaine said she would support the nomination under criterion D. She noted that the building's association with Bon Marche seemed tentative.

Other Board members agreed.

Mr. Schwartz said he would support the nomination under criterion D but suggested the Board determine whether it meets the threshold criterion.

Action:

I move approval of the Bon Marche Stables Building at 2315 Western Avenue for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include the exterior of the building; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation is scheduled for January 16, 2008; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/RM/CH 10:0:0 Motion carried.

120507.32 Puget Sound News Co./Terminal Sales Annex
1931 Second Avenue

Staff Report: Staff recommends the nomination of the Puget Sound News Co./Terminal Sales Annex Building at 1931 Second Avenue based on the following designation standards: *D. It embodies the distinctive visible characteristics of an architectural style, period, or of a method of construction; and E. It is an outstanding work of a designer or builder.*

Staff recommends that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include the exterior of the building.

Applicant Comment: William Justen, Executive Director of Samis Land Company, owner, stated that they self nominated this building which is considered a Category Two building in the Downtown Building Survey. He introduced Melody McCutcheon, attorney for the owner and Larry Johnson to present the nomination report. Mr. Justen reported that Samis Land Company owns several historic buildings in downtown, Pioneer Square and south Lake Union. He said he does not believe this building to be exceptional or unique. He said they have submitted for a MUP for new development on this site and the lots north and south of it. This lot is narrow at 45' and only has one main facade.

Mr. Johnson said this building is located at Second and Virginia next to a corner parking lot. It features a polychrome, painted, terra cotta façade with a large central window and entry. Historically there was a grille at the entrance. He said the basement level grade is rare in Seattle. In the interior, there are

marble stairs leading to the second floor and the original detailing in the vestibule remains. He said this building originally housed a publishing company that operated out of one large room.

He said the building could meet criterion C because it was built for Puget Sound New Company as part of the Denny Regrade development. It is the highest building on that block and perhaps there was an expectation that other buildings would be built nearby. He showed a photograph of the newsboy statuettes that were removed from the entryway when Puget Sound News moved in 1948. Other alterations include removal of the entry gate, the addition of the skybridge on the west elevation and replacement of some of the glazing.

He said Puget Sound News specialized in publishing post cards and local booklets.

Regarding criterion D, he said it is an example of the Collegiate Gothic Revival style, but he felt the Mann building, Medical Dental building and the building at 4th and Pike were better examples. He noted that only the main façade has elements of this style and the terra cotta façade has been painted. However, he said it is an example of an early reinforced concrete structure.

He reported that the building was designed by Bebb and Mendel, who also designed the Times Square building, Fischer Studio building and numerous buildings on the University of Washington campus, including Suzzallo Library. He said they likely did not consider the Puget Sound News building to be one of their best. He said he does not consider it to be prominent since it is located mid-block.

Melody McCutcheon said she did not believe the building meets criterion D because it has this Gothic Revival style on only one side and she did not think this was enough to meet the criterion. She said the narrow width of the building, the awkward use of the first floor and the painted terra cotta diminish any significance it may have had. Further she said Bebb and Mendel have other 200 architectural works in Seattle and she believes this was not significant among them.

Board Questions:

Mr. Abelsen asked about the replacement windows.

Mr. Johnson said the glazing in the windows was replaced after the original plate glass was broken.

Ms. Howard asked Mr. Johnson about the significance of the building's Collegiate Gothic Revival style.

Mr. Johnson said it may be that as a newspaper building that they were trying to emulate buildings on and near the University of Washington campus.

Mr. Matthews disagreed with Mr. Johnson's assertion that this building style is Collegiate Gothic Revival. He suggested instead that it is Commercial Gothic style, particularly given that the building is not affiliated with a college or university.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

The Board agreed generally to support this nomination under criterion D, noting its handsome façade, unusual window rhythm, lower level detailing and Commercial Gothic façade.

Mr. Veith noted that the large window bay could be a mark of Gould's education in the French method-Art Nouveau influence.

Mr. Martinson said the building has retained its integrity.

Action:

I move approval of the Puget Sound News Co./Terminal Sales Annex Building at 1931 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; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation is scheduled for January 16, 2008; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/HM/JS 10:0:0 Motion carried.

120507.33 Norway Center/Mountaineers Building
300 3rd Avenue West

Staff Report: Staff does not recommend the nomination of the Norway Center/Mountaineers Building at 300 3rd Ave W based on the following designation standards of SMC 25.12:

Applicant Comment: Derek Bottles, Avalon Bay Communities, Melody McCutcheon, attorney for the owner and architectural historian Larry Johnson presented the nomination on behalf of the building owner.

Mr. Bottles said they have submitted a MUP to redevelop the site. He said he has contacted the Sons and Daughters of Norway, Queen Anne Historical

Society, DOCOMOMOWEWA and all of them declined to support the nomination.

Larry Johnson said this building, built in 1950, is not visible from Elliott Ave W. He said the parking lot and garden space are original but a top floor has been added to the original roof deck in 1953. The architect was John Mahlum. Mr. Johnson said the masonry has interesting pattern but the interior finishes were institutional. He added that he was told by a colleague of Mr. Mahlum that the building was built for \$8/square foot. Regarding criterion C, he said this building has been home to the Norway Center, a Norwegian social club, and more recently the Mountaineers, but neither group felt the building had a strong association with them. Mr. Johnson said its design style is associated with the Moderne movement but there are better example of this, such as the Seattle School Administration building, the MOHAI building, University of Washington Faculty Club and the Magnolia Branch library, to name a few. He said one significant feature, the existing entry wall, was “ruined” by the addition of the roof, which was probably not part of Mahlum’s original design. Also, he said there are better examples of Mahlum’s work in Seattle, such as the Norse Retirement Center, Decature School, and North Seattle Community College. As for its prominence, Mr. Johnson said it has low visibility from Elliott Avenue and is not prominent.

Melody McCutcheon noted that she supports the staff recommendation not to nominate since there is no significant association with the Sons and Daughters of Norway, nor with the Mountaineers. She said it is not a good example of the Moderne style and neither is it a significant example of the architect, Mahlum’s work. Also, she said there have been many changes to the exterior and interiors. Lastly, there is no community support to nomination this building.

Board Questions: There were no questions.

Public Comment: Christine Palmer of Historic Seattle noted that just because a building is not on DOCOMOMOWEWA’s list of significant Moderne style building does not mean it is may not be significant. She noted that there are many significant buildings that the organization has not cataloged yet.

The owner’s representative said he spoke with Andy Phillips and he confirmed that this building was not on their list.

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

Action:

I move that the Board not approve the nomination of the Norway Center/
Mountaineers Building as a Seattle Landmark, as per the reasons given in the
Staff Report.

MM/SC/JS/AC 10:0:0 Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 7:30pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator