



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 174/08

### MINUTES

**Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting**  
**Seattle Municipal Tower**  
**700 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 40th Floor**  
**Room 4060**  
**Wednesday, March 5, 2008– 3:30 p.m.**

#### Board Members Present

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

#### Staff

Elizabeth Chave  
Sarah Sodt  
Melinda Bloom

#### Absent:

Ron Martinson  
Christine Howard

Stephen Lee, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:36 pm.

#### **030508.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES** December 19, 2007

Mr. Lee and Mr. Veith submitted corrections of the December 19, 2007 meeting.

Ms. Tremaine moved to approve the minutes as amended.

MM/SC/MT/VA 7:0:2 Ms. Conti and Mr. Martinson abstained as they were absent from the December 19 meeting.

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** January 16, 2008

Mr. Veith, Mr. Lee, Ms. Tremaine and Mr. Hannum submitted corrections of the January 16, 2008 meeting.

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"



addition butting up to the existing school; he said previously the roof was shown as separate from the existing (landmarked) structure.

Mr. Bates said glazing in the proposed change butts up to the (landmarked) structure where before there was shown a section of solid CMU wall. He said as part of the ability to narrow it they eliminated it and glazed there. He said it is still separated cleanly from the historic building in that the roof is elevated above the old gym while the new wall assembly abuts to the existing.

Mr. Bates said they also pulled the canopy back so it is not connected to the historic building, as per discussions at the ARC meeting.

Public Comment:

Mr. Lee said that public comments must be related to the reviewing of the application in front of the Board today. He asked that comments be kept to two minutes.

Chris Jackins provided handouts to the Board and said he had five points. He said the language regarding windows were changed to replace on page 3; he suggest the language be changed back to “reinstalled in place”. He said the new gym north and south facades have been lengthened by 17 feet; he said this caused the new gym to extend past the center of the original school to the second set of central doors. He said this obscures more of the outline and massing of the original landmark building. He said a number of District presentations stated that the proposed gym is not a middle school sized gym but rather a larger adult sized gym intended to accommodate adult community use. He said as such educational specifications cannot be used to justify the extra size impacts on views of the landmark. He said the new gym will obscure protected city views from Wallingford Playfield and will also separate these protected City views from the current context of simultaneous viewing of the City and the landmarked school, diminishing both. He said the play area has changed; the proposal to keep the play area at a raised height will needlessly obscure views of the landmark. He said the height is not driven by underground parking garage as this has been deleted. He asked the Board to make a fresh attempt to preserve more aspects of the landmark.

Bill Denny, Wallingford resident and architect said he was one of three appellants of this project to the Hearing Examiner. He said they were successful in either reversing or remanding three of the four items they were looking to have reversed which were half of the land use approvals for this project. He said the project in its current state does not meet the requirement of the Hearing Examiner. He said there was not to be additional lot coverage and the central area, the parking garage and play structure will eventually end up being dropped to meet the requirements of the Hearing Examiner. He said in a correction notice from the City they were reminded of this on February 29; their drawings

were resubmitted three days later and they received another correction note on March 3 indicating that they still needed to comply with the Hearings Examiner decision. He asked the Board to hold approval until drawings have complied with the decision of the Hearings Examiner.

Mike Ruby, Wallingford resident and a mechanical engineer said that he is asking the Board to make a clear statement to the architects that the Board is not requiring them to install single pane windows; he said the District has said repeatedly they are doing it because the Landmarks Board is making them do it. Mr. Ruby asked the Board not to allow them to remove the windows and reinstall as single pane, it is not energy efficient. He also asked the Board to state publicly and clearly that it is not making them install single pane windows.

Pete Sond, neighbor of the school, said the major purpose of a landmark is to honor buildings that make a positive contribution to character of the neighborhood. He said Wallingford is a neighborhood of 100 year old houses which give it a character the community appreciates and values. He said the school has added to that character; he said he thinks the gym is a poor fit to the original historic structure. He said when he first saw the design of the gym, he asked Michael Romero and asked why such a poor fit is being added to the school. He said the Mr. Romero said the Landmarks Board made them do it. He said since then, everyone he has talked to about the design has said “it is the best we could get from the Landmarks Board”. He asked the Board to go to Densmore to look at the school, at the houses across the street and then look at the building and ask if that is the best fit for this neighborhood and this school. He said his neighbors loathe the design.

Greg Flood said the problem with the design is the more modern style of the new building with its barrel roof. He said the indication has been that they (the District) have “had to” have the barrel roof in order to comply with Landmarks requirements. He said his group has suggested doing something that is distinct from Hamilton, which has a flat roof, perhaps a hipped roof. He said there are single family houses all around; the model and elevations don’t show that context and the close proximity that the school is to the immediate neighborhood. He said the new gym will block protected City views; he thinks that a hip roof would probably improve that as it would be coming up at a different angle. He showed a plan showing the building with a hipped roof.

Lee Ellefson, resident of Wallingford and member of the Wallingford Council said he likes the rebuild and said the vast majority of community members in Wallingford are enthusiastic about the changes. He urged the Board to approve the changes.

Sue Raney, long term resident of Wallingford said she was concerned that with the modification they would lose separation of the children’s play area from the

delivery zone; she said she is pleased to see that has been changed so the mixture of uses won't occur.

Board discussion:

Mr. Abelsen said he has no concern of impact to the historic landmark with how the buildings are joined together. He said the way the roof structure now meets the old building is not a real departure from what he's previously seen and agreed to. He said overall it is acceptable.

Mr. Matthews said he thinks the design meets the criteria the Board has to judge by.

Ms. Strong said she agreed with Mr. Matthews.

Mr. Lee said that the Board has already approved the design, with today's proposal the bulk has gotten smaller but the image of the building has stayed the same; he thinks it is acceptable.

Ms. Tremaine said she is concerned about the non-compliance with the Hearing Examiner.

Mr. Lee said that was not under the Board's purview. He said if there are any more changes to design the applicants will have to come back to the Board for approval in order to get a building permit; he said the Board can only respond to what is presented by the applicants in their application.

**Action:** I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for Hamilton Middle School at 1610 N. 41<sup>st</sup>. St. for the proposed revisions to the Final design for the proposed gymnasium addition 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 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.*

**MM/SC/VA/MH**

**8:0:0**

Mr. Veith returned to the meeting.

030508.22

Fire Station #2  
2334 4th Avenue

Ms. Sodt introduced Frank Silkwood from Arai Jackson Ellison Murakami Architects and Theresa Rodriguez from City of Seattle Fleets and Facilities department.

Mr. Silkwood said Fire Station # 2 was built in 1921 and is an early example of a reinforced concrete building with inlay of brick detail. He said they are seeking a Certificate of Approval for improvements to the landmark’s exterior and have met with the ARC twice. He provided boards with existing and proposed drawings for comparison. He said the building will be gutted internally to allow for programmatic revision to the interior of the building, to allow for seismic retrofit, installation of exterior wall insulation on the interior surfaces of the exterior wall; and to allow a complete remodel of the mechanical and electrical systems.

He said the station office which is located in the northwest corner will be relocated adjacent to the center entry. They propose to relocate the vehicular door into adjacent bay and swap out the window. He said they propose a new sidewalk and driveway along the 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue facade of the building and propose to relocate the historic bell to a location along the sidewalk adjacent to the center entry and the station office. He said they would put in accent lighting to illuminate the bell.

He said there will be little change on the exterior elevations; they plan new paint on the cement plaster veneer that is on the concrete throughout the building and they plan to clean and seal all brick infill. He said strips of brick that come down to grade at the typical corner entry doors will get graffiti protectant applied up to the pediment height; it will be clear but will look slightly different from the rest of the brick, but it will make it easier to maintain.

He said they will be replacing the non-original failed insulating glazing with clear glazing that matches what had been there traditionally. He said the existing building has an identification sign that will be moved to a new location which he pointed out on the drawing. He said the call box for emergencies will be moved to a new position which he pointed to on the drawing. He showed the door in its new location adjacent to where it used to be and the corresponding relocation of the window. He showed photo mock-ups of the entries in order to show changes in lighting and signage.

He said at the North entry currently there is a Fire Station Number 2 sign which is cast cement with raised letters; the raised letters are painted gold. He proposes to paint those letters to match background of sign so as not to call attention to it but to still preserve the historic sign at its historic location. He said they propose to provide a replica sign at the center entry; the sign will be cast cement with raised letters with the letters painted gold. He said the drawings show the proposed new location of the red call box with the same relationship to the station doors that it has now. He proposed at the center entry to replace the existing non-historic light fixture with something less obtrusive visually; he said they plan a very thin linear fixture that would be located under the balcony and would provide light on the façade at the entry and on the sidewalk in front. The fixture is about 1 ½ inches in diameter and about 54' long. He said the fixture would not be visible unless it is on. He said at the south entry they will remove two large glaring non-historic light fixtures. The same strip LED fixture will be installed under the projecting pediment.

He reviewed the construction detail drawings for the relocation of the vehicular access door and the adjacent window. He said they propose to remove the concrete sill that is below the existing window and to construct a new concrete sill where the window will go and to relocate the brick sill that will go above it. The concrete sill will be reinforced concrete construction with cement plaster veneer to match adjacent concrete. It will have a cast cement base below. He said it will look like it has always been built that way.

He said they propose to paint and clean the brick in the alley elevation. There are three light fixtures they would like to replace for better energy efficiency and glare control. He said they will paint, and clean brick on the north and south elevations. There are two doors on the north elevation, one is active and one is inactive; after the project it will be reversed but the appearance will be the same.

They will paint, clean and seal brick in the courtyard and will replace three light fixtures.

Board questions:

Mr. Matthews said that was a very clear presentation; he said he appreciated the before and after drawings; he has no questions.

Mr. Abelsen asked about “the switch” between the window location and vehicle bay and asked Mr. Silkwood to elaborate on what appears to be an interior programmatic issue.

Mr. Silkwood said the history of the existing vehicular door is that it was used to take apparatus through and back into the motor vehicle repair part of the facility. He said over time an elevator has been added on the interior and that there is no longer enough clearance for vehicular function. The program calls for a Reserve Battalion Commander’s vehicle to be at the station ready to go, so they were asked to reactivate the bay but discovered that it doesn’t work in terms of clearance so they chose to swap the vehicular door with the adjacent window bay to gain more room for a vehicle.

Mr. Abelsen asked if it was a depth (of vehicle) issue.

Mr. Silkwood said it was, but is also a width issue. It is still a substandard bay but there is much better width and depth to accommodate a vehicle.

Mr. Lee asked Mr. Silkwood to put up the other elevations and said what was interesting to him at ARC is the design they ended up appears to be a better design than the existing design because of the symmetry.

Mr. Abelsen said he agreed the design appears better but it is a significant change. He asked if it was reversible.

Mr. Silkwood said it was.

Mr. Abelsen asked if the painting over of the existing signage was reversible as well.

Mr. Silkwood said it was, they could just paint gold back over top.

Mr. Abelsen asked where they were stopping the graffiti coating on the brick.

Mr. Silkwood pointed to the drawing and said it would be a narrow strip of brick at the pediment where there is already tension horizontally and already a feeling that something is breaking at that point. He said it shouldn’t be too noticeable.

Public comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Tremaine said the symmetry is improved by the change and she thought it was a very articulate presentation.

Mr. Matthews said the building divided into a number of structural bays lends itself better to change than other types of buildings. He said he accepts that other alternatives have been looked at for the interior arrangement, and this is the most successful.

Mr. Veith said it is similar to storefront revisions and because of the strength of the bay and the retention of the architectural language of the options for the bays, he said he thinks this is in keeping with the typical way the Board reviews storefront bay revisions. Even though it is a significant change it is a change in a system that is very amenable to that without losing the character of the building itself. He said he thinks it works very well. He said he wrote an article on the architect Huntington and this is one of his favorite buildings in the City. He said he feels like the changes are not modifying any of the characteristics that make the building significant to him or the City at large; he thinks it is a very light touch on a very significant building. He said Mr. Silkwood has preserved all the characteristics that speak about the building, its origins and its purpose.

Mr. Abelsen said he wanted to challenge this point, noting that the function of this building is different from commercial buildings with storefront systems.

Mr. Veith said his point is that the Board has taken a certain approach with storefronts because they are a necessarily changeable type of thing and the Board likes to see people utilize one cohesive store front system. This case is different but because of the strength of the character of the structural bays, as Mr. Matthews mentioned, this is a situation where you can get away with this kind of change without taking anything away from the significant character of the building.

Mr. Abelsen said he agreed.

**Action:** I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations of Fire Stations No. 2 at 2318 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue..

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 113089 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and are compatible with the

massing, size and scale and architectural features of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.

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

MM/SC/MT/HM

9:0:0

030508.23 Bon Marche/Macy's  
300 Pine Street

Ms. Sodt introduced Adele Ernst from Macy's who will present. She said that the project designer is based in Illinois and could not attend.

Applicant Comments: Ms. Ernst said they are seeking approval for two blade signs and applied window signage. The restaurant that used to be on the corner of 3<sup>rd</sup> and Pine has been replaced the La Brea Bakery. One blade sign is proposed for 3<sup>rd</sup> and one is proposed for Pine Street. She provided handouts to the Board with details.

Board Questions:

Mr. Lee said the illustration doesn't show the bread making mural; Ms. Ernst said it is in another handout and identified that handout.

Ms. Sodt said that she has passed around a hand-colored rendering of the storefront, but that the actual copy of the mural is in the packet provided to Board, which is also being passed.

Mr. Veith asked for clarification of whether the green color sample being passed around was for the canopy.

Ms. Ernst said it was for the sign and the edging.

Ms. Sodt said they included some interior features in the drawing submittal that are not under the Board's purview.

Ms. Ernst introduced Randy McGrail who is with of Macy's facilities department and who will be able to answer questions about method of attachment.

Mr. Abelsen asked about the final application to the windows and said that two on the south are just lettering but he asked if the one with the bread and the baking of the bread images are translucent.

Ms. Ernst said they are vinyl sheets that just slip in behind plexi-glass on the interior.

Mr. Abelsen asked if they are opaque, if no light could come through.

Ms. Ernst confirmed that.

Mr. Lee asked for clarification of why the mural was needed.

Mr. McGrail said there is an elevation change on the interior, with a floor structure behind the window, so if in fact the signage was transparent all you would see is a gap and space underneath the interior floor structure, where garbage and various things sometimes collect. The mural is intended to obscure this gap.

Mr. Abelsen said his question is more about visibility and if the sign would introduce any issues as far as visibility in or out.

Ms. Ernst said it would not affect visibility at all.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

The Board concurred it was a light touch and did not adversely affect the historic character of the building.

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

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 114772 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and are compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/HM/MH

9:0:0

**030508.3 DESIGNATION**

030508.31 Washington Athletic Club  
1325 Sixth Avenue

30+ Minutes

Mr. Lee introduced Kate Krafft and said that this is in consideration of designation of the Washington Athletic Club.

**Applicant Comment:** Kate Krafft, representing the City, said the building, located at the SW corner of 6<sup>th</sup> and Union in downtown Seattle, was finished in 1930. She said it is a twenty-one story building specifically designed for use as a private athletic club with guest accommodations (and continues to be used for those purposes) with five ground level storefronts and an entrance on 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The principal façade is oriented to Union Street. The building has a complex stepped back form with a base, shaft and tower. The building exhibits Art Moderne/Art Deco features, which are evident in verticality with piers and intermediate piers and bas relief sculpted terracotta ornament. Other Art Deco examples in downtown Seattle are the Northern Life Tower (1928) and the Exchange Building (1929). These are commercial buildings that are not only distinctive on the exterior, but have exquisite interiors as well. Due to economic downturn after 1930 major downtown commercial construction was halted and elaborate Art Deco designs for new downtown buildings were never completed. The Washington Athletic Club (WAC) was the last major high rise to be completed until construction of the Norton Building. The WAC building housed gyms, a bowling alley, exercise facility, swimming pool, social/dining area and 100 hotel rooms to attract members from outside Seattle. The club was open to men and women with women having a separate entrance. Sherwood D. Ford was the architect and he traveled all over the country to examine clubs to develop design including a Los Angeles club from which he took the idea for a 6<sup>th</sup> floor level pool.

Ms. Krafft said that Mr. Ford practiced for several years in Seattle designing the Whitman Hotel (in Walla Walla), Mayflower Theater later known as the Music Hall. W.D. Kormer who was developer of the Theater was financier of WAC so there was a distinct relationship between Music Hall and WAC. She said there were two major additions, one in 1956 designed by Bain and Overturf and another in 1970/71 designed by John Graham and Company. She said the building is prominent from 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue for pedestrians. The principal façade with its major piers and intermediate piers, its verticality, windows and other elements reinforce the vertical character of the design. The fenestration reflects the interior uses: the social rooms with the large windows. There is a plaque dedicated to Hannah Newman, the original landowner, and sculpted by James A. Wehn who did the Chief Sealth statue at Tillicum Place. The storefront on the east side has the terracotta surround intact; the other four storefronts have varying degrees of alteration although several still retain terracotta trim and speckled terracotta panels that are all the way around the base. Above the storefront portion of the base are terracotta ornaments, images and motifs that are repeated throughout the building. There are decorative patterns that seem to reference the letter “W”, and on the dentil course of the sill are fluted panels, and throughout a rope element. Plants are represented in many places on the building. Ms. Krafft pointed out the original window openings, but noted that the sash was not all original. The original entry was a recessed vestibule on 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue. She said the raised portion of the parapet at the shaft base corresponded to the original entrance that was

below, with repeated fluted motifs, stepped element, gargoyles and segmental arched windows, chevron type element, eagles at top of piers. The east and west tower elevations mirror each other. She said the window replacements at the top were changed pretty early on; originally they were narrow slotted windows. She said there have been many changes to the interior; the grand entry was altered and all original fixtures are gone. The swimming pool is intact, although the exercise rooms have been continuously updated; the interior is not worthy of consideration for designation. Original portions of 1930 high rise building meet several designation standards through the association of the cultural history of club; it embodies the distinctive Art Moderne and Art Deco styles; it is one of few remaining examples of Sherwood Ford's work; and through the spatial siting and scale it is easily identifiable as a visual feature in the downtown core.

#### Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked with respect to Criterion C what the connections that Ms. Krafft thinks are important, if it is because it is an athletic club or is it because the club itself is important.

Ms. Krafft said the social history behind clubs in downtown Seattle shows a tradition of places of assembly in downtown, one of the land use patterns that survived after the residential development was gone. The construction of the WAC was a major undertaking given the economic conditions of the era. Since 1930 it has functioned continuously as a social institution in downtown Seattle open to men, women and families.

Owner comment: Jack McCullough said the WAC looks forward to the Incentives and Controls negotiation. He was accompanied by Terry Ernst, Architect and WAC Board member, and Jim Johnson, President and CEO of the WAC. He heard from the Board a willingness to maintain the ability for flexibility. The WAC has been the owner and operator for decades and has maintained it lovingly. He suggested Criteria C and E.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

#### Board Discussion:

Mr. Matthews said it is a very fine building, an excellent example of its style and time. He said he is always happy when the owner thinks so too and wishes to see the building honored in that way. He supports the designation.

Mr. Lee said the Board has to say on record if you agree with staff and if so which Criteria.

Mr. Matthews said he would agree with staff that Standards C, D, E and F are all appropriate.

Ms. Conti said she agrees with Mr. Matthew; she said it is a really exciting building and that she supports C, D, E and F.

Mr. Hannum said one of his coworkers was recently talking about the recent decision on the Manning's/Denney's building and said it wasn't an easy one, it wasn't a landmark like the WAC or the Space Needle. He supports based on C, D, E and F.

Ms. Nicolas said she agrees with C, D, E and F.

Ms. Tremaine said looking at the Exchange Building and the WAC building and how beautiful they are; she wishes there were more around. She agrees with C, D, E, and F.

Mr. Abelsen said it is an outstanding building with great detail and has a wonderful heritage in the City. He supports fully each of the staff recommendations of C, D, E and F.

Mr. Veith said he strongly supports D and E, less strong on C and F. He would rank in order, D, E, C and F but he thinks that F just gets over the threshold but he can support on all.

Ms. Strong said she supports the designation and said it is fortunate that that building has been so beautifully maintained and is in such excellent condition so would support designation based on C, D, E and F.

Mr. Lee said it is a fantastic building and he said it is a thrill to be in the room today to support the designation of the building. It brought to mind the Rainier Club where the building is the club, the club is the building and it is totally a great marriage. He said he looks forward to working with the WAC in the future.

Action: "I move that the Board approve the designation of the Washington Athletic Club at 1325 Sixth Avenue a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C, D, E and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the exterior of the building, excluding the 1954/70 addition."

MM/SC/MH/AC

9:0:0

**030508.4**

**CONTROLS AND INCENTIVES**

030508.41 Central Waterfront Piers  
Piers 54, 55, 56, 57 and 59

Ms. Sodt they are very close to having an agreement with the Piers which is very exciting. Because there are multiple owners, coordinating the signing of the agreement will take a couple weeks so they have asked for an extension for a month.

MM/SC/SL/TV

9:0:0

Ms. Sodt introduced the future new member of the Board, Jerry Finrow who is from the Planning Commission. Mr. Finrow will serve in the Planning Commission representative position on the Board; this position has been vacant.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator