



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 725/15

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
Seattle Municipal Tower
700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor
Room 4060
Wednesday, November 4, 2015 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Marjorie Anderson
Deb Barker
Robert Ketcherside
Jordon Kiel
Aaron Luoma
Jeffrey Murdock, Vice Chair
Julianne Patterson
Matthew Sneddon
Mike Stanley

Staff

Erin Doherty
Rebecca Frestedt
Genna Nashem
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Nick Carter

Acting Chair Jeffrey Murdock called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

110415.1

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

September 16, 2015

MM/SC/DB/AL

7:0:1 Minutes approved as amended. Mr. Stanley
abstained.

Mr. Kiel arrived at 3:32 pm.

October 7, 2015

MM/SC/DB/AL

8:0:1 Minutes approved as amended. Mr. Kiel abstained.

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

110415.2 BOARD BUSINESS

110415.21 Columbia City Review Committee
New member confirmation

Ms. Frestedt explained the appointment of Philip Christofides to the Columbia City Review Committee.

Action: I move to appoint Philip Christofides to the Columbia City Review Committee.

MM/SC/RK/AL 9:0:0 Motion carried.

110415.3 SPECIAL TAX VALUATION

110415.31 Palladian Apartments
2000 Second Avenue

Ms. Doherty provided photos to Board members for their review.

David Cohanin, owner, provided an overview of the project. He said that they brought the hotel up to code seismically along with all major systems, fire-life safety and preserved what they could. He said that the 97 room hotel was tuck-pointed and non-historic windows were replaced. He said they put in new storefronts and entry and noted the wall of 100 year old marble. He said they wanted to expose some of the brick and beam but the National Parks Service said 'no'.

Ms. Doherty went over details of the Special Tax program and noted that \$ 27,058,337.00 were submitted and allowed. She said that the percentage value of rehabilitation was 293%. She reported that the work was performed in accordance with a Certificate of Approval from the Landmarks Preservation Board.

Mr. Murdock said he appreciated the work and noted that it is a beautiful building.

Mr. Luoma said it was great to see the good activity.

Mr. Cohanin said he appreciated this program and that it helped tremendously.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: The Palladian Apartments, located at 2000 Second Avenue, that this action is based upon criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; that this property has been substantially improved in

the 24-month period prior to application; and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Landmarks Preservation Board and the owner.

MM/SC/AL/MST 9:0:0 Motion carried.

110415.4 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

110415.41

Harvard Belmont

954 Broadway Ave E

Proposed removal of four trees and replanting of seven trees

Samantha Novak explained the proposal to remove four trees and replace them with six. She said they will plant them in spaces where there were trees previously.

Ms. Nashem reported that site plan showing existing and proposed tree location was provided to board members (details in DON file).

Ms. Novak explained that the site plan indicated where the five new trees will go and noted they need 30' between them. She said that the proposed Katsura will provide diversity in the neighborhood; she said that six is preferred but if that isn't workable with spacing they will plant five.

Mr. Luoma said that at least one Maple is very damaged and probably needs to be removed soon and the other trees are old and past their prime. He said he understands the reasons to want to replace the trees. He said he preferred the Red Sunset Maple because it is a larger tree and noted that the Katsura is not native to the area. He said that if SDOT wants more diversity Katsura are in the district as well.

Ms. Novak said that the trees are losing branches during storms and the arborist recommends removing them for safety reasons.

Ms. Patterson asked who decides the spacing.

Ms. Novak said that SDOT has criteria regarding planting trees.

Mr. Luoma said that five is appropriate but if SDOT says six can fit that is okay as well.

Mr. Sneddon asked if there are any significant trees.

Ms. Novak said the house dates to 1908 and these are original trees.

Mr. Luoma said that is partly why his preference for Red Leaf Maple because it has the Maple look and preserves that historical look.

Ms. Nashem said that SDOT has a list of allowable street trees which includes both Red Leaf Maple and Katsura but does not include Big Leaf Maple.

Ms. Novak noted that more mature trees are being planted – 3 ½” caliper and 12-18’ tall.

Ms. Barker asked about maintenance plan.

Ms. Novak said it depends on tree needs and they will work with landscaper or arborist on that.

Mr. Murdock said he appreciated the continuation of a species associated with property from original landscape and would choose that.

Ms. Barker agreed with Mr. Murdock’s comment.

Mr. Sneddon said that in kind replacement is more in line with standards.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board issue a Certificate of Approval for removal of four big leaf maple street trees and replant with (5- 6) new trees either Red Sunset Maple per the submittal

The proposed exterior alterations meet the following sections of the District ordinance and The Harvard Belmont District Guidelines:

District ordinance

The proposed restorations plans as presented November 4, 2015 do not adversely affect the special features or characteristics of the buildings as specified in SMC 25.22.

The other factors of SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable

The Harvard Belmont District Guidelines

3. Landscaping:

Guideline: Maintain existing landscaping, especially the mature trees.

Guideline: Maintain the alignment and spacing of street trees. Planting street trees where none now exist is encouraged. Existing street trees are important and pruning should be done only in a professional manner to maintain the trees health and to retain the natural form.

The existing trees will be replaced with more trees than currently exist. The trees will be planted in a pattern similar to other street trees allowing for current spacing requirements.

MM/SC/AL/RK 9:0:0 Motion carried.

110415.5 DESIGNATION

110415.51 Meany Middle School
301 31st Avenue East / 300-315 20th Avenue East

Ellen Mirro, Johnson Partnership, prepared and presented the report (full report in DON file). She provided context of the site and the neighborhood. She reported that the original school was built in 1902 (no longer extant) and there were numerous additions over time. She did a virtual walk around the school and noted elements on the John Maloney addition – the sawtooth roof monitors, sunshades, and clerestory. She said that the school was never designed as a whole complete school structure and the additions changed the approach of the school to the south. She said the form is intact. She said it was re-roofed in 2010-11; reframed in 1988 and 1991 and all sheathing was replaced. She said that in 1992 a window assessment was done and they did a comprehensive repair and replacement.

She said that the building did not meet criteria A, B, C, or D and may not meet criteria E or F. She said that the Maloney portion of the school was built in 1955 during a time of growth but that it was not significantly associated with the development of the neighborhood and did not meet Criterion C. She said that the Mid Century Modern typology provided economy and flexibility to modern schools; she provided photo of Portola High School in southern California as a good example of the style. She said that Lafayette School has monitors as well and they are a common device to bring in light to the building. She said that this building does not embody the style and may not have the integrity to convey what it is. She provided examples of John Maloney's work – Seafirst Bank, Lind Hall at Central Washington University among others - and said this is not an outstanding work of his. In response to a Board question she noted that the structural engineer for the Maloney addition was Worthington / Skilling and signed by Joseph Jackson. She said that the school may be locally prominent but it is not real visible so may not meet F.

Mr. Luoma asked if the membrane was replaced when it was reroofed.

Ms. Mirro said that it was a seismic upgrade and the structure had to be redone with new sheathing. She said that more seismic issues have been found.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Sneddon asked if there is a stated design intent by the architect on the sawtooth portion.

Ms. Mirro said that they were using a form associated with a traditional 'factory'. She said that the building was not published in any architectural publication.

Mr. Stanley did not support designation and said the sawtooth roof was an interesting example of a failed trend.

Ms. Barker did not support designation noting the building does not rise to the level of a landmark. She said that there are integrity issues.

Mr. Ketcherside did not support designation and while the sawtooth roof feature catches the eye the building does not embody the style.

Mr. Kiel did not support designation. He said it is not Maloney's best work and is not a great example of the modern style.

Mr. Sneddon supported designation on criteria C and D. He said it is a distinctively modern work of the 1950s – a departure from Neoclassicism. He said the site is a chapter in history of the school architect and the portfolio of Seattle schools.

Mr. Luoma did not support designation and said that the roof form is striking. He said the design is representative of modern architecture and a change in school design. He said the roof is notable but the facades and overall form are not.

Ms. Anderson said she had supported nomination for further review, but that she would not support designation because the building form has changed so much.

Ms. Patterson did not support designation.

Mr. Murdock supported designation and said it is compelling work of post-war Modernism. He said it is not a façade building and it does not have high ornamentation. He said the daylight factory form was used as an educational tool and is an important concept. He said the school interior is humble, but the light and spatial design is impressive. The qualities are beautiful and you won't find them before or after this era. He said that Maloney was intrigued by engineering and used it in his designs. He said the space and light on the interior and exterior still conveys its expression. He said this addition can stand on its own, and that preserving it alone is fine because it does not rely on the rest of the school for its significance.

Mr. Sneddon noted the space and light of the sawtooth roof form is critical aspect of the design. He noted the lack of decoration as suited to the modern form.

Ms. Patterson asked why the board would focus on just the Maloney addition and not the Mahlum addition.

Mr. Murdock said there is also a Naramore addition as well, and it was hard to understand the character of either of those single elements. He said that outboard roof insulation was added to the Mahlum portions of the building which detracted from its integrity. He noted that the Maloney addition still has integrity.

Mr. Sneddon said the Mahlum portion has integrity issues and was a strange design and he noted the odd flashing and funky roofline.

Ms. Patterson said that the school as a whole is significant but not this one addition by itself.

Mr. Sneddon said there is hardly anything left of the Naramore addition.

Mr. Murdock said that at nomination meeting the board decided this was the only worthy portion.

Mr. Ketcherside said that the scope at designation is limited, but that the criteria at nomination are not.

Mr. Luoma noted the light quality and how that begins to embody the experience of the building on the interior and said he struggled with how that would be protected.

Ms. Barker said the light quality is important.

Mr. Murdock said that light and space – that is what architecture is; it is more than construction. The design of the roof clerestory creates the natural interior lighting.

Mr. Ketcherside said that if this was the only portion of the school left he wondered if it would be considered for designation.

Mr. Kiel said it was a building out of stock and noted that it is not a great example of Modernism. He said the lighting is just the irony of the factory-type classroom setting. He said that the roof form does one good thing – light.

Ms. Patterson said the issue with designation was that just the one portion / addition was nominated and noted that the addition has never existed as a standalone building before so it would lack context.

Mr. Kiel commented that the addition is a response to what was there.

Ms. Barker said that the addition housed different uses that were not accommodated in the rest of the school and noted that it met that intent.

Mr. Sneddon asked Mr. Kiel if he thought the addition needed to meet national significance as illustrating Modern Architecture.

Mr. Kiel said it did not but that it shouldn't just be the best thing we have in this category. He said that at least it should be the best example of Modernism around.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Meany Middle School at 301 21st Avenue East / 300-315 20th Avenue East as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standard D; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the exterior of the 1954-55 classroom wing; and portions of the site within 30' of the 1954-55 classroom wing.

MM/SC/MSN/JM 2:7:0 Motion failed. Mmes. Patterson, Barker, Anderson, and Messrs. Luoma, Ketcherside, Kiel, and Stanley opposed.

110415.6 NOMINATION

110415.61 701-9th Avenue North

The nomination was withdrawn from consideration. Jack McCullough said that they talked to the owners and they will come back at a later date with supplemental material.

110415.7 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator