



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 91/08

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Seattle Municipal Tower

700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor

Room 4060

Wednesday, February 6, 2008– 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Vernon Abelsen
Mollie Tremaine
Marie Strong
Mark Hannum
Tom Veith
Christine Howard
Stephen Lee
Alyce Conti
Czarina Nicolas
Ron Martinson
Henry Matthews

Staff

Elizabeth Chave
Sarah Sodt
Melinda Bloom

Stephen Lee, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:33 pm.

020608.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meetings of December 19, 2007, January 2, 2008, and January 16, 2008
deferred.

020608.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

020608.21 Queen Anne Library
400 W. Garfield

Applicant Comments: Bob Hoshide, project architect, presented the request for approval for a new sign at the corner of 4th Avenue West and W. Garfield replacing the existing sign. He said the existing wood panel on wood post sign has deteriorated and is not historic. He said the proposed sign is a masonry L-shaped structure that will be on the corner of the lawn above the

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

brick retaining wall. He said brick will be on back facing the Library, on ends and on top course with brick to match existing on Library. He said the street side faces will be cast brass panel with polished brass lettering. The existing sign is about 5'2" above lawn and the new sign is about 3' above lawn. With a lower sign the landscaping would go away with the sign visible as an identifying element. The lettering and logo will be Seattle Public Library standard: letters a little smaller than white painted on existing sign. They will add two in-ground landscape lights that shine up per ARC recommendation, if there are funds for this.

Alyce Conti arrived at 3:40.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Matthews said it is nice to have the sign visible from two sides.

Mr. Lee said the proposed sign is appropriate.

Action:

"I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior monument sign, as per the submittal. This action is based on the following:

The proposed change does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance #121101 as the proposed sign 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*.

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

MM/SC/VA/CH

11:0:0

Motion carried

020608.22

Magnolia Library
2801 34th Avenue West

Applicant Comment: David Strauss, project architect with SHKS Architects, presented three items for the Board's consideration. He proposes adding a rock retaining wall/curb to retain earth away from the building. He said it will be constructed of six to eight inches of stone although one corner is two feet tall. It is visible from the inside of the library. He said the material proposed is native northwest stone from Oregon, dry stack stone wall/curb with rustic character. He said they also propose to replace five or six Madrona trees that

died after construction of the Library with Strawberry trees (*Arbutus unedo*) as they have similar bark, foliage and trunk to Madrona. It was determined that the Madrona is too difficult to grow and planting new would not be successful. He said the existing sign was never permitted by Seattle Transportation and it is not likely they will approve running power to new sign so he will ask for a deferral on Board consideration for the sign.

Ms. Tremaine asked about the chain.

Mr. Strauss said that with water coming off the roof they recommend use of chain coming from conductor but they haven't designed that and will have to come back.

Mr. Veith asked if there was a drawing siting the trees.

Ms. Chave said it is in the plan.

Mr. Hannum arrived at 3:50 pm.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Veith said the stone was a good substitute for the originally specified stone.

Action:

“I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed site alterations, as per the submittal for the Magnolia Library. This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance #121100 as the proposed associated site alterations, do not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and are compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.

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

MM/SC/HM/VA

11:0:0 Motion carried.

020608.3 DESIGNATIONS

020608.31 John B. Allen School

6532 Phinney Avenue North

Applicant Comment: Rhoda Lawrence, Board member of the Phinney Ridge Neighborhood Association, presented the designation information. She said the prominent buildings are significant in the neighborhood with siting close to Greenlake and Woodland Park. It is located at the intersection of Phinney and Greenwood. She said the site and the school buildings are part of ensemble development by the School District in 1902; it is one of five that remain in the city. It is a full block building first was building in 1904, the second in 1918, both intact representing two different architectural periods of school designs representing the philosophy of the School District at the time. She said that the Phinney Ridge Neighborhood Association is in process of negotiating to purchase the buildings from the School District.

Ms. Lawrence said that the 1904 Building and the 1918 building are two distinct construction types. The 1904 is wood frame and the 1918 structure is brick masonry and concrete. The 1904 building is in the colonial revival style, designed by James Stephens, School District Architect; this was one of his first wood-framed model schools. The 1918 building was designed by Edgar Blair who worked under James Stephens as School District Architect. This building was one of his first and was known as a border school because it sat on the edge of property. There is an open connection between the two buildings which allowed dialog between the two. The juxtaposition of the two buildings and increased focus on recreation area allowed multi-use of building by the School District and the community. The 1904 building in contrast to the 1918 building has a square shape with four classrooms stacked over four classrooms with central hall. The interiors of the buildings are intact: the individual classrooms, hallway, stairwells are all intact and well-maintained. The 1918 building is linear designed with classrooms along one side, single loaded corridor aspect. She said t is well-maintained and intact.

Ms. Lawrence said that the 1904 building is one of only ten of this type remaining in the School District. It retains its Colonial Revival features with tall double hung windows, and strong cornice lines. It is one of the best examples remaining in the City. The 1918 American Renaissance style building is in good condition and retains its unusual shape, molded engaged brick work, horizontal banding and cast stone entry details.

Ms. Lawrence said that in 1953 the air raid siren was installed partially on School District site and partially on SDOT site. In 2006 it was restored with funding from the City; hazardous materials were removed and it was repainted.

Ms. Lawrence said that the School District closed both buildings in 1981 and the Phinney Neighborhood Association leased them. She said the site can be viewed from Greenwood and Phinney Avenues and is visible from across

Green Lake. It is a good example of the architects' work, an intact example of the development of the School District and the changes in the educational philosophy at the time and has had an important role in the social activities of the community.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith said that he noticed in suggested language for approval of designation that none of the interiors of the Blair addition are included; he asked if there was any special reason for not including the classrooms in the 1918 building.

Ms. Lawrence said no. The classrooms are interior spaces and serve a variety of uses; one is a dance studio and has had interior finishes redone. She is concerned about being able to respond to needs of the community in the future.

Mr. Veith said that the LPB does not control uses, only physical structure. He wondered if there was an argument that there was a lack of appropriateness of protecting interior spaces.

Ed Madeiros, Director of the Phinney Neighborhood Association, said that accessibility is an issue and that investing in elevator improvements could impact small offices.

Ms. Lawrence said if there was a need to make changes that if done appropriately there would be no issue.

Mr. Veith said that the Wallingford Center, a City Landmark owned by School District, has an elevator. He said just because it is landmarked doesn't mean it is frozen in time. He said because we are specifically including the interiors of the 1904 building which is appropriate because it is one of the few buildings of that type that still has its historic interior, he wondered if there was a specific reason we were not doing the same with the 1918 building.

Ms. Chave said that the 1904 interiors are very distinctive. She said the Northwest School/ Summit School Building has its interior corridors designated but that is a private school, and University Heights includes the corridors but not classrooms. She said staff felt the interior of the 1918 Building were not quite as significant.

Mr. Lee said that we don't want to avoid change and we want to encourage buildings to be adapted.

Ms. Lawrence asked for clarification on what was included in the Staff Report.

Ms. Chave read the Staff Report regarding the interiors: she said the first and second floors, the hallways and classrooms of the 1904 building, but not the bathrooms or basement.

Public comment: Leanne Olson from the Queen Anne Historical Society supports the designation.

Board discussion:

Mr. Veith said the site is unique, as there are very few significant changes to the building, some changes were very early ones on the 1918 building. He said the building can be seen from across Greenlake, and from a distance south on Phinney; it is at a turn, the exact position it has to be to be defined as a real landmark in the traditional sense. He said it is a splendid example of Standard F and the fact that a 1904 building is in such spectacular shape and evocative of its original use. He said his only question is “what do we not designate?” Regarding the 1918 building he wondered what makes it inappropriate for designation; he would like to designate the classrooms and would defer to the rest of the Board.

Ms. Strong said yes based on D and F. She said it is very much a landmark in the neighborhood.

Mr. Martinson said yes based on D and F. He said he hasn't seen the inside but if it is in original condition it should be included as well.

Mr. Abelsen said yes and D and F and to include the interior; both are significant unto themselves and share a magnificent site.

Ms. Tremaine said yes on D & F and to include the interior corridors, stairways and classrooms in the 1904 building. She asked the staff if SDOT had to sign off on the air raid tower.

Ms. Chave said she has been in contact with SDOT, and SDOT is aware of the designation proceedings.

Ms. Nicolas said yes on D and F; she said she enjoyed the relationship between the two buildings and architectural styles and approves the extra designations.

Mr. Hannum said yes on D and F and that this is one of the better examples of F. He said yes on the interior of the 1918 building as well.

Ms. Conti said she agrees on D and F and to including the interiors of the 1918 building.

Mr. Matthews said he agreed with D and F.

Mr. Lee said he admired the building and agrees with D and F.

Mr. Veith said he could make a motion but said that he had specifically mentioned the classrooms of the 1918 building; some of the members mentioned more broadly the interiors of the 1918 building and if they are happy to restrict it to the classroom interiors or whether if other interior spaces should be included. He asked if anyone had objections to that addition.

There were no objections.

Action:

"I move that the Board approve the designation of the John B. Allen School at 6532 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 exteriors of the 1904 building and the 1918 building; the interior staircases, corridors and classrooms of the 1904 building; the interior classrooms and corridors of the 1918 building; the air raid siren structure; and the site excluding the sheds and play structures."

MM/SC/TV/MH

11:0:0 Motion carried.

020608.32

Cassel Crag Apartments
1218 Terry Avenue

Mr. Veith recused himself.

Gary Kaplan, Chairman and CEO of Virginia Mason provided a background of Virginia Mason and how they strategically look at their facilities. Their facilities strategy is of a quality strategy but one that requires facilities don't impede their work but actually help to facilitate the work. They are looking at their real estate portfolio to see what their needs will be regarding future growth. With regard to the Cassel Crag design and Criterion D, the building must embody the distinctive visible characteristics of an architectural style, or period or method of construction; according to their historic consultant, Susan Boyle, this building does not qualify as a landmark. He said he opposes designation because it does not rise to the level of historic preservation under the criterion. They have worked to maintain the building and are good stewards of Cassel Crag and all their First Hill buildings. He asked that Cassel Crag not be designated.

Susan Boyle, historic consultant for Virginia Mason said she focused on two aspects of First Hill then compared it to other Gothic Revival structures in the area. She showed a photo from 1936 which shows the courtyard building and maps show the context of when the building was constructed. 1912 to 1920 prior to construction the Hill had a uniform format of street grid with primarily residential construction with the beginnings of some of the institutions including what became Virginia Mason. By 1940 to 1960 many of the residences had changed from houses to apartment buildings. The aerial view showed immediate context to Virginia Mason facilities showing the massing, it is a u-shaped 118 x 110, with deep courtyard 28 x 60 feet. In 1925 Angus and Charlotte Cassel were the original owners. He worked for a freight company. They constructed the building as an investment; they and their two sons lived in the building until 1940 when Herman Conner purchased it. Virginia Mason purchased the building in 1971.

Ms. Boyle referred to an inventory map: At time inventory prepared buildings that were considered potential landmarks were solid red, buildings which were contributors to the community. They looked at all significant building in area per the inventory. The map also shows the width expansion of Boren which becomes a prominent street on First Hill and shows the isolation given by the freeway. Surrounding Cassel Crag in the neighborhood includes the Sovereign apartments, built in 1925; the Sorrento Hotel built in 1908, the Exeter Apartment Building, Catholic Archbishop's residence, the Heffen House, built in 1902, the Gainsborough Building, built in 1930; on the other side of Boren is the Evalengine Women's Residence, now call the Tuscany Apartments, and The Baroness Apartment/Hotel. There are many courtyards in the neighborhood: John Allen, and several pioneer mansions: the Stimson Green house, the Dearborn House. There are examples of Gothic Revival such as the First Baptist Church on the other side of Boren Avenue. Due east of Cassel Crag is the Sunset Club.

Citing Mimi Sheridan, Ms. Boyle said by 1920s most of the buildings were "C" or "U" shaped so this is pretty standard shape, efficiency style building. By 1932 42% of residents were renters. 1925 was the high point of apartment construction in the early 20th century. It is a fairly standard plan with double loaded corridor and single primary entry at the end of the courtyard. Contemporary views show its exterior facades, the primary west and north facades dark brick with a painted concrete foundation base and its rusticated and judicious use of Gothic Revival style decoration. Up the street one can see the Marlboro House in the background. There is a very narrow set back at south side on the secondary facade. The exterior decorative details are primarily on the west façade in the courtyard, around the doorways and at the raised parapet above the single entry where there is leaded glass windows. There is a second entry that has Gothic Style low arched opening and coining around primary corners. The original building had double hung windows; 50% of which have been replaced with vinyl. The main lobby is relatively

modest in size with a vestibule area with steps leading to upper landing to stairway and elevator. It is somewhat classical in its decorative detailing and features a simple marble wainscot on the lower area. Virginia Mason has owned the building since 1971 and have incrementally remodeled it to use as administrative offices in former dwelling spaces. Some of the original kitchens and bathrooms have been retained. It is very typical of 1925 construction.

Ms. Boyle said that Gothic architectural features, if distinctive should feature steep gabled roofs in lower scale buildings, or flat roofs with raised parapets, finials, the preferred material reflects back to period of 13th to 16th century; it is masonry or stone, sometime with timbering or stucco in Tudor revival. She said there is an emphasis on gateways and entryways frequently treated with surrounds and decorations. The massing is often composed emphasizing vertical proportions and expressed the underlying structural base of the buildings. Complex chimney forms, projected window base, and oriole windows are frequently used as are shake openings such as arches which are usually pointed. She said carved stone and terracotta is material used in 20th century Revival buildings, pretuned tracery,, clustered columns, shields and archaic columns and they are frequently organized in more contemporary buildings in panels around doorways or layered. Windows are typically casement often with leading or opening tracery surrounds.

Ms. Boyle said that in the teens and 1920s a revival of the Gothic style and at this point begins to be used in taller buildings where the verticality of the proportion systems lends itself well for example the Liggett Building here in Seattle, or the Woolworth Building in New York. This style lends itself to educational buildings where there is not only a decorative use but also a symbolic use because in educational buildings the style is used to recall the precedence of English colleges. She said First Hill area buildings that do embody this style are the Marlborough House (1927), terracotta cladding, open tracery, columnar qualities that are adapted from original Gothic; O'Dea High School (1923) is a more full complete holistic rendering of style, at front entry see projecting bay with oriole treatment, open tracery; the pilasters and over the glazing and the at the top of the finials. The Arcadia Building (1916), is a Gothic Revival style and courtyard a bit larger than Cassel Crag, wings look wider, there is more complete cladding with decorative material and massing differentiation at roof level which identifies this building as Gothic Revival building. It has two entry ways similarly expressed with terracotta surrounds at the entry deep within its landscape courtyard. She said in addressing Criterion D the aforementioned buildings fit the criterion in her opinion and Cassel Crag does not; its use of stylistic elements is more minimal and referential. Cassel Crag is representation of apartment buildings in 1920 but its features are not distinct and it doesn't rise to the level of landmark status.

Todd Johnson, Vice President of Facilities at Virginia Mason said he wanted to share community input. He said he has been participated routinely over the years with many community groups including the First Hill Community Council, the First Hill Improvement Association, the Freeway Park neighborhood group and a number of residential associations. He said they listened to neighbors' concerns about their activities and the neighborhood in general and hear a lot of concerns about transportation and nothing about preservation. Virginia Mason has supported by helping to finance the preservation of the 1924 John Winthrop Apartment Building. They also donated a half block of land across from the Historic Seattle's Dearborn House to create the four story Tate-Mason house which he believes is sympathetic to its surroundings in the neighborhood both in scale and in architectural style and it is home to 97 apartments for seniors. He read a letter from Professor Norm Johnston, Architectural Historian, a fellow of AIA, noted teacher who taught 29 years at University of Washington and later served Associate Dean, numerous books and neighbor to Cassel Crag. Mr. Johnston's letter stated that he revisited the site and concluded with some reluctance that nomination should be denied as it is unwarranted.

Tom Walsh, Attorney representing Virginia Mason reviewed comments by the former speakers none of whom supported nomination. He said based on criteria D it is a nice older building but doesn't rise to the level of distinction.

Board Questions:

Mr. Martinson asked what the landmark status is of the three buildings, the Marlborough and the other two that Ms. Boyle mentioned.

Ms. Chave said that none of them have gone through the landmark process.

Mr. Martinson asked if O'Dea was landmarked.

Ms. Chave said no.

Ms. Boyle said that the Marlborough is undergoing rehabilitation; she doesn't now if they'll come in for review. Dearborn and Stimson Green are landmarks and perhaps the Sorrento. She believes in City's database there are 42 buildings, 15 of which are apartment buildings and most of those are cited as likely to meet the criteria.

Ms. Chave said that a draft nomination has been recently submitted for the Sorrento.

Mr. Abelsen said he agreed that the Marlborough and O'Dea High School are clearly evident of Gothic Revival. He said he is curious from basis of

comparison, between Cassel Crag and Arcadia, and asked what kind of tenant was the original design intended for.

Ms. Boyle said she didn't know but she assumed primarily for single people and couples as there are eleven studios, twenty-one one bedroom units, five two-bedrooms and one three-bedroom units. She said she provided a survey based on Polk directories of tenants and their occupations and they appeared to have been middle and working class, clerical and service workers. She said she didn't know enough about the Arcadia's tenancy to make a comparison.

Mr. Abelsen asked if from a cost basis of the amount of ornament and detail on building was dictated by its original design and use, if there was a limitation to the Architect and/or the owner for going one step further to bring it more in line with what is evident in the Marlborough building.

Ms. Boyle said she doesn't know enough about the financial mechanism of the time. She said that visually it is just like many other typical apartments on First Hill and Queen Anne.

Mr. Matthews referred to a letter written by Ms. Boyle on February and said she showed original Gothic and then later Gothic Revival. He said she skipped what he considered the real Gothic Revival that occurred in this country between 1820 and 1860. He asked if any of these are relevant compared with the Gothic Revival that occurred early in 20th Century. He asked if she is looking at this as a example of a style.

Ms. Boyle said she is not saying it should be a Gothic building; by the mid-20's it is more eclectic.

Mr. Matthews said she was comparing it primarily with the buildings she is showed (O'Dea and Marlborough) as a style and he said he thinks this should have a different style or name and decide whether it belongs to that group.

Ms. Tremaine said it seems clear that Cassel Crag didn't appear on any survey yet Ms. Boyle listed surveys that it possibly could have been on and it wasn't on any of them. She asked why it was not on a survey.

Ms. Boyle said it is conjectural when doing a survey you sort of build a comparative bar. It is important; she said she uses surveys to get an initial sense of what is there. The board is not bound by surveys; sometimes they aren't survey. She said the appearance of a building in prior publications whether it be mass or surveys or documents is the test of time; if something shows up repeatedly that tells her that people recognize it.

Ms. Sordt said the entire city has not been surveyed so there is no comprehensive survey of this area of the City.

Ms. Chave said they haven't completed all the neighborhoods and are working on survey of the city. She said that she would let the Board know if a subject property was included in the current survey.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Matthews said if it were in a Historic District he would have no hesitation to say it is a contributing building so since it is not it has to be looked at as a stand-alone building. He said he respects Norm Johnston and like Norm Johnston, he agrees reluctantly.

Mr. Lee said we can add a criterion if someone thinks it might qualify. He said the Board needs to state whether or not it qualifies and under what criterion.

Mr. Mathews said no.

Ms. Conti said she had a hard time to qualify under D.

Ms. Howard said without additional information, no.

Mr. Hannum said it is a charming building but doesn't rise to the status; no.

Ms. Nicolas it lacked prominence; no.

Ms. Tremaine said she asked herself if it is unique; and in considering BOLA's research she found other buildings more worthy. She would not support designation.

Mr. Abelson said he would not support designation.. He supported the nomination but doesn't support designation as it doesn't rise up to the level to meet Criterion D.

Mr. Martinson said comparing it to other buildings that aren't landmarked does not offer this building any protection. It doesn't rise to standard; no.

Ms. Strong said no based on D; it doesn't meet the designation standards.

Mr. Lee said no and that we need to be careful about the other ones; we need to stick to the criteria. Under separate discussions about Historic Districts, other communities could benefit becoming Historic Districts like Columbia City has. He said that today just looking at this building it doesn't really rise to significance.

Action: "I move that the Board not approve the designation of the Cassel Crag Apartment Building at 1218 Terry Avenue as a Seattle Landmark, as it does not meet any of the designation standards listed of SMC25.12.350"

MM/SC/RM/MS

11:0:0 Motion carried

020608.4 NOMINATIONS

020608.41 Greyhound Bus Terminal
807 Stewart Street

Applicant Comment: Mildred Andrews said the Central Terminal was built in 1927 in a restrained interpretation of the Mediterranean Revival style. She is unsure of who the architect was as the plans were lost but in looking through files at Department of Planning & Development found the architect listed as "Pertica" which may be a misspelling of B. Marcus Priteca. The 8th and Stewart location was at the outer edge of downtown development. Downtown Seattle development gravitated north, with new buildings like the Medical Dental Building, the Vance Hotel, Olive Tower, and the Paramount Theater until the stock market collapse. The subject area was comprised of businesses, residences, churches. Then, as now, Stewart Street was a heavily trafficked thoroughfare.

When it opened the subject building served several regional motor stage lines and was also the last of three stops in the city for the Seattle-Everett Interurban Railway. There was a concourse between 8th and 9th Avenues behind the building where a 28' x 36' steel roof marquis extended from roof juncture across the passenger loading zone. Interurban cars and buses turned from Stewart Street onto 9th Avenue and then in to concourse. Interurbans were on tracks on outside lane and buses used the two inside lanes. At the first floor an awning extended the full length of the building. The scale of the building and awning were suitable for the smaller buses whose height matched the first story; the integrity was compromised at a later date when the awning was raised to accommodate larger buses. She showed a 1927 photo of the three story concrete structure with a basement and poured concrete foundation. The massing of the building is simple with a flat roof and hipped parapet that is clad in clay tiles. The roof-wall juncture is enhanced by decorated brick and cast stone band with floral motifs. The exterior walls were sheathed in wire cut brick and cast stone corbels and castellated brick. The exterior walls are organized in three horizontal bands; pilasters that were originally adorned with cast stone ornament divide the walls into vertical bays. Fenestration consisted of paired double hung windows which originally had decorated sills. The Stewart Street and 8th Avenue entries were flanked by commercial storefronts fitted with plate glass windows fitted with wood

sashes and steel bulkhead. The building was originally designed to be pedestrian friendly.

Tax assessor records and newspaper articles about the grand opening provide information about building's original interior. The western third of the building contained three floors with a café, a drugstore and restrooms on the first floor and offices on the upper floors. The eastern two thirds was a double height volume with a mezzanine above the lobby which featured a beamed ceiling and Phillipine mahogany doors, trim and ticket booths. The east end of the building housed the baggage area. The basement contained the boiler room, janitors' quarters, storage space and a men's smoking room. In a 1938 photograph showed signage across the upper walls advertising bus schedules. A year later in 1939 the Seattle-Everett Interurban made its last run and the tracks were removed.

Ms. Andrews explained that Greyhound bought the North Coast lines in 1947. Greyhound replaced the original high marquis with a bus shed which extends the full width of the building and remains intact today. To accommodate the larger buses the connection of the new shed roof to the original terminal had to be raised to point above second story window sills. Ms. Andrews stated that this addition compromises the integrity of the original scale and composition of the rear façade. The bus shed's metal roof is supported by steel beams set on large girders which are supported by steel columns set in concrete sleeves. Numbered gates and additional ticket booths were additional alterations. In the 1962 remodel, a one story addition was built on the north facade. The original brick exterior walls were covered with a ceramic tile; most of the decorated tile and cast stone was removed. The decorated brick and cast stone band at the roof line remained intact. Also, during this time the storefronts were in-filled and covered with ceramic tile and the round arched windows above the main entrance were removed. Louvered sheet metal vents were punched into first floor wall surfaces at several locations on Stewart Street façade.

The addition along the north elevation was constructed in early 1960s; it is a one-story volume with a flat roof and concrete foundation. Wall surfaces are organized into vertical bays by full height pilasters that resemble the composition of the 1927 building. All the original doors and marquis were replaced with the exception of the marquis on the southwest elevation. The entrance on the west elevation was removed and a new entry added.

Ms. Andrews cited a 1965 article in the Seattle Times about staffing levels at the Terminal: 125 drivers, 30 supervisory, 78 depot employees, 76 mechanics, and 18 to run the restaurant. Since the 1960s many routes have been eliminated and today's arrivals and departures include only 13 buses per day.

In the 1960s interior vending machines took the place of the former drugstore. The former café was enlarged, remodeled and leased to Burger King. The baggage area was remodeled for new passage express service as well as money order and auto rental services. The contemporary view of the primary entrance from Stewart Street shows primary entrance on Stewart Street. Original storefronts were that had provided pedestrian-friendly environment were removed and covered with ceramic tile. The entrance is fitted with aluminum and glass double doors with transom and side lights dating from the 1960s. A brick pediment with decorated cast stone ornament which was not covered over in the 1960s further articulates the entrance though it is obscured by street trees and large blade Greyhound sign. Three large arched windows were removed. On the southwest entrance was originally flanked by two storefront bays on either side; during 1960s remodel the window openings were reduced in size and the entrance was replaced with plate glass window. Storefront to the left when facing the building was replaced with a recessed entrance and fitted with double doors. The two storefront windows to the right of the storefront entry were boarded up.

She said the original configuration of the southeast entrance is unknown but most of the finishes and detailing were removed during 1960s remodel. Six of the original double hung windows remain in place as does the decorative brick and cast stone at the roof wall juncture. These features were obstructed by a metal and neon Greyhound sign.

Ms. Andrews stated that the rear elevation has undergone significant alterations including addition of the bus shed. Original doors were replaced with three glass and aluminum doors. A secondary entrance with metal doors is located two bays to the right of the main entrance. A number of the bays have filled in areas on the first floor that were originally window. The primary entrance to the building opens directly to the lobby with the ticket counter on the opposite wall; original ticket booths were replaced in the 1960s. The exit to the bus loading area is to the right of the ticket counter across from the main entry; the general configuration does not appear to have changed since 1946. The original double height lobby space was compromised sometime after 1962 with the addition of a dropped acoustical tile ceiling.

Ms. Andrews explained the Pioneer Masonry & Restoration inspected the conditions and said the ceramic tile could not easily be removed. A sample of tile removed from the brick with extreme difficulty due to the porous nature of the brick and mortar. The cast stone column capitals remain intact. She introduced Jay Arthur Morefield from Spencer Decker Architects who accompanied Pioneer Masonry when they investigated.

Mr. Morefield said measurements were taken from existing cast stone capitals on the south façade and the existing pilasters where the capitals used to reside.

The original dimensions of the cast stone capitals are larger in width and depth than the existing pilaster dimensions. Without removing the tile over the capitals we can assume the original cast stone was removed or severely compromised at the time the tile was installed. The building was originally constructed using wire cut fired bricks; to further accentuate the masonry patterns a deeply tooled grout joint was used. With the supervision of Pioneer Masonry a sample of the tile was removed. The composition of the applied ceramic tile is bonded with a full cementitious backer directly to the wire cut brick. The mortar band is a full ½ to ¾". According to Pioneer Masonry, the wire cut face of the brick makes it ideal for mortar applications; the grooves in the face of the brick provide simple foundation for the mortar to adhere and make it extremely difficult to remove without compromising the integrity of the original brick. This, combined with the deeply tooled mortar joints make removal of the ceramic tile and the underlying mortar bed a very difficult task that would most certainly mar or destroy the original façade beneath.

She said that the building has undergone considerable alterations, including the roof form, massing and rhythm of structural openings still impart some of intent of original design. Previous owners and architects have not respected its integrity. Major exterior modifications including the covering over of the original brick with ceramic tile, removal of decorative cast stone and tile work, removal of the original storefronts, marquis and entrances, construction of the north addition, and large canopy on rear elevation. Changes to the interior include the removal of high lobby space, new floor, wall and ceiling finishes in all the public space and the reconfiguration of many of the spaces. Most of the alterations are irreversible. Ms. Andrews stated that in her opinion the overall impact of these changes erodes building integrity.

Ms. Andrews summarized that she did not think any of the designation standards were met. She said the building's location and lack of physical integrity disqualify it. She said one is more likely to think of the Fremont Trolley Barn or the Interurban Building in Pioneer Square, both of which are Landmarks. She does not think the final run of the Interurban is of historical significance. She said there are more significant examples of Stone and Webster's work. She said that even if Priteca designed the building, it is not one of his significant works like the Paramount Theater. The building has gradually faded into obscurity because of the 1962 remodel which covered up storefronts, decreasing bus ridership and because of new development in the neighborhood.

Board Questions: There were no Board questions.

Karen Link presented a report for the City. She clarified that she did not say that all the capitals were hidden beneath the modern cladding but that they might be. She said she is surprised that there were so many that are there. She said the building is significant in its association with the Pacific

Northwest Traction Company; it is an important part of its history. It replaced more makeshift terminals such as the converted Seattle Electric Freight Shed at 6th and Olive. The Interurban ran north to Everett and this had a big affect on Seattle, particularly the Fremont and Greenwood neighborhoods, and Everett. It was an important part of transportation and development history in the area.

It was built specifically to serve as Central Terminal, for Pacific Northwest Traction. At the time of its construction downtown Seattle didn't go that far North. In the first zoning code in 1923 the idea of downtown was between Battery and Union, and 4th and 8th they were starting to develop the Vance Building, the Lloyd, the Medical Dental Building, the Fox Theater; all of which were close to the Central Terminal Building. The building has a close relationship to the New Orpheum Theater which was designed by Priteca; she said she believes that Priteca designed the Central Terminal as well.

She presented commonalities between the two buildings: paired double hung windows, contrasting brick and cast stone, terracotta, corpel band for the roof, hipped roof form with terracotta tile roof, similar blade signs which may have had nothing to do with Priteca, and the use arches. As part of the Stone and Webster subsidiary and Pacific Northwest Traction Company the building's connection with the Seattle Interurban the building is important and fits Criterion C. The building was a very important terminal and was associated with both the Seattle-Everett Interurban and with the Associated Motor Stages and Stone and Webster's profitable work in the Pacific Northwest. Interurban and buses played a major role in development of Seattle and area north of Seattle. Because it was associated in a significant way with the cultural, political and economic heritage of the City it meets Criterion C despite its lack of physical integrity. The Central Terminal functioned as Southern terminus for Seattle to Everett Interurban. Last stop on interurban for south so Criterion A would apply. The integrity issue is huge; the building over time does have a problem with location. Despite recladding, it remains identifiable and is a prominent neighborhood feature and meets Critrion F.

Board Questions:

Mr. Martenson asked when the last run was made and if there was a celebration.

Ms. Link said the last run was celebrated. There was a PBS piece about Interurbans at the time. This signified the end of an era.

Mr. Abelson asked about the influence this building had on the urban design of the buildings on in the northern part of the city.

Ms. Link said the building was built specifically for Pacific Northwest Traction Company. The route went only on Westlake and it solidified development of that area. Westlake was important to the development of the City. The route continued north across Fremont Bridge and that commercial area developed; this development continued in Greenwood. The original Everett line was founded in 1902 Stone & Webster extended it from Ballard south into Downtown and north from Lake Ballinger to Everett; it had a great impact along the way.

Mr. Abelson said to weigh in on the significant balance of buses provided to the growth of city versus auto oriented development.

Ms. Link said buses became more important in the 1920s. Originally there were two divisions Northern and Southern. Buses run along same direction; the line was Associated Buses but they ran the same way. Running of buses solidified development in all the areas along the route.

Public Comment: Patrick Nevil of King County Labor Council said he represents 75,000 workers in King County. He said the building falls under Criterion C and he supported the nomination. For eight decades the bus has always been significant middle class link and serves as a symbol of hardworking men and women of industry. He asked the Board to not lose sight of the historic richness of this first real bus terminal. It was a new era of public transportation. The community deserves a careful analysis of what the building means to the public. The 1927 erection of bus terminal highlights necessity of public transportation in a bus-linked city.

Board discussion:

Mr. Veith said there are significant integrity issues. He cited the ordinance which says we should nominate things that have significant character, interest or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural character of the City, State or Nation; it has integrity or ability to convey that significance. The building has big integrity issues and that removes consideration of Criterion E as it is not an especially good work of the architect. It does not remove from consideration of C or F. He said he knows about Stone and Webster because he wrote about the street car system in Wallingford. Stone and Webster's involvement with the City and its politics is important involvement because they are the firm that was responsible almost nationally for replacing rail with rubber. The street car system met its demise in 1939-40. This was part of a political movement throughout country; it was not popular with labor and changed labor relations with transportation. Criterion C is the one he thinks need to be considered association with this building. With regard to Criterion F he said he is very aware of building but not sure he would endorse F but it is something to be considered because large numbers of people made large use of terminal. He said he is leaning toward Yes based on Criterion C.

Ms. Strong said she would defer to her colleagues for the moment.

Mr. Martenson said if all was stripped away, the signs, the bus canopy, it would look like it used to as the structural form is still there. He said it was borderline for him.

Mr. Abelson said the building is significant. He said it does convey its significance because it is still being used as a bus terminal and in that he agrees with Mr. Veith. He said he wonders if designation should look to 1960's design or the 1920's design. He referred to Pioneer Masonry's opinion about difficulty to remove ceramic tile. He is leaning against but wants to hear from more of his colleagues.

Ms. Tremaine said the building is a well known and a busy place particularly during the war she said that C should be looked at closely because it was associated in a significant way with the economic and culture of the area. She said there are integrity issues. She referred to Pioneer Masonry's opinion about the difficulty to remove tile. She says yes to nomination at this moment but she doesn't know if it would be worthy of designation.

Ms. Nicolas said she is on the fence; she does think it merits landmark status.

Mr. Hannum said he is against the nomination. It has significant integrity issues and can't convey the significance. He said that the interurban was only around for 12 years so not significant. It is a bus terminus and bus travel was important but he doesn't know this building is significantly associated with that. This is similar to the Teamster's building on Denny way; the Teamsters were important but in that situation it couldn't be determined that the building was significantly associated.

Ms. Howard said she struggles with integrity issue. She is inclined to support nomination based on Criterion A. She said her great grandfather was a conductor and she knows he went on that final run because her grandmother mentioned it when they passed the Greyhound Building. So for her it still spoke to that moment in history so would fit into C but she is on the fence.

Ms. Conti said no as it does not meet the initial hurdle for physical integrity nor can it convey its significance.

Mr. Mathews said transportation was important in the making of city; he said he wonders whether public would have the same sentiment. He referred to the public comment by the earlier Labor Council representative who clearly stated there is a great deal of sentiment about the historic significance of this building. He said that integrity is a problem and he has doubts about the building's ability to convey its significance. He is on the fence.

Mr. Lee said building struggles to convey its significance. He said it doesn't rise to the level of a Seattle landmark. He asked if there could be a motion for nomination.

Mr. Veith said he would make a motion for nomination.

Action: I move the approval of the Grehound Bus Terminal at 807 Stewart Street for consideration as a Seattle landmark noting the legal description in the nomination form. The features and characteristics proposed for preservation include the exterior of the building and the site at the public meeting for Board consideration of designation is scheduled for March 19, 2008 that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/TV/CH

3:8:0

Motion failed.

020608.42

Alpha Cine Building
1001 Lenora Street

Applicant Comment: Larry Johnson said the building is located in the midst of the Denny Triangle, across the street from the William Volker Company building which is now the main campus of Cornish. The lot is 120 x 60' deep. The facades as well as the lower portion fenestration have been altered. A film production company now occupies the building. He said it is a two story building on the eastern side and a three story building on the west side due to grade change. He said the interior has been altered and there is nothing original left.

He said in looking at the Criteria for designation there is nothing historic connected to the building so it wouldn't fit with Criterion A. It has no significant association with the development of the area so does not fit with C. He said that in 1890 the area was very residential but by 1930 some low scale buildings associated with parking garages and auto sales had been constructed as well as the William Volker building. In 1937 there was a house at either side and the building still had the original glazing and storefront.

He referred to Criterion D and said the Art Deco style is streamlined and futuristic, with a use of setbacks, horizontal and vertical banding, and ornamentation which included often low relief and geometric design, chevrons, zigzags, floral and fern motifs. There was a lot of concrete, smooth face stone and masonry with accents of terracotta or glass. He said often a lot of polychromatic elements are used, and the best Deco designs involved a collaboration of artists. He provided photos of local examples: Roosevelt Hotel, Great Northern Life Building, U.S. Marine Hospital, Exchange

Building, Washington Athletic Club, Seattle Times Building, the Volker Building and the Edmond Meany Hotel.

He pointed to the verticality in two facades of the Alpha Cine building, banding, spandrels, bas relief/cast stone. He said there are dozens of extant buildings that better embody Art Deco. Many of the defining characteristics of been removed. He said it may not rise to the level of a landmark.

The building was designed by Louis Svarz who worked for William Doty Van Sicken and opened his own practice and work independently until 1937. Svarz designed the Aberdeen Amory, the Ranke Building (Nordstrom Building), the D.N.E. Roffe Building, and the Alpha Cine Building. None, except for the Ranke Building, are exceptional.

He said the building's location, it is just visible off the side, does not fit Criterion F.

He said the building does not rise to the level of significance to meet any criteria because of loss of integrity, west side loss of fenestration, interior altered.

Vicki Clayton said that Cornish chose to nominate the building as part of campus relocation so want to proceed forward with their remodeling plans. It will be the home of their music department so will have sound absorption issues. A good building that will meet needs of college and community; she said they will be good stewards of the building as they have with other buildings they own (Kerry Building, Raisbeck Hall).

She said no to C. With regard to E there are better examples of architects, for example the Volker building across the street. She said they do not support the nomination as it is an average building and not distinctive.

Board Questions: There were no questions.

Karen Link presented comments for the City supporting designation of the Lenora Building. She said that this building is the most intact of Louis Svarz's known work and that it was associated with the Puget Sound Notion Company which was in business from 1905 to 1963 which was an important chunk of time in the development of Seattle's economy. It is divided into six bays by engaged piers. The cast stone base and the more ornate finials at the entry bay and most of the original windows are there. She pointed out ornament at the top of the parapet and the thin pilasters which divide the entry bay into three sections as well as incised ornament at entry portal. Piers are more elaborate at entry bay and topped with cast stone finials, ornaments at top of parapet. Volker Building across the street is a National Register landmark and this building compares well with that; it is unfair to compare

with taller buildings (Northern Life Tower); this was designed for an area that was zoned for lower buildings. This is a nice low-scale building; the Volker is a bit blockier than this. Not all the openings on the west elevation have been altered; all the other character defining features remain: the soldier course above the east openings, the cast stone sill. East elevation is fairly intact and the multi-paned glazing is there as well as the loading dock. To Criterion D she says yes; it does stand out as a good example of low-scale commercial buildings in Seattle. It employs high style design elements, Art Deco façade composition detailing.

She said that Mr. Svarz was a 1909 graduate of Massachusetts Institute of Technology. 1903 – 1911 he worked for William Doty Van Sicien 1903 – 1911; he was in private practice. 1916 – mid-1930s and then worked for the Federal Home Authority from 1940s and 1950s. He designed the Ranke Building (Nordstrom Building); in 1973 it was reclad. The Roffe Building lost a lot of features; windows were changed and there were alterations to cladding. The Alpha Cine Building is well designed and the last one that we know of so she thinks it meets Criterion E.

She said the economic and urban development of this area, this building was part of that and it was built specifically for a wholesale business that operated from 1905 until 1963. It was part of a grouping of commercial light manufactured buildings which developed first because of the Seattle-Everett Interurban and the last phase of the Denny Regrade. She said it fits Criterion C because of its involvement with Seattle's early economic development and also was associated with a company that endured from 1905-1963.

Ms. Strong departed at 6:30 pm.

Questions:

Ms. Sodt noted that the Volker Building is a National Register Landmark but not a City Landmark.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Mathews said it is necessary to look at a small building slightly differently from a large building. It is good example of small Art Deco and nomination should be considered. He said he doesn't know much about Svarz. He said it is a good piece of work but not outstanding. He said Yes on D, maybe E.

Ms. Conti said yes on D; low scale Art Deco.

Ms. Howard said yes on D and would like more information on Louis Svarz.

Mr. Hannum said he was on the fence and that he said it is an interesting low scale Deco building but he is not sure it rises to Landmark status.

Ms. Nicolas said it is a nice building but she is not sure about landmark status.

Ms. Tremaine said the building is not unique; it has non-descript East and West facades and is not Landmark quality.

Mr. Abelson said Yes.

Mr. Martenson said Yes.

Mr. Veith said it is a nice building but said it didn't rise to the standard of Landmark status.

Mr. Lee said he agreed with Mr. Veith.

Action: "I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Alpha Cine Building at 1001 Lenora Street for consideration as a Seattle Landmark, noting the legal description in the nomination form. The features and characteristics proposed for preservation include the exterior of the building. The public meeting for Board consideration designation scheduled March 19, 2008 and that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SV/RM/CH

4:6:0

Motioned failed.

020608.5 CONTROLS AND INCENTIVES

020608.51 Cooper House
225-227 ½ 14th Ave E

Ms. Chave presented the signed controls and incentives agreement on the Cooper House. She introduced Jenkins Chan, who is with the Dwelling Company, the property owner. She explained that the west elevation would be under administrative review for changes to guardrails, windows and doors.

Ms. Chave said that a request for additional alterations would be coming through soon; the owners wanted to get this agreement completed to make that an easy process.

Action: "I move to adopt and approve the controls and incentives agreement for the Cooper House at 225-227 14th Avenue E."

**MM/SC/TV/VA
approved.**

10:0:0

Adopted and

020608.52 Fitch-Nutt House
4401 Phinney Avenue North

Ms. Chave said they received a letter from the owner's (Mr. Grunvold) attorney, Richard Hill which says, "this response on behalf of Kurt Grunvold to your letter of January 8, Mr. Grunvold respectfully requests a continuance for six months in connection with the negotiation of controls and incentives. Mr. Grunvold is currently selling the property; the new owner would like to work directly with you to discuss, negotiate and reach agreement upon controls and incentives."

Ms. Chave said that staff supports the continuance

Action: I move that we accept the Controls and Incentives for the Fitch Nutt House, 4401 Phinney Avenue North to be extended for six months.

MM/SC/MT/MH

10:0:0

020608.53 Joshua Green Building
1425 Fourth Avenue

Ms. Sodt said she had a signed agreement for the Joshua Green Building; she said it is a standard C and I agreement.

Action: I move that we adopt the Controls and Incentives agreement for the Joshua Green Building at 1425 Fourth Avenue.

**MM/SC/MH/CH
approved.**

10:0:0

Adopted and

Ms. Chave said she will hand out the updated Landmark Ordinance.

The meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator