



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 426/08

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Seattle Municipal Tower

700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor

Room 4060

Wednesday, July 16, 2008– 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Vernon Abelsen

Mollie Tremaine

Marie Strong

Tom Veith

Stephen Lee

Czarina Nicolas

Ron Martinson

Czarina Nicolas

Henry Matthews

Mark Hannum

Staff

Elizabeth Chave

Sarah Sodt

Melinda Bloom

Rebecca Frestedt

Absent

Jerry Finrow

Christine Howard

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

071608.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

June 4, 2008

MM/SC/TV/MS

8:0:0 June 4, 2008 minutes postponed.

Ms. Conti arrived at 3:34 pm.

Meeting of May 21, 2008

MM/SC/TV/MT

8:0:1 Approved as amended. Ms. Nicolas abstained.

Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

071608.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

071608.21 4909 Rainier Ave. S.
Hepler Building
(Columbia City Landmark District)
Reconfiguration of storefront to create three tenant spaces; proposal includes new windows and two new entrances

Rebecca Frestedt described the application for façade alterations that will divide the storefront into three tenant spaces along Rainier Ave. The applicant proposes to construct two new entrances on either side of the main entrance. Façade alterations will include the installation of new wood frame windows and ADA accessible wooden doors. The configuration of the original vestibule will be retained.

Ms. Frestedt said the Hepler Building was constructed in 1906 and is a contributing building to the District. Based on historic photographs, it appears that the current storefront configuration which includes addition of canopy and tiles is the result of modifications made in the 1930s or 1940s. She stated that the canopy and tiles have attained significance over time. On June 20, 2008 the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval of the proposed exterior alterations.

Applicant Comment:

Stefan Wynn, Wynn and Associates, explained the intent was to retain the original door configuration; however, the existing doors did not meet egress and ADA requirements. The proposal includes modifications that retain the original proportions and appearance of the main entrance while meeting Code requirements. He said they want to keep the composition, the proportions and styles of the four doors. They intend to provide two ADA accessible doors that will meet functional requirements and will use tempered, insulated glass. He said they intend to retain as much of the original tiles as possible, but will need to replace broken tiles. He added that attempts to match the color of the tile have been unsuccessful so they propose to remove the bottom three courses of tile across the entire front of the building. The original tiles will be harvested for reuse on the columns so they match the look and rhythm of the existing tile and will then use new tiles to infill under the existing windows.

Board Questions:

Mr. Hannum asked if the tile would be replaced across the entire pony wall or just underneath the windows. He also questioned whether or not the pony wall could be removed without disturbing the columns.

Mr. Wynn explained they would remove all of the tile and the entire pony wall which is currently rotted. From that process they would be able to harvest enough good tiles that when they build it back, under each of the columns they would be able to patch broken or missing tiles within the columns. They will be able to remove the pony wall without disturbing the columns. He provided a sample of the ½ round tiles that will be used for the returns.

Mr. Veith asked if the stops in the casing are metal.

Mr. Wynn said no and that the windows consist of wood-stopped glazing. He referenced photos of other storefronts in the neighborhood. He said they are attempting to match the language of other windows in the District.

Mr. Abelsen expressed concern about putting in a whole band of new color at the bottom.

Mr. Wynn responded that at some point a series of tiles were installed under the window that don't match the current building; there is an existing hodge podge already and they want to be consistent. The goal is to match as close as possible and keep two different tiles from coming into direct contact.

Mr. Abelsen stated the pulls on the doors were interesting and asked if they were original to the building.

Mr. Wynn concurred and said that they appear to be original. He said none of the doors have a complete set of hardware so they hope to take all the parts from the inside and outside of all doors and have enough hardware for the center doors.

Mr. Veith confirmed that all black tiles would be replaced; the red tiles under the windows will be salvaged for use on the columns. He asked if there will be enough original red tile to bring the color all the way to the black band.

Mr. Wynn concurred with Mr. Veith's comments.

Public Comments: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Lee thought it an interesting and successful approach.

Mr. Hannum stated that it is a reasonable proposal.

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

2. Building Materials and Fixtures. Integrity of structure, form and decoration should be respected. Building facades should be brick, wood, or other materials that are in keeping with the historic character of the District.

3. Building Surface Treatments. Approved surface treatments shall be consistent with the historic qualities of the District.

4. Storefront. Building facades should have a greater proportion of window and door openings than wall spaces on pedestrian levels. Any exterior façade alteration shall respect the original architectural integrity of the storefront. Recessed entryways and/or alcoves shall be maintained for existing street-level storefronts. Original fenestration shall be preserved (i.e., windows, transom areas, and door design). Storefront materials should be brick, wood, concrete, and tile, or a combination thereof.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

MM/SC/MT/MH

9:0:0 Motion approved.

071608.22

Washington Athletic Club

1325 Sixth Avenue

Proposed signage and awning

Summary of proposed changes: Proposed new business signage and awning.

Sarah Sodt passed out drawings and samples to Board members and introduced Jerry Ernst, Washington Athletic Club.

Applicant Comment:

Mr. Ernst explained the request for new signage and an awning for HSBC bank on the ground floor of the WAC building. He reviewed the exhibits for the proposed signage (details in file). A permit was issued for the signage one year ago and the project was put on hold; in the interim the WAC was landmarked. The attachment details for the channel letters and logo will be supported from a wiring raceway which will be attached only at mortar joints. The internal illumination of the letters and the logo will be LED. The proposed awning color will be a darker red which will match the existing building awnings along Union St. An exposed retractable awning mechanism will be covered with a plate colored to match the stone that is over the window facing Union.

Mr. Ernst informed the Board the exterior, which has been called out as marble, is actually terracotta; it has been glazed with deep red color with an applied ochre

colored fleck. A number of panels have been replaced over the years. He provided photos showing the terracotta panels and the variation in the original panels as well as the repair work that has occurred over the years.

Board Questions:

Mr. Abelsen noted that ARC reviewed this and ARC had requested the photos that Mr. Ernst just discussed.

Mr. Hannum asked what the 24-hr bank sign referred to.

Tom Masterson, representative for HSBC Bank, stated there is an interior ATM in the vestibule which customers can access; there is no ATM access from outside. During banking hours this will be the bank entrance; after hours the bank will be closed off with a roll up gate.

Ms. Strong asked if the existing raised logo in the marble façade was the WAC logo.

Mr. Ernst stated it was the logo for a retail store that was there before; the logo does stick out but there is nothing identifying an individual store anymore.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Abelsen and Mr. Lee thought the application was reasonable. There was Board agreement that it was fine.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed business signage and awning.

This action is based on the following:

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

MM/SC/HM/VA

9:0:0

Motion approved.

071608.23

900 Summit Ave. E.

(Harvard-Belmont Landmark District)

Proposed exterior alterations, including window replacement, balcony railings, paint colors and entrance canopy

Ms. Chave explained the application and said it is a revision to a recently approved proposal to a non-contributing 1960's building.

Jennifer Reilly, Architect, and Mandy Hoskins Architect presented on behalf of the owner. Ms. Reilly said the original design for the building was approved in November 2007; that proposal included more substantial alterations than what is proposed now. Originally proposed but will not be done: replace portion of cement fiberboard lap siding with stucco, replace portions of carved out balconies on north elevation and siding replacement on the south elevation. Currently, no siding replacement is proposed; they propose to modify the paint tone in those areas where they were previously going to replace the siding.

Ms. Chave said that the Board's concern with the previous proposal was the siding changes, and that has been eliminated from this proposal.

Ms. Reilly explained the new paint scheme: brown similar to the existing but with more depth and saturation; a lighter beige for the accentuated areas; brick red tone. She said they will not enlarge the size of the decks; the solid railings will be cable rail system to open up the decks and create better views. Windows originally proposed will not be added to the east elevation. The new canopy is the same as the glass canopy and replaces an old fabric canopy.

Board Questions:

Mr. Abelsen asked how the new colors compare to the original.

Ms. Chave said the original was stained shingle; the building was built in 1968 and design by Bumgardner. She read details about the building from the file. The siding looks to have been a dark stain.

Mr. Veith said half the windows have already been changed. He asked if the existing round canopy was being kept and the projection is being added.

Ms. Reilly explained the projection is replacing the existing round canopy.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Tremaine thought the brown color was better than yellow.

Ms. Chave stated this is just a reduction in scope of a previously approved application.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the proposed exterior alterations, including alterations to windows, decks, and the entrance canopy; and proposed exterior colors, as per the applicant's submittal. This action is based on the following:

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

C. 1.

Guideline: Additions (and renovations) should be sympathetic to the original design and should not, except as additions, change the character of the original structure which is being preserved.

The proposed alterations are sympathetic to the existing building

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

The materials proposed are consistent with the original building.

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

071608.24

West Seattle Library
2306 42nd Ave SW
Proposed ladder for roof access

Ms. Chave explained the application and stated it had been reviewed by ARC. She said the applicant will be re-roofing and they want a new access ladder. They will replace the roof material in kind.

Mr. Veith stated ARC asked the applicant to put their connectors into the joints.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action:

I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed ladder for roof access, as per the submittal. This action is based on the following:

4. The proposed change does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 121102 as the proposed alteration 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/MS/MH 9:0:0 Motion approved.

Mr. Veith proposed a friendly amendment to the motion: the applicant has agreed to locate anchorage for the ladder into existing grout joints wherever possible.

MS/MH 9:0:0 Motion approved.

071608.3 DESIGNATIONS

071608.31 Ankeny House
912 2nd Ave W

Mark Huck, owner, gave the designation presentation. He provided a PowerPoint handout to the Board (handout available in file) and described the elements of the Shingle Style in which the turrets are integrated, the building is wrapped in natural siding without interruption; unity is the guiding principal. The shingles are stretched around the 2nd floor. There are other examples of this style around the country that exhibit a tightly integrated Norman tower and lack of ornamentation. He said historical precedence for this style seems to point back to an architect named Shaw.

Mr. Huck said he believes the house meets Criterion C because of the powwow tree and the use of the land for tribal councils prior to the arrival of European settlers. He cited a newspaper article that mentions the tree as “one of the most revered” in northwest history. He believes the house meets Criterion D because the Shingle Style is well represented and the house is one of the few remaining of this style in Seattle. The house meets Criterion F because it stands out on the block; it is bordered to the south by an 8-story apartment building and to the north by townhomes and dominates the intersection below it. Coming up 2nd Avenue and turning onto Olympic Place the house is very distinctive. He said the house has maintained its integrity and does convey itself well.

Board Questions:

Ms. Tremaine asked if there is a railing in the center of the porch.

Mr. Huck responded the metal rail is a later addition.

Mr. Abelsen asked if Mr. Huck was able to find any information on the original designer.

Mr. Huck found no information on the designer.

Ms. Chave said the person who prepared the City’s the Queen Anne Survey couldn’t find that information either.

Mr. Lee talked about elements to be included in designation.

Mr. Huck said Historic Seattle has covenants running with the house which are comprehensive.

Ms. Chave said that while they may be complementary, legally the covenants are separate from the City Ordinance.

There was Board discussion about what elements should be included with the designation.

Mr. Huck said they (owners) hope to someday turn the house into a bed and breakfast which may involve adding more rooms but not adding those directly on to the house. Using the rear of the structure would have the least amount of impact on the house and its view from the street.

Ms. Chave explained that could be discussed in the Controls part of the process.

Mr. Lee advised that if the site is designated, the owners have the opportunity for other departures from DPD requirements which is very useful and the opportunity to get DPD staff the chance to help with something that may be non-conforming.

Mr. Huck said the entry is the most striking room: the existing window, front door, and banister. They would like the flexibility to carpet the stairs and they don't believe the lighting fixture is original so would like to except the lighting; there are recessed lights that they would like to except as well. The parlor has original woodwork, windows, fireplace and pocket doors; they would like the ability to change colors of the walls and the lighting fixtures. In the future an owner might want to connect the dining room to the kitchen; the major feature of the dining room is the windows which will be protected anyway so they would like to take the dining room out as well.

Mr. Veith said the standpoint of the Board at this time is what is worthy of landmark status and asked if the dining room was a landmark or is it just a standard dining room in a landmark house.

Mr. Huck thought it was the latter; there is nothing significant about the dining room. He said the parlor has the fireplace and the pocket doors.

Ms. Chave explained that dining rooms that have been designated had significant features such as the Tiffany window in the Ferry House. She said the Board included at nomination the site, the exterior, the entry hall and main stairway, the parlor and the main dining room.

Mr. Huck stated they would like to have the dining room removed from the list as there is not a good reason to designate it and it might constrict a future owner.

Public Comment:

Christine Palmer, Historic Seattle, said there is a letter from them in the file supporting designation. She said Historic Seattle restored the house in 1980 and there were extensive changes and replacements inside and out. Elements that remain that may or may not be original are the stairwell and hallway, the front parlor the fireplace in the parlor and the fire place on the 2nd floor. The dining room appeared to have some level of alteration. The turret had some major replacement elements on the exterior as there had been a fire sometime before Historic Seattle acquired it. She recommended designating portions of the interior but not to the extent that Mr. Huck's future program for the house be impaired.

Leanne Olson, Queen Anne Historical Society, thought the dining room is beautiful but has nothing unusual and it shouldn't be included as a designated feature.

Char Eggleston, Queen Anne Historical Society, thanked the owners for doing this and said it is a wonderful house. She agreed that the dining room should not be included.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hannum said he supported designation but that the interiors should not be included.

Mr. Matthews said the entrance hall should be included. He said the shingle style is a rare style in the Northwest. He supports designation on D and F.

Ms. Nicolas said it should be designated on D and F and to include the entrance hall.

Ms. Tremaine said that she supports it on d and F and that it is an easily identifiable feature of its neighborhood. She said the interiors should not be included.

Ms. Conti supported it on D and F. She said she would include the entrance hall and parlor.

Mr. Abelsen said that he supports it on D and F and he would consider E as well. He concurs with Mr. Matthews on the interior- entryway or entry/parlor.

Ms. Strong said that she supports designation on D and F and would include entry and stairway,

Mr. Veith said he supports designation based on D and F. He said the interiors are nice but not compelling enough for designation.

Mr. Lee said he supports designation on D and F and would include entry and stairway.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Ankeny/Gowey House at 912 2nd Ave W a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards D and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the exterior of the building, the entrance hall and stairway, and the site.

MM/SC/HM/VA 9:0:0 Motion approved.

071608.32

Sorrento Hotel
900 Madison St.

Kate Krafft, Architectural Historian, presented in support of designation and reviewed the criteria for designation; her complete report is on file. She said the Sorrento is an exceptional example of the Italianate style and was designed to accommodate a sloping site. It is set back from the street with a courtyard which is distinctive. The original design included 7th floor dining facilities, a belvedere with Florentine style loggia and roof garden. It meets Criterion D.

Ms. Krafft said that the Sorrento meets Criterion E. Harlan Thomas was a highly skilled architect and educator; he was the head of the University of Washington School of Architecture for a couple decades. This is an exceptional example of his work and indicative of his personal background, architectural training and professional accomplishments. He traveled extensively, particularly in Italy and England which influenced the design of a number of buildings he subsequently built in Seattle. He was skilled in period revival designs. The Corner Market Building, Chamber of Commerce building are examples of his work. He collaborated with others in the design of libraries, King County General Hospital, Harborview and Bagley Hall at University of Washington.

Ms. Krafft said the Sorrento meets Criterion F because of the lowrise buildings to the east and west which provide good views of the building. It was a residential property in a neighborhood that has a rich history in terms of residential development at the time the hotel was built. Ms. Krafft believes it meets Criterion C because it operated as a first class family – residential – and tourist hotel attracting famous visitors and elderly widows of First Hill families. It provided a kind of housing which is important in understanding the history of Seattle; it was a very high class residential hotel. It is also important because of its tradition of housing members of the military and functioned as an important social gathering place. The Sorrento has continuously operated for hotel purposes.

Ms. Krafft said the greatest alterations have occurred at the upper floor levels; the covered roof garden was closed in by the late 1930s, the cladding has been alterations at the window level in the tower elements, windows have been replaced with a close match, the courtyard has been altered to provide an opening for the drive through and landscaping has been changed, the canopy was added at front door. Interior changes include: in the Fireside Room and the old main lobby area is Honduran Mahogany paneling, light cove material, modern, unobtrusive sconces have been installed; Ms. Krafft was uncertain when the ceiling fixtures were installed. The Hunt Club area was repeatedly remodeled during the 1940s and while there may be some historic fabric in this space, for the most part Ms. Krafft stated it has been renovated. Most of the historic building fabric is in the obvious public area. The original dining rooms on the upper floor went all the way through the center of the building. The lunettes have been covered although they are still visible from the exterior; there is no longer a view of the Sound.

Ms. Krafft believes that the Sorrento Hotel meets at least four of the landmark Criteria and urged the Board to designate it.

Board Questions:

Mr. Abelsen asked if the hotel was a gathering place.

Ms. Krafft stated the dining room itself, which later became known as the “Talk of the Town” was a major dining facility. At that time there were few rooftop restaurants especially with a view downtown. It was a unique space and she found a great deal of advertising for it. In the 1920s there became a tradition of it being a gathering place for people in the Military. Ms. Krafft explained that it is the longest continuously running hotel in downtown.

Melody McCutcheon, Hillis Clark Martin Peterson, representative for the owners, said the owners have been good stewards of the building and do not oppose designation. She said the family agrees with the Staff Report which recommends designation of the site, the exterior, the entry and elevator lobby, the reception desk and Fireside Room. She expressed concern that additional interior areas would be designated as well. She said they have no disagreement with D, E, and F but have some concern with C because the history of when, how and for whom it was a hotel is more complicated than has been explained. She said the owners are concerned that if designated under C based on this long hotel use then it will always have to be a hotel. She introduced architectural consultant David Peterson, Nicholson Kovalchick Architects, who would provide a more in-depth look of which elements should be included in the designation.

Ms. Chave said the Board can't control use.

Ms. McCutcheon asked that when the designation report is written up information provided by the owners be included to provide more history.

David Peterson, Nicholson Kovalchick Architects provided handouts (full report available in file) and explained elements that may or may not have been historic. There are no original drawings, only old photos. The original configuration of the building is intact. The lobby/entry has been altered; although there are a surprising number of renovations to the space it has all been contextually done and the integrity of the space remains throughout. The site has been completely changed from original design; the courtyard has been altered to accommodate cars but it maintains the open space and formal entry to the hotel especially the entrance from the sidewalk. The biggest change is the wall which was widened to accommodate cars and several courses of brick were removed and an iron fence was put in. The exterior is essentially the same; it is a beautiful building by a prominent architect and its use as a continually operating hotel. The windows and the entire top floor were changed. The masonry and terracotta and portions of the penthouse level remain intact. In 1912 an entry to the restaurant was created and windows were enlarged on Terry Ave. A marquis was added but was later removed. Today, there is a new marquis, the balustrade at level two is new, center vents in the windows are new but the masonry in general, and the Flemish bond and terracotta are all historic. The north and west elevations are utilitarian but essentially all the revisions have been on the top floor at the penthouse level.

Mr. Peterson clarified that the entry lobby and elevator lobby are all one space and right at the entry is a hexagonal space that has ornate moulding on the ceiling that is different from the rest of the elevator lobby. The original reception desk has been moved back; a safe used to be located at the window to the right of where the old desk was. The lounge was designed for 1961 with piano bar on the left and the main bar in the middle and separating grills between the south and north parts of the dining room. The Fireside Room is essentially the same with the exception of some swinging doors that are at the south end of the Fireside Room and the non-bearing partition wall that separates it from the lobby. He explained that there has been much replacement of individual pieces of the Fireside Room, elevator and entry lobbies. Many panels of wood have been replaced, the ceiling is salvaged material from other locations, and the moulding came from elsewhere or was rebuilt. Non-historic features include the pass through between the elevator lobby and the Fireside Room,

the Bellhop desk, the main entry doors and windows, and the light fixtures are not original to the location. The historic fabric is the paneling, the beams, the ceiling may be original in certain locations, and the hexagonal area just inside the entry is much more ornate than the rest of the building. The Fireside room originally had three windows which have been covered by wood panels. The Rookwood Fireplace is historic and unique.

Mr. Peterson said the Hunt Club has no physical integrity and should not be included in designation. The windows are not original; the vestibule entry is now used as a wine cellar. The oak paneling has been reused as dividers and where they desired an architectural effect. The beams are covered with 1960s reflective plywood and a drop ceiling; the fixtures are non-historic. The original flooring may still exist under the carpet.

Board Questions:

Ms. Krafft, in response to Board member question stated the last major remodel of the Hunt Club was done in 1981 – 82 although it had been repeatedly remodeled from the 1940s through the 1960s. There are no original architectural drawings to know exactly what the original wall configurations were; they have just made some assumptions about what was where. As-builts were done prior to the 1981 remodel.

Mr. Hannum asked why the towers were infilled with brick.

Neither Mr. Peterson nor Ms. Krafft knew the answer to Mr. Hannum's question.

Mr. Abelsen asked if the owners object to the designation of any of the spaces outside of the Hunt Club.

Mr. Peterson said it is so scattershot but that changes to the elevator entry lobby, reception desk area and the Fireside Room were clearly historic but the exact items that are not historic need to be detailed (e.g. how many panels are plywood).

Mr. Abelsen clarified that if the areas were designated along with the building and site the owner wouldn't necessarily be restricted from doing improvements that might recall more of the historic nature.

Ms. McCutcheon understood the point was to designate the spaces rather than individual pieces but that Mr. Peterson was noting that there is variety within the spaces and prepared his report as a guide for future use.

Ms. Krafft stated the Secretary of Interior Standards address changes over time may be significant.

Mr. Abelsen wanted to be sure everyone was clear about what the purpose is.

Public Comment:

Christine Palmer, Historic Seattle, supported designation and acknowledge Debby Gibby from the First Hill Community Council for sponsoring the nomination.

Board discussion:

Mr. Veith said that he is convinced that the Hunt Club is not historic (in terms of integrity). He said he supports the staff recommendation. (C,D,E,F)

Ms. Strong said she is not convinced on C. She said she supports it on D, E ,and F.

Mr. Abelsen said that he supports the staff recommendation. He said he appreciates the owners' architect putting together the analysis of the list of features.

Mr. Hannum said he agrees with the staff report.

Mr. Matthews said he agrees with the staff report.

Ms. Nicolas said she agrees with the staff report.

Ms. Tremaine said that she is not sure about C, but agrees on D, E and F.

Ms. Conti said she does not think C is applicable, but otherwise agrees with the staff report.

Mr. Lee said it is a fantastic building and supported designation based on D, E and F.

Action: I move the Board approve the designation of the Sorrento Hotel at 900 Madison Street, a Seattle Landmark noting the legal description above that the Designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards D, E, and F; features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the site, the exterior of the building and the following elements of the interior: the entry lobby, reception desk, the elevator lobby and the Fireside Room.

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

071608.4 NOMINATION

071608.41 Fischer Studio Building
1519 Third Avenue

Ms. Sodt explained this is a Category 1 building and the owners are in support of the nomination.

Kate Krafft, Architectural Historian and consultant for the City, presented the nomination (full report on file). The Fischer Studio Building is an 8-story retail and apartment condo building which was constructed in two phases: the first three floors were constructed in 1912 with the upper five done in 1915. It is a mid-block building and the prominent façade is on 3rd Avenue. The building meets Criterion C. George W. Fisher was a wholesale grocer who had great financial success in the Klondike era and then entered in to real estate development. He decided to build a commercial office building. Bebb and Mendel designed the first three floors which were rapidly built with a variegated brick facade; Bebb and Gould designed the upper five with different façade treatment and added performance space. Piano retailer Kohler and

Chase was a major tenant and influenced the early design of the building. The terracotta façade has been described as Venetian inspired because of the blind tracery with the repeated patterns.

Ms. Krafft explained the office spaces were rented to music teachers by the hour and day of the week to teach in; the upper five floors included apartments and deluxe apartments intended for the use of music, art and dance teachers. Space included a vestibule/waiting area and private space so it could be used as live/work space. The concert hall lounge on the 7th and 8th floors was used for the performer to prepare for the concert and contained an entry to the stage of the concert hall. Many music related businesses were concentrated in this geographic area.

In the early 1970s Seattle architect Ralph Anderson acquired the building and renovated it into condominiums. He was active in early preservation and adaptive reuse activities in the City.

Ms. Krafft stated the building meets Criterion D with its extraordinary terracotta façade designed by Bebb and Gould, pattern of blind tracery on the upper floors, the ridge ornamentation with the gargoyles and grotesques along the cresting. The original drawings show there were light fixtures designed in the mouth but Ms. Krafft wasn't sure if the lights were ever installed. The side elevations have window openings; the west elevation shows changes to the windows once the building was condominium-ized. The storefronts have been greatly altered; the original storefront windows for the pianos were beautiful.

With regard to Criterion E, Bebb and Mendel were prolific and important architects from the late 1890s until the partnership dissolved in 1914. Bebb and Gould designed homes in revival styles and many Seattle buildings (Times Square Building, Puget Sound News Company, Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co.). Gould was involved in the establishment of the University of Washington School of Architecture. The Fischer Studio Building is important for its architectural character, its association with Bebb and Gould and for its role in the music business and the dissemination of music education and performance activities.

Board Questions:

Ms. Sodt explained the concert hall has been modified as the building was converted to condo use. Minimal historic finishes are extant in the hallways.

Ms. Krafft said when Anderson purchased the building in 1974, the building was not looked at holistically and the studio spaces were divided up in ways that suited individuals. In 1914 the building was used for music studios and there were at least 51 music teachers that used the building. Into the 1940s the building was still a very popular place to live; the teachers were highly respected local musicians and this was a prestigious place to live and to teach. Gould was very involved with arts in the City; the architectural drawings had a lot of texture to the wall in terms of ornament and she thought the concert hall was designed with acoustics in mind.

Public Comment:

Art Skolnick said he went through the building with Ralph Anderson at the time of purchase and said it was in worn condition. The theater space was worn but nice.

Anderson's decision to do condos was made on the fly; he built whatever anyone wanted. Once condominium-ized, the theater space became home of the condo association but he hasn't been there since.

Board Discussion:

The Board agreed with the Staff Report and supported Criteria C, D and E.

Mr. Veith wondered if Ralph Anderson's involvement and his unusual approach were a significant part of history which might affect how we look at the minor facades. This might be a case where the alterations gain significance.

Mr. Lee thought that with regard to Criterion E, here we have at least four architects involved in the building that we know of.

Ms. Chave added that at Gasworks Park there are several levels of significance: the original Gasworks, the 1970s significance, then Richard Hague's contribution etc.

Mr. Veith said that before the 1970s "condominium" was a word that few people knew let alone understood and he thought that legal set up occurred around that time.

Ms. Conti thought it was the early 1970s when the condo act originated.

Mr. Veith thought that another aspect of the building that would fall under Criterion C and thought it was worth examining.

Mr. Abelsen asked if it could be noted in the nomination that multi-tiered designation was considered.

Ms. Chave replied it would be in the minutes as discussed and then at designation during discussion of different criteria it can be explained "why".

Mr. Veith hoped it would be in the designation report.

Action: I move approval of the Fischer Studio Building at 1519 Third Avenue for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include the exterior of the building; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation is scheduled for September 3, 2008; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

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

Ms. Sodt informed the Board the property owner already has a permit to do work at the storefront level which they have held back on; she thought the modifications would more sympathetic to the building than what is currently existing.

071608.5

CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

071608.51

Central Building
810 Third Avenue

Ms. Sodt explained the Controls agreement was straightforward; the only addition was for Administrative Review of signage in the signage band at storefront level and for the two blade signs that are on Marion and Columbia.

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

071608.52 Eitel Building
1507 Second Avenue

Ms. Sodt explained the owner requested a 60-day extension; they are still working on their EIS and have submitted some economic analysis information which staff has reviewed and responded to.

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

071608.6 BOARD BUSINESS

Public Comment:

Art Skolnik explained he has been active for about 40 years in historic preservation programs in Washington: as the District Manager of Pioneer Square, City Conservator for the City of Seattle, and State Historic Preservation Officer for Washington State. He has been active in other activities as well, run for public office and been an all around gadfly. He stated he has been active in the Alaskan Way Viaduct issues. In doing research on the historical significance and the process he came across information the Board needs to know. He provided a copy of the CLG agreement between the City and the State of Washington and said that the Board has a responsibility to the general public in the process and not just as the designators or reviewers of City registered landmarks. In the agreement, the State Historic Preservation Officer forwards to the City, meaning the Mayor and to the Commission which is the Landmarks Preservation Board, an opportunity to comment on a site that is considered for nomination to the National Register. He said there is a requirement that a public hearing be held because the National Historic Preservation Act is for the benefit of the public and he wants to make sure there is public access, public comment, and public notification of a site that is being considered. The Board has a responsibility in the process, when notified, and not through the City. The Board has to hold a public meeting, get input and then make a recommendation, write a report and the report goes to the State Historic Preservation Officer.

Mr. Skolnik said in 2002 something happened related to the nomination form that the State Historic Preservation Officer received for the nomination of the Alaskan Way Viaduct. Later it was found to be eligible for the National Register but the City was asked to comment as consistent with the policies. He provided a letter from Karen Gordon to the State Historic Preservation Officer explaining that the then Chair of the Landmarks Board signed over the review responsibility to the City Preservation Officer. He said he checked with everyone, from the National Register, the National Parks Service, the State Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the Chair of the Landmarks Board does not have the authority to delegate that review responsibility to anyone, specifically the City Historic Preservation Officer. The reason is to protect the public's participation you have to have two opinions that

come from the City; one from the political side or the Mayor which the City Historic Preservation Officer works for; the other recommendation is from the Board who represents the public's interest and the opportunity to gain information from the public.

Mr. Skolnik said in that case there was no public meeting on the Viaduct in 2002. Because Karen Gordon represented the City and the Landmarks Board there were two "Nos" and the State Historic Preservation Officer does not have to process the nomination to the State Advisory Council. All this is being done amongst a few people; there were no public meetings, the letter that was sent from the City to the Preservation Officer was not published. It went to the State Historic Preservation Officer who decided not to process it for whatever reasons and there was no State Advisory Council meeting, no public information. There is also an appeal period, 30 days after any person can appeal the decision of the State Historic Preservation Officer but because no one knew that this was going on no one knew there was an appeal process. Mr. Skolnik appealed to the Board to change that; to go back and be in concurrence with Federal and State Law and in agreement with the CLG agreement that the Board maintain the responsibility because if the Board doesn't use it the CLG agreement is at risk. He said he has talked with Megan Brown, the person who oversees all the CLGs in the National Park Service and she concurs that you have to maintain the review responsibility. He said he recently submitted a draft nomination for the Alaskan Way Viaduct; he said he wants there to be dialog on whether the Viaduct is significant or not. He said he does not want it to come to the City and, because he said he knows the Mayor doesn't want to keep the Viaduct, he doesn't want the same thing to happen to his nomination form which the Board should have in a month or so. He said he wanted to be sure there will be a public meeting and he doesn't want to take any threatening actions but he said he will appeal and do things to keep this out in the open. He said he is not saying the Board should support anything about the Viaduct, he said he wants a public discussion amongst people who care about significant historic things.

Christine Palmer, Historic Seattle, updated the Board on upcoming nominations as the result of the training they do to help Seattle residents understand how to protect community character and they teach how to do nominations at the County, State and National level. Three nominations are coming up, one is in Rainier Valley, one is in First Hill, one is in Sodo and one is a National Register District nomination for the Roanoke neighborhood. She said that unlike what Mr. Skolnik just shared, her dialog with SHPO reveals that not only will SHPO will review the National Register nomination to the Advisory Council for Historic Preservation it will not come to this body. She shares this so the Board understands what is being done to protect community character. As soon as draft nominations are ready for staff review they hope to bring before the Board for review.

Char Eggleston, Queen Anne Historical Society, Harlan Thomas, noted that the architect for the Sorrento Hotel, also designed the Seven Church of Christ on Queen Anne and also built his home on Queen Anne. She was happy to see samples of his artwork in Ms. Krafft's presentation. The plaque she showed to the ARC will be put on the Wilke Farmhouse in August; she would love the Board to attend. They hope to show the community that we have historic buildings on the hill and all over because a lot of people have no idea but they are thrilled they do have historic property around them. Two other events are planned: A plaque presentation

September 9, the Park Ridge Apartments at 916 Queen Anne Avenue, which is a 1926 apartment building and is a wonderful adaptive reuse. Ms. Eggleston explained their “watch list” which is comprised of homes they are concerned about; real estate people in the community watch what is going on and alert her so they can negotiate with the owner. It worked well on the Dr. Homer Harris house up on 7th Avenue; they were able to get the real estate agents involved so all parties are aware of Queen Anne Historical Society’s concern. There are also five churches they are concerned about; they are being proactive and doing outreach to them.

Leanne Olson explained they (QAHS) are trying to be more proactive; the 7th Church of Christ Scientist had a sign in front of it stating it was requesting a demolition permit. It was designed by Harlan Thomas and built in 1926. It is a Neo Byzantine Early Christian Revival Church; it is a beautiful building. Through much hard work they were able to hold off the wrecking ball long enough for another church to purchase it; it is not yet a landmark but they would love it to be. The building needs to be stabilized, address the roof and do an earthquake retrofit. They have met with the Church and hopefully someday soon they will have a nomination for that building.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator