



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 769/15

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting  
Seattle Municipal Tower  
700 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 40<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Room 4060  
Wednesday, December 2, 2015 - 3:30 p.m.

### Board Members Present

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

### Staff

Sarah Sodt  
Erin Doherty  
Melinda Bloom

### Absent

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

### **120215.1 SPECIAL TAX VALUATION**

120215.11 Exchange Building  
821 Second Avenue

Ms. Sodt explained the Special Tax Valuation program and noted that submitted rehabilitation costs were \$ 22,026,622.01, \$ 21,995,190.76 of which

were eligible. She reported that work was performed in accordance with a Certificate of Approval from the Landmarks Preservation Board.

Andy Watulla described the work that was done noting the seismic retrofit, façade repoint, repair and refurbish, and they cleaned up signage as well. Responding to questions he explained that lobby floors were protected with seismic work being done in corners. He said they used the Deli loading dock as well.

Mr. Murdock said that ARC reviewed several proposals and the work was sensitively done. He said they did a great job.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: The Exchange Building, located at 821 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/DB/AL 10:0:0 Motion carried.

**120215.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

120215.21 Exchange Building  
821 Second Avenue  
Proposed exterior louver

Andy Watulla explained that venting with Type 1 Hood is required for food services. He proposed removal of a portion of lower stone below the awning on 1<sup>st</sup>; louver will be tucked as close to canopy as possible and will not be visible. He said that they are bringing back the old trading floor.

Jack McCullough said they will save the removed stone; if restaurant goes away the stone can be put back in.

Mr. Watulla said they had to reglaze and repair many panels; consultants kept track of every repair. He said the stone will be stored in the basement. He said that alternatives were explored.

Mr. McCullough said that there is no alley and this location is the only option they have; he noted it is not visible.

Mr. Sneddon asked about louver versus screen option.

Mr. Watulla explained that hood types vary and the other type would be used if grease would be generated in food preparation. He said that the louver will be above the canopy.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Murdock said it is the appropriate way to do this and it is out of view.

Ms. Barker agreed and said it is a good solution.

Mr. Ketcherside said it is preferable not to remove stone but this is the best resolution to continued use of space.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alteration.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed change does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 115038, as the proposed exterior alterations and interior alterations 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/NC/AL 10:0:0 Motion carried.

120215.22 Eitel Building  
128 Pike Street  
Proposed business signage

Ms. Sodt provided photos of recently approved signage – hanging sign on corner.

Julie Hart, general manager, explained the proposed additional signage. She said they propose interior window decals – two on the Pike Street side and three on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue side.

Ms. Barker asked if they would add hours.

Julie said they would. She said it is a hard paper sign but noted Harley can make whatever is required.

Mr. Murdock said transparency is encouraged so that building can be seen more than the sign.

Mr. Ketcherside suggested clear with white text.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker supported what was proposed with change to hours sign.

Mr. Murdock said that it is all reversible.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed signage, as per the application submittal and with new hours sign to be reviewed administratively, at the Eitel Building, 1501 Second Avenue.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 123534 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/NC/DB 10:00 Motion carried.

120215.23

Washington Hall

153 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue

Proposed alterations to auditorium ceiling

Jocelyn Schmidt, Ron Wright & Associates, explained that two areas required modifications to ceiling finish. She provided photos. She said that on the underside of the balcony on the north side, the existing plaster and drywall have water damage. On the south side, the existing drywall is applied over the lathe and plaster and is bowing. They propose to remove the drywall and the lathe and plaster and install new drywall. She said that plaster in low ceiling areas of auditorium is falling; they propose to remove the lathe and plaster and install new drywall. She explained that the drywall will have a smooth finish, consistent with the plaster. She said the sprinkler heads will be concealed. She said the ceiling grid with stage lights will remain and some schoolhouse fixtures are being installed. She said there is no up-lighting.

Mr. Kiel asked if the problem was solved.

Ms. Schmidt said that the drywall was installed over lathe and plaster and the plaster was delaminating.

Ms. Patterson asked if the balconies are all drywall.

Ms. Schmidt said that drywall is over existing plaster; on the north there is partial plaster and partial drywall.

Mr. Sneddon asked if there is any remaining lathe and plaster.

Ms. Schmidt said there is no original plaster left on the remainder of the auditorium ceiling, this was previously replaced with drywall. She said that other parts of the building have new plaster veneer or original lathe and plaster.

Ms. Doherty said that all new perimeter sheer walls are plywood, with drywall and plaster veneer. She said the plaster details around the proscenium and mezzanine are all intact.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Murdock said the plan is appropriate and reasonable.

Ms. Barker agreed with Mr. Murdock.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed interior alterations at Washington Hall, 153 Fourteenth Avenue, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed interior alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 123346, as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize 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/DB/AL 10:0:0 Motion carried.

**120215.3 DESIGNATIONS**

120215.31 Franklin Apartments

2302 Fourth Avenue

Mr. Murdock explained the designation meeting process.

Mr. McCullough said that the building would work in a district but is not a landmark on its own. He said that Criterion C requires double significance.

Larry Johnson, Johnson Partnership, prepared and presented the report (full report in DON file). He provided context of the neighborhood and site. He said the building was built in 1918 and designed by George Lawton and Herman Moldenaur. He noted the symmetrical arrangement of the revival style building and the brick masonry with dense hard-fired tapestry brick. He noted terracotta lintels and sills, original wood sash and double hung windows, metal cornice, and light pink terracotta at the main entry. He described the iron gate at the entry and noted the steps, doors, and wainscot in Alaska Marble.

Mr. Johnson said a lot of the window are boarded up and said a window survey shows that all need repair – some more so than others. He said that the entry marble has been replaced. He said the building has good integrity but noted the deteriorated cornice, wood windows and cracked marble at the entry. He said the building has marginal integrity and did not meet criteria A, B, or C. He said that the building was built long after the neighborhood's significant development. He said that the type of residents who lived in the building were women – secretaries, seamstresses – and were nothing special. He noted that there are other landmarks in the area.

He said that the building did not meet Criterion D and noted the nearby Fifth Avenue Court and Castle Apartments which are better. He said that there is a large inventory of early apartment houses and this one is in poor condition compared to others. He said it is an average example. He said that this is not a good example of Lawton and Moldenaur's work and provided other local examples that he considered better: San Marco, Castle, and Fifth Avenue Court apartments, and the Polson, Mottman, Hambach, Liggett, and Republic buildings among others. He said that the Castle apartment building is eligible for designation. He said the building does not meet Criterion E. He said that the building is more of a background building and does not meet Criterion F.

Mr. McCullough said that the building doesn't meet the criteria for designation. He said that it is an average building and doesn't meet the double significance. He said that there are lots of better examples by the designers. He said that this building doesn't have the ability to convey what it is. He said it is unadorned, average, not in good shape, windows and cornice are in poor shape. He said he doesn't see a landmark. He said the building is deteriorating.

Mr. Murdock said the cornice had metal but said it also had wood construction along Bell.

Mr. Johnson said it is all painted and he can't tell. He said there is lots of rust and staining and he assumes it is all sheet metal. He said if it is wood he expects it would be in worse shape.

Mr. Ketcherside asked about marble cladding repairs.

Mr. Johnson provided photo and noted one side is pieced together and said the Alaska Marble quarry had been shut down.

Mr. Ketcherside asked about comments about an apartment district in Belltown and this could be one of a group.

Mr. McCullough said it could have a role in a district but not as an individual landmark.

Mr. Johnson agreed with Mr. McCullough.

Mr. Sneddon asked if other landmarked apartment buildings were designated under C or D.

Mr. Johnson said that most would stand up well under D.

Ms. Sodt said that she believes the Windham Apartments was designated under C and D and the Palladium Apartments was designated under C, D and E. She said that there is probably a mix of designation criteria used in apartment designations.

Public Comment:

Leanne Olson, Queen Anne Historical Society, supported designation under Criterion D and said it doesn't have to be the best. She said it meets the basic criteria and it can be fixed.

Steve Hall supported designation. He said the building was seen as a liability rather than an asset. He said that the building could be used for affordable housing or office space. He noted the wood floors, glass doorknobs. He said the entire building needs care and there are many group that could help. He suggested considering a wider range of alternatives. He noted the nooks and crannies, places and spaces and said it is not just a façade. He encouraged rehabilitation and re-use of the historic property.

Becca Crib supported designation and said buildings like this survive because they are cared for and designation would provide caring.

Patty Close, previous owner's daughter, said her father rented to people others wouldn't and the building deteriorated. She said it is unbelievable inside and had been damaged by squatters, leaking roof, sewage coming out. She said they had to close the building up because it was not safe. She said the doors had been broken in and all jambs were busted through. She said they put padlocks on doors and people still broke in. She said water and power were turned off. She said that the interior can't be saved – there are no old doors, no chimney, the cornice is metal and full of holes. She said the windows needs to be replaced.

Evan Clifthorne, City Council aide, said it is a rare occurrence when the City council recommends the designation of a building. He said that there were more women living at the building and that is remarkable. He said the apartment district was at the center of that. He said the building is ripe with stories that tell of the community. He said that one of its first building managers was a woman who ended up purchasing the building. He said he lives in the building next door and the building can tell the story of average people. It is not fancy; it is a piece of history of regular folk. He said that single working women lived there and that is a more important story than a leaky cornice. He said it may be bad inside but that doesn't mean it can't be repaired.

Tiffany Jorgenson supported designation on A and C. She said it was an affordable housing type in Belltown – worker hotels were common. She noted the number of middle class women working during the way. She said that it is one of the best examples; 20 apartment buildings were constructed in the area following the second regrade and only three remain. She said that the Franklin is rare and unique. She noted Belltown's relationship to downtown and said there were no high end apartments during this time. She noted the marble, the 400 – 550 square foot units with bathroom and kitchen and tile works. She noted a Seattle archive photo taken from Cornelius Building with the regrade shown behind it.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, provided a letter (in DON file). She supported designation on criterion C, D, and F. She said the building has high integrity. She said that Historic Seattle saved a building in worse condition than this – Washington Hall had a waterfall coming through the middle. She said they purchased the building after three decades of deferred maintenance. She said the windows are easy. She said she would love if the Ordinance would allow thematic multi-property designation. She said that Belltown has changed so much but it part of the larger history and development of an apartment district. She noted the photo on the cover of "Shared Walls" by Diana James. She thanked City Council for support and gave kudos to Friends of Historic Belltown and others.

Brooke Best supported designation for future generations. He said it is not the greatest or most distinctive but noted they are fast disappearing. He said the building contributed to the character of the neighborhood. He said that condition does not equate integrity. He supported designation on criteria C, D, and F.

Diana James supported designation and said that buildings in that area were enough to have a feel for earlier time. She said if this one goes others can go easily. She noted Bell Street Park and said that Adams has capitalized on that. She said the Franklin will be like the Fleming – Capital Hill Housing – to keep affordable housing. She said so many have lived in this building and it speaks to all.

Valerie Talarico said the building is distinguished and distinctive. She said it does evoke a sense of place and time and noted the context of people having a sense of time and history.

#### Board Discussion:

Mr. Sneddon supported nomination on criteria C and D. He said the building embodies visible characteristics of classic revival elements. He said it sits well in its architectural milieu. He didn't support inclusion of interior and noted unfortunate deterioration. He said the building has good integrity and can convey its significance. He noted the changing nature of Seattle workforce – single men and women, the clerical part of the workforce and entry level jobs – this building was part of those forces. He said he also supported Criterion F because of its relationship to other period buildings; individual parts with each part valuable.

Mr. Carter said he was not sure about Criterion C. He said lots of building represents a changing time in Seattle. He said a district of buildings is needed. He said that this is not significant enough but it does have distinctive visible characteristics of its time so he leaned toward supporting designation on Criterion D. He said that he walked by the building and noticed it because of all the construction – it is a nice old building. He said he is not sure about Criterion F but noted every time we lose one of these buildings we lost part of that identity.

Mr. Sneddon said it is hard to support Criterion F only but if F were to be added on he would support it.

Mr. Luoma noted integrity issues but said there are no missing items and no additions. He said that the condition is deteriorated but the foundations of integrity can still be conveyed. He said he is not strongly convinced on Criterion C. He said it is hard not to be convinced on Criterion D; he said it is not high style and it doesn't need to be. He did not support Criterion F. He

said a district is an easy solution to discuss but he wondered if the concept would be embraced by property owners. He said a district would not devalue property.

Mr. Kiel supported designation and noted the extraordinary integrity. He said the building was constructed during a time of significance and it is also significant because of its typology. He said its plain-ness makes it important. He spoke to 'catalog terracotta' and said that is how you got terracotta if you were building affordable housing. He said the building has its roots in its time. He supported C and D.

Mr. Ketcherside supported designation on Criterion D; he said that while there is an argument for C he wasn't convinced of it. He strongly supports a district and noted that street clocks – although not contiguous – were designated. He said he would love to see architectural offices, grunge venues and said he wished there had been an auto row district. He favored having neighborhoods as a whole be a district with a building as contributing members. He said that this is different – there is a set of buildings unified by typology. He said losing them one by one will widdle away a significant element of the city.

Mr. Stanley said he loves the streetscape. He said it is a great environment and how this fits with buildings around it. He said a thematic district would be great; he did not support designation.

Ms. Barker supported designation on criteria C, D, and F. She said the building is intact and has integrity. She said the material is nothing fancy; the materials were picked out of a catalog. She said it is a very basic but stately building. She said the scale of the building is identifying – it is not so tall and one can look at it in one glance. She said because it is a smaller building it is on a corner and it captures her attention. She said the building is much more recognizable.

Ms. Anderson said the building has a distinct quality and represents its architectural style. She said it is simple and that it doesn't need high style to be distinct. She said it has integrity but noted the condition is unfortunate. She said the exterior has retained integrity and she supported Criterion D. She said there is no compelling case for C. She commented on the integrity and that the building contributes to the Belltown feel. She said she has been to the park and walked by the building. She said she felt like she walked through a historic part of town. She said she would support Criterion F as a 'tack on' if others would.

Mr. Murdock said he lives in the neighborhood. He supported Criterion D and said it is a good example. He said it is modest working housing. He said there is remarkable integrity and it can still convey what it is. He noted the storytelling quality of the building and the amazing dialog with the

Charlesgate Apartments across the street. He noted the insertion of a modern street park. He noted the amazing contrast in siting, age and scale in relation to the park; he supported F and noted it is compelling in relation to this park.

Mr. Kiel noted that for Criterion D a building needs to embody characteristics; the building doesn't need to be distinctive.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Franklin Apartments at 2302 Fourth Avenue as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards D; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the exterior of the building.

MM/SC/AL/NC 8:1:1 Motion carried. Mr. Stanley opposed. Ms. Patterson recused herself.

*Mr. Stanley left at 5:40 pm.*

#### **120215.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

120215.41 The Theodora  
6559 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE

Ms. Doherty explained the signed agreement.

Action: I move to approve Controls and Incentives agreement for The Theodora, 6559 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE.

MM/SC/NC/DB 9:0:0 Motion carried.

120215.42 Loyal Heights Elementary School  
2501 NW 80<sup>th</sup> Street  
Request for an extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for a six month extension and noted they are proposing major renovation and addition.

Ms. Barker said she wanted updates.

Ms. Doherty said that the School District appears to be committed to a schedule.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for Loyal Heights Elements School, 2501 NW 80<sup>th</sup> Street, for six months.

MM/SC/DB/NC 9:0:0 Motion carried.

120215.32 Bullock House  
1220 10th Avenue East

Valerie Tarico, owner, said they have owned the house for 20 years. She thanked the board for their work. She noted the sense of place and time and part of sense of well-being the house provides. She said they value the house and she noted its value to the community as well.

Kate Krafft prepared and presented the report (full report in DON file). She provided context of the site and neighborhood and said at the time North Capitol Hill was much less developed than other areas of the neighborhood. She said that significant residential development did not occur until after the turn of the century. She said that the house was built in 1912; she noted the “two-car” garage that was designed and built to match the character of the house. She noted the sandstone retaining wall and said that blocks of sandstone scattered on the site are associated with owner J. W. Bullock’s business.

She said that J. W. Bullock was in Alaska prior to the Klondike and was involved in a smaller gold rush. She said he joined the Klondike and then returned to Seattle in 1902. She said he was President of Mutual Gold Mine. She said he was a supplier of gravel, wood and coal; he was one of the largest coal dealers in Seattle. She said there were several coal bunkers and this house was built on the site of one of them. She said that Bullock was on City Council 1910-11.

She said that builder and architect Louis O. Menard built the house and garage in 1912. She said he was listed in the 1910 census as a house carpenter and he lived in Hillman City; in 1920 he was listed as carpenter contractor. She said she was unable to find much information about his career, but suspected that he was prolific as a designer/builder. She reported that after the Bullocks divorced the house was used as a kindergarten; relatives lived in house for a time; and the house was used as a rooming house until the 1970s.

Ms. Krafft said the Colonial Revival house is very well preserved. She noted a south side dormer was added to create a 3<sup>rd</sup> floor bathroom. She described the pedimented entry, dentils, and side-lights with segmented windows; quoins, multi-pane windows, balustrade bracket, and full width porch. She said the reception hall is flanked by the living room and study; she noted the large dining room with built in sideboard. She pointed out the conservatory overlooking the garden. She said the Menard adapted the plan to Bullock’s vision. She pointed out the golden oak running trim, intact wood floors, original light fixtures, fireplace and two sliding doors with leaded glass. She noted the beamed ceiling in the conservatory and the intact upper floor details.

She said that very few single family homes on Capitol Hill are landmarks. She said the house is well-preserved and noted its significance due to its association with Bullock; it is a representative example of eclectic Colonial Revival style; it is a representative example of Menard’s work; and it is associated with the history and development of North Broadway neighborhood.

Ms. Tarico said it has been a three-family house for 20 years; she said there are ways to be creative in living in these houses instead of tearing them down.

Public Comment:

Leanne Olson, Queen Anne Historical Society, commended the owners and said she wished there were more property owners like them.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Patterson supported designation on Criterion D and said it is encouraging to see this homeowner stewardship and support of designation. She noted the multiple window styles in the house and commented that they are all original. She noted Menard and the homeowner's process in selecting. She said that the house was designed and built by the carpenter; she said the trend has died out but it was popular at one time.

Ms. Anderson said she enjoyed this building and noted the eclectic use of styles and features. She said it is a beautiful house and noted the way it has maintained used over time. She said it was designed and constructed by the same person. She didn't support Criterion E, but did support D.

Ms. Barker supported designation on Criterion D and E. She noted Menard and said it is a magnificently done house with its features and attention to detail. She said it is outstanding. She said if Menard did more then we may discover more.

Mr. Ketcherside supported designation on Criterion D and E. He commented on what other beautiful homes Menard must have built and hoped that more could be found about his career. He said even with more examples of his work this building is still outstanding. He thanked the homeowners for supporting designation and paying for the process; the house and its story are now documented.

Mr. Kiel supported designation on criteria D and E and said Menard was a gifted designer. He called it a 'collage of parts' and said it is a beautiful building. He said it makes an interesting story and noted the story of transition and changing ideas.

Mr. Luoma supported designation on criteria D and E. He noted Menard's work and craftsmanship in an era where he was not formally trained, and commented on the scale and detail. He commended the owners for taking the sense of place and memories and preserving them in written and physical form.

Mr. Carter supported designation on criteria D and E. He thanked the owners. He said the house is outstanding inside and noted the carpentry, trim and detail, that it is remarkable that it is all still there.

Mr. Sneddon supported designation on criteria D and E. He said the house embodies its style and noted it was at the later end of the Four-square movement. He said it is a transitional house with Colonial Revival and Tudor coming into it. He said it is outstanding example of the builder and style. He said the garage was an up and coming concept. He noted the craftsmanship and eclecticism of windows and other features. He said that it was a moment in history for the designer/builder and uniquely from the trade side. He said he would have supported C because it captures Seattle becoming a boom town after the Alaska-Yukon Pacific Exposition. He said this was one of the first elite neighborhoods even with its location away from the City's downtown. He said that this was a wealthy neighborhood emerging; the same thing was happening in Portland and Spokane.

Mr. Murdock supported designation on criteria D and E. He said it doesn't have to have comparisons – the work stands alone.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Bullock House at 1220 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue East as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards D and E; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the site; the exterior of the house and garage; and the following areas on the first floor interior: reception hall, main stair, living room, dining room, study, and conservatory.

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

**120215.5 STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator