



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 645/15

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
Seattle Municipal Tower
700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor
Room 4060
Wednesday, October 21, 2015 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Marjorie Anderson
Deb Barker
Robert Ketcherside
Jordon Kiel
Aaron Luoma
Julianne Patterson
Matthew Sneddon
Mike Stanley

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Genna Nashem
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Nick Carter
Jeffrey Murdock, Vice Chair

Acting Chair Aaron Luoma called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

102115.1 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
September 16, 2015 Tabled

102115.2 **CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

102115.21 Rainier Chapter House
800 East Roy St
Proposed signage

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Applicant Comment:

Teresa Summers, DAR, said the building was purpose-built for DAR; she said they rent the space out for events and need appropriate signage.

Diana Prigger said the painted aluminum signs will be painted with anti-graffiti film. Sign will have black background with white lettering – black to match the fence, white to match the house. She said that one sign will be placed at the corner of East Roy and Harvard and the other on the front fence on E. Roy for best visibility. She said attachment to fence will be with aluminum clips that attach to the cross board.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Luoma said he was part of the Harvard Belmont subcommittee that found the signs appropriate; they are small, discrete and in character with the building.

Mr. Ketcherside supported the application and said the signs are appropriate and needed.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board issue a Certificate of Approval for installation of two signs attached to the fence.

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 October 21, 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

D. SIGNS

Guideline: Keep signs relatively small and subordinate to the building. Signs that flash, blink, revolve or are otherwise in motion or appear to be in motion, or signs that vary in intensity shall not be permitted.

Sign lighting should be subdued, incandescent and front-lit from the exterior rather than back-lit of the fluorescent type. Signs shall be designed to minimize glare on existing buildings.

Commercial Buildings: Signs should fit within the existing features of the facade. Flush mounted signs are encouraged.

Projecting signs should be limited in size and number to avoid obscuring building features that would otherwise be visible along the block.

MM/SC/DB/RK 8:0:0 Motion carried.

102115.22

Woman's Century Club

807 East Roy St

Proposed revision to LPB50615 for design of the exterior stair

Sara Hatfield proposed minor revision to stair that exits from the basement. She said that the way was designed would have it exiting right up to the windows which would then need to be fire rated. She said they changed the stair into an L-shape to eliminate that need. She said it brings more symmetry to the façade. She said that they configured the rail pickets the same as before. She said the change is a code requirement and was approved by NPS.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Luoma attended the Harvard Belmont meeting and said the request was reasonable and the stair will be further away from the existing tree.

Mr. Sneddon noted the existing windows will be preserved.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board issue a Certificate of Approval for revision to the new entry to the basement.

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 October 21, 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

2. CRITERIA AND VALUES

The category of the building shall be considered when changes are proposed. Category 1 buildings are the most important in the district and these properties shall, to the greatest extent possible, retain the intrinsic historic values recognized when the district was formed.

Building Categories

The buildings within the District are categorized as follows:

Category 1: Buildings and significant landscape elements with an identifiable architectural or historic significance in satisfaction of the appropriate criteria of the Seattle Landmark Ordinance (SMC 25.12)

These buildings characterize a distinctive architectural style, or contain elements of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship which are characteristic of an architectural period. The preservation of these elements is of primary importance to the District. May also include historic sites.

C. INDIVIDUAL BUILDINGS

1. Additions or renovations

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

Guideline: Preserve the visual quality of individual facades including use of materials, form and structure.

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

Secretary of Interior Standards

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.
2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

MM/SC/RK/DB 8:0:0 Motion carried.

102115.23

Lincoln Reservoir Gate House

1000 E. Pine Street

Proposed murals for window niches, and interpretive sign

Marcia Iwasaki, Office of Arts and Culture, said the project is a collaborative one with Arts, DOPAR, and SPU. She said the temporary artwork on the Lincoln Gatehouse is proposed for 13 niches (former window openings) and one arch above the door. She said art will be done by youth from DOPAR after school programs; they will pay an honorarium to the kids who will work with a teaching artist. Art will be on foil or vinyl and there will be no harm to the building. She said the theme will be related to the site but the specific project is still wide open. She said that they will work with ten youth. She said they will find the right teaching artist. She said there will be field trips to learn about public art. Kids will learn job training skills, and working with teaching artist. She said the art will be up for six months and then a second class's art will go up for six months.

She said there will be a small sign on the fence in front of the gatehouse explaining ‘this is temporary artwork produced by....’ She said there is lots of graffiti there so the anti-graffiti coating for the artwork is good, and hopefully there will be less.

Mr. Stanley asked if the building graffiti would be painted first.

Ms. Doherty said that graffiti should be removed by a proper means of cleaning, it should not be painted over.

Mr. Sneddon asked how the art installation could be done without hurting the building’s integrity.

Ms. Doherty said that the original window openings have been infilled with CMU.

Ms. Iwasaki said the cmu has stucco over it. She said they will work with a conservator to choose an adhesive that will not damage the stucco.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker said ARC reviewed – it is a one-time art installation with two phases – and recommended approval.

Mr. Kiel said he is a fan of this sort of activation of a landmark and community involvement. He noted it is only temporary.

Mr. Ketcherside said the gatehouse contributes to unusable area and the activation will be good.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed temporary artwork and interpretive sign on the 1901 Gate House, at Lincoln Reservoir, 1000 E. Pine Street.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed temporary installation does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 121042 as the proposed work 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*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/RK/DB 8:0:0 Motion carried.

102115.24

Alexis Hotel/First Avenue Group

1007 First Avenue

Proposed signage and canopy alterations

Steve Zamberlin explained the proposal to refurbish the non-historic canopy structure and to add two signs. He said that the signs will have routed out push-through copy with LED light shining through acrylic plastic. He said the sign will be centered within the display. He said the canopy structure will be attached to the existing façade; cove lighting with LED will provide enhanced light for safety. He said that ARC asked about need for enhanced lighting and he said the existing lighting is not enough for security and presence. He said that the lighting will highlight canopy and building entrance. He said they will not address the Madison canopy at this time.

He said that the three existing transom sign cabinets are built in; they will change the face panel out from green to black with no copy change.

Ms. Sodt said that the board recently reviewed changes to the signage south of the canopy for a bridal shop. She said it is in the same block and noted that the panels just slide out.

Mr. Zamberlin said they are sprucing up and getting rid of old lights.

Ms. Sodt said that all gooseneck lights will be removed.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board discussion:

Ms. Barker said that the Roche Bobois and the evening shots were helpful. She said that the canopy is not historic and the entrance was modified prior to designation so the changes made sense to ARC.

Mr. Kiel had asked in ARC to recess the LED light strip. He said it was good to get rid of the light on top of the canopy.

Mr. Ketcherside said the text changes are straightforward and the change to black face panels is good.

Mr. Sneddon said it doesn't detract from the building and the purpose for the change is relevant.

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

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed exterior alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 111058, as the changes 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/DB/MST 8:0:0 Motion carried.

102115.25

Satterlee House

4866 Beach Drive SW

Proposed enclosure of rear porch

Ms. Doherty provided photos of various views of the house for reference.

David Delafield, owner, said that they are restoring the house. He said that the back porch is falling down and they propose to reinforce it and enclose it to match the style of the house with the same footprint, roofline and detail, and soffit detail. He said this space will be an expansion of the very small kitchen. He said they will add two windows that are compatible with the era of the house. He said they are reusing the original back door. He said they are not reusing original windows but will use divided lite wood windows. He said the back of the house is not visible.

Mr. Ketcherside asked about the basement or crawlspace created beneath.

Mr. Delafield said that the crawl space will be enclosed and the original structural wall of the basement will remain untouched.

Mr. Luoma said ARC asked about options to differentiate the details of the enclosure from the original house. One idea was providing more exposure of the concrete foundation.

Mr. Delafield said they could do a different siding exposure. He said they will raise the roof a bit and will do new footing and stemwall.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Kiel said he appreciated the care taken to match the house and the attention to materials – he said it looks differentiated. He said there are many other window alterations on the sides of the house that the loss of the two kitchen windows in back seems okay.

Ms. Barker said the differentiation of old and new is at the rear of the house and is obscured by trees and the hillside.

Mr. Luoma said enclosure of porches is one of the most common things done to historic houses.

Mr. Sneddon said that enclosing an open design element detracts from the building's integrity; there was purpose in the original design. He said a purist might object, but that he thinks the proposal is acceptable.

Mr. Ketcherside said the enclosure of the porch is differentiation enough.

Ms. Patterson said it will be obvious it is not original and she noted it is on the back.

Ms. Doherty said that Historic Seattle holds a preservation easement on this property, and that Eugenia Woo had reviewed and approved the proposed work.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed enclosure of the rear porch, at the Satterlee House, 4866 Beach Drive SW.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed exterior alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 111022 as the proposed work 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*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/RK/JK 8:0:0 Motion carried.

102115.26 Terminal Sales Annex
1931 Second Avenue
Proposed new construction

Ms. Sodt explained that the application is for preliminary design only – height, bulk, scale, massing.

Jack McCullough introduced the project team: Steve Jones, Mark Modawell, and Brent Peters.

Mr. Jones provided a summary of the project process to date and went over the earlier design approval. He explained that they removed the housing portion of the

project and will do the hotel only. He said it is more to scale and they have integrated the landmark into their design. He said that the hotel will be the flagship of a new brand. He said they plan to put the lobby at the top accessed by a ground floor to top elevator. He noted the landmark building's 90 year history at the site. He said the façade and 23' along the sides will be integrated into new with concrete slabs. He said the new floor slabs will line up with the landmark.

He explained they added massing at the northeast corner and showed the evolution of design of the two-story volume of the lobby. He said they simplified the intersection of the tower and the landmark and pointed out how the landmark slides into the new construction. He said that they revised 2nd Avenue and retail massing to pick up the articulation of the landmark. He said the landmark sidewall materials will be a 'monolithic stucco finish' which some board members found appropriate. He said they will raise the retail within the landmark to existing elevation at the ground floor. He said they propose café space inside the lobby and storage below it. He said the doors will remain and marble stairs will lead up to retail space. He said that Vermont marble lost from a barge and recently retrieved from Commencement Bay will be used within the landmark portion of the building. He said the rooms were worked out with the windows of the landmark – historic windows will be used and higher ceilings will remain. He said that the suites will be 'rock star' suites that can be used separately or together all at once.

Mr. Luoma asked about the storage space and if grills are there now.

Mr. Peters said there are grills there now and they will remain. He said that it is blocked out now and they will keep it that way.

Mr. Jones said the storage area has a very low height.

Ms. Barker said the sidewalk angles through the plane.

Ms. Sodt said that a window survey has been started and applicants will return to board with that. Responding to clarifying question she said that no permits will be issued until final design approved. She said that this approval allows them to secure financing.

Ms. Patterson asked if there is a lock on the maximum height.

Ms. Sodt said that they could come back shorter or taller.

Mr. McCullough said they have already gotten the MUP.

Messrs. Luoma and Sneddon commented about the gasket element around the landmark.

Mr. McCullough said that the board thought the earlier design was too expressive.

Public Comment:

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, said what is proposed is façadism and doesn't meet the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. She said that although it is on

the better end of the spectrum it is another funny looking building. She suggested reading ‘What Price Façadism’ in Arcade magazine.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker said that the retail suggestion was made by Mmes. Wine and Walker Brems. She said that she said that the proposal with inside changes in relation to sidewalls and 2nd Avenue engages exterior better than original design had. She said she is glad the window is usable.

Mr. Stanley said it is ironic that earlier it would have been purely a façade. He said he likes the treatment and he supported the application.

Mr. Sneddon said the design team had been responsive to ARC comments and the new design for the interior is good.

Mr. Kiel said he agreed with Ms. Woo about façadism and that it is on the far good end of the spectrum; he noted they were allowing other sub-façade elements. He said it is a façade building anyway and he said the design is a nice response.

Ms. Patterson said that it seems awkward and the landmark building is dwarfed. She noted the retail space on the corner and said it makes no sense in how the streetscape would have been broken up. She said the insertion of the landmark into the new with the stucco on the sides is confusing and awkward.

Ms. Anderson said she agreed. She said they are making a good effort even though the awkwardness lends a curiosity about the building – why it is there. She said that the different volumes make it a little less awkward. She said she likes the café and the rooms.

Mr. Ketcherside said that the initial plan was definitely façadism like what has happened on Capitol Hill. He said that this plan, with the strong voice of Ms. Walker Brems and Mr. Murdock, integrate floor levels into the new building. He said the experience of walking by the same as before construction and he noted the use of windows. He likes the integration of the landmark with the new building and is interested in seeing the final project. He said it looks acceptable now.

Ms. Barker said there was discussion about the alley façade and the two blank sides. She said there was discussion about the re-use of the alley side, structural issues, and changes made to that façade that already had alterations to it.

Mr. Luoma said the ‘what ifs’ have been explored. He said that with regard to the blank walls that if there had been development on either north or south sides it could have been more distracting to the landmark. He said that the amount stepped back is critical; the older building can be seen along with its textural quality. He said that the simple new façade helps the landmark stand out more. He said it is reasonable and they have been responsive to board comments.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for Preliminary Design for the new construction and

partial demolition as described in the application submittal and submitted plans, conditional upon Board review and approval of all construction drawings, finishes and details necessary for a final Certificate of Approval. This action is based on the following:

1. In regards to *SMC 25.12.750 A, the extent to which the proposed alteration or significance change would adversely affect the features or characteristics described in the Designation Report*: While the proposal includes partial demolition, a substantial portion of the first bay is proposed to remain, therefore the primary elevation and view of the building will remain.
2. In regards to *SMC 25.12.750 B, The reasonableness or lack thereof of the proposed alterations or significant change in light of other alternatives available to achieve the objectives of the owner*: The applicant has responded positively to feedback provided by the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) to explore design alternatives to the surrounding new construction--the design has evolved to incorporate ARC feedback.
3. The other factors of *SMC 25.12 .750 C and 25.12.750 D* are not applicable at this time in the process.

MM/SC/JK/DB 7:1:0 Motion carried. Ms. Patterson voted against the motion.

102115.3 TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS

102115.31 Eagles Temple Building/ACT Theatre
1416 7th Avenue

Ms. Sordt explained that the Board is requested to verify the eligibility of the Eagles Temple Building at 1416 7th Avenue for the transfer of development rights (TDR); the Board is also requested to approve the required covenant. The code provisions require:

- Designation of the building(s) as a City of Seattle Landmark, pursuant to SMC 25.12;
- Execution of a Controls and Incentive Agreement regarding the Landmark and recording of same against the property;
- Receipt of a TDR authorization letter from DPD, which establishes the amount of TDRs available for transfer from the sending site;
- Provisions of security to assure completion of any required rehabilitation and restoration of the landmark, unless such work has been completed.
- The owner must also execute and record an agreement in the form and content acceptable to the Landmarks Preservation Board providing for the maintenance of the historically significant features of the building, per SMC

23.49.014D(4). The owner has completed, and the City Historic Preservation Officer has approved, subject to final approval by the Board, a covenant that includes the commitment of the owner to maintain the Eagles Temple Building consistent with Ordinance No. 112272.

- In this case the provisions of SMC 23.49.011 also apply, and therefore DPD is also a signatory on the covenant to ensure the performing arts theater use established under approved permits, including combined seating capacity in one or more venues for at least 800, for at least 40 years from the first use of any Landmark TDR

Ms. Barker noted STG should be Act Theater.

Ms. Sodt said it is not too late to be corrected. Responding to clarifying questions she said that Code Amendment allows theater to gain more FAR to transfer and that use needed to be locked in for 40 years.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board makes the determination that the Eagles Temple Building at 1416 7th Avenue has fulfilled the requirements for transfer of Landmark TDR pursuant to SMC 23.49.014 and Ordinance No. 120443 – that the building is a designated Landmark with a Controls and Incentives Agreement pursuant to Ordinance No. 112272; that an authorization letter from DPD has been received and has identified the number of transferable square feet to be 83,844 square feet; and, the building is not presently in need of rehabilitation, therefore no security is required.

MM/SC/MA/RK 8:0:0 Motion carried.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approved the agreement entitled “COVENANTS FOR LANDMARK TRANSFERABLE DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS” as submitted to the Board as the legal agreement required as a condition to the transfer of development rights from the Eagles Temple Building at 1416 7th Avenue, per SMC 23.49.014D(4).

MM/SC/MA/DB 8:0:0 Motion carried.

102115.4 NOMINATIONS

102115.41 J. W. Bullock House
1220 10th Avenue East

Kate Krafft, architectural historian, prepared and presented the nomination report (full report in DON file). She provided context of the site and neighborhood. She said the house was built on a large lot in 1912 for J. W. Bullock. She said it is an elaborate variation on the American Foursquare. She noted the hipped roof, dormers and the intact garage built in the character of the house. She said the

house has an eclectic mix of Colonial Revival design features and all exterior features are intact. She said the façade has a full width porch, pediment entry, balustrade treatment at the 2nd floor porch, and red brick cladding on first floor and buff brick above. She said the foundation is rustic concrete treatment and she noted the multi-pane windows, sash, stained glass windows, bullseye window, corner quoin treatment, and original intact entry sconces. She noted the rusticated sandstone retaining wall, landscaped yard, and pieces of sandstone and old hitching posts.

She pointed out garage details – the red brick, quoined corners that match the house, and the original bi-fold garage doors. She went over the house's circulation and floor plan with the full width porch, reception hall, elaborate main stairway, conservatory, and living room with fireplace. She went over original interior finishes and noted the golden oak paneling, cabinets, and trim in the stairwell and hall, original inlay hardware floor, original light fixtures, fireplace with rusticated brick surround. She pointed out the beamed ceiling, light fixtures, stained glass, and sliding doors in the conservatory. She said there is intact original hardware throughout the house. She walked the board through 2nd floor elements and noted the master suite with fireplace, bath, two bedrooms, dark stained oak trim and fir floors. She said the basement is modern but with historic fireplace and sandstone surround.

Ms. Krafft said the neighborhood was platted by Phinney in 1882 and there was no significant residential development until 1894. She said the residential development was spurred by Volunteer Park improvements and transportation improvements. She said James Moore platted Capitol Hill Addition and heavily promoted residential development. She said to the north residential development was inhibited by 15 acres retained by the Leary families.

Ms. Krafft said that J. W. Bullock was involved with general mercantile businesses. He was active in the Gold Rush in Alaska. In 1902 was president of Mutual Gold Mining. She said that in 1905 he worked for S. L. Dowell and Company which he acquired in 1907; it became one of the largest coal dealers in Seattle and was a lucrative business. She said there were three separate coal bunkers and mule teams that hauled coal to Seattle. She said he built this house at the site of one of the bunkers. She said he served on Seattle City Council.

Ms. Krafft said that builder Louis O. Menard has no other references credited to him. He was born in Quebec and trained there before moving to Seattle in 1907. She said he died in 1945 with the obituary noting him a 'retired building contractor'.

Ms. Krafft said that Bullock had other investments and a mining office in the Smith Tower. She said he lived at this house into the 1930s and retained it in his 1922 divorce. In 1931 the house was advertised as a furnished house for rent. She said that in 1936 Bullock relatives lived in the house and in 1955 it was put up for

sale. She said that Bullock died in the midst of the Depression. She said the house was used as a boarding house with communal kitchen; she said there were six renters. She said that despite the itinerant use it remained very much intact. She said on the south elevation the dormer was expanded to add a bathroom and shower. She said the interior is very intact. She noted the rear porch was enclosed.

She said there are distinctive homes nearby and she noted there are very few single family homes in Capitol Hill. She said it is well preserved and the owners, who acquired it in 1994, have been good stewards and have nominated it to preserve it. She said it meets the criteria for the association with J. W. Bullock, the North Broadway neighborhood, its eclectic Colonial Revival design made by a skilled carpenter-builder-architect, Louis O. Menard.

Owner Brian Arbogast said he and his wife (Valerie Tarico) moved into the house in 1994; with friends living on the third floor. He said that it used to be a rooming house. When they moved in they made a lot of repairs, but said that the interior was primarily intact. He said they support nomination.

Ms. Barker asked if there was information on the leaded window artisans.

Ms. Krafft said there wasn't, nor was there information on the light fixtures.

Ms. Barker asked if there are 1994 photos of the house.

Ms. Krafft said there is a scrapbook and the carpentry in the house is significant. She said it is much more elaborate than a typical Seattle foursquare.

Mr. Sneddon asked if the original wiring is there and if the house was gas or electric.

Mr. Arbogast said the lathe and plaster is there as is the coal furnace. He said they use the original radiators. He said the electric is knob and tube.

Mr. Ketcherside wondered if more information about Menard could be found in relation to the AYP Exposition.

Ms. Krafft said that he was a fine woodworker.

Mr. Sneddon asked if this was a plan book house.

Ms. Krafft said that this was more elaborate and larger; she said it was customized for the Bullocks. She said it had an elaborate garden that stretched onto the adjacent parcel.

Mr. Luoma asked when the south lot was sold.

Ms. Kraft said she assumed it was during settlement of the estate.

Ms. Patterson asked if the windows are original and why there was such variation.

Ms. Krafft said that the multi-pane windows are part of the Colonial Revival style and she noted the eclectic is associated with variation. She indicated that they are all original.

Public Comment:

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, said she was happy to support nomination and thanked the owners for their stewardship. She said there is a lot happening in the neighborhood and it is good to see the house protected.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Stanley supported nomination and agreed with the Staff Report. He appreciated the owners' self-nomination.

Mr. Sneddon supported nomination and said it was an interesting example of an early style building that takes an interesting direction. He said the detached garage is rare. He said that it is rare to have the original garage with doors and window intact. He said he supported Criterion C because of its association with the development of an elite neighborhood and its connection with the boom period. He supported criteria C, D, and E.

Ms. Patterson supported nomination on Criteria D for the eclectic Colonial Revival style with its variety of window types; and Criteria E for architect / builder / designer Louis O. Menard. She said it is important to recognize the contribution of a carpenter / builder, and not just the work of high style architects.

Mr. Kiel echoed his colleagues and supported nomination on criteria D and E.

Mr. Ketcherside supported nomination and noted Bullock, coal, residential growth. He noted the remaining hitch ring leftover from the property's days as a coal bunker. He said the house was developed on the far edge of Capitol Hill and the Roanoke neighborhood, and found that to be compelling. He noted the early detached garage and said the recommended areas of control are good. He supported criteria D and E.

Ms. Barker supported nomination and noted criteria C and D – the Staff Report features – and suggested E and F be considered as well.

Ms. Anderson supported nomination and agreed with Ms. Barker and suggested including C. She said she would like to know more about Louis Menard.

Mr. Luoma supported nomination and the Staff Report and said that Menard must have done other houses if he was this good. He noted the quoin treatment and said he wished there was more information on the original gardens.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the J.W. Bullock House at 1220 10th Avenue East for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed 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, that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for December 2, 2015; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/MSN/RK 8:0:0 Motion carried.

102115.42 Franklin Apartments
2302 4th Avenue

Ms. Patterson recused herself.

Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill, said the building was not worthy of landmark status. He said they are early in the process of development. He said that it is one of the least impressive examples of the brick apartment buildings.

Larry Johnson, The Johnson Partnership, prepared and presented the report (full report in DON file). He provided context of the site and neighborhood and noted the building occupies most of the site. He said that the building was designed by George Lawton and built in 1918. He said it is a wood frame building with hard fired brick veneer, terracotta lintel, and metal cornice. He noted the light pink Gladding and McBean terracotta and Alaska marble. He said that the building has good integrity but the windows are boarded up and the cornice is deteriorating. He said that the building did not meet any of the criteria for nomination.

He said that the area really developed after the third regrade. He listed other brick apartment buildings near by including Watermark, Rivoli, and Palladian among others. He said that among the large body of brick apartment buildings this one is more average. He said that Saunders and Lawton was one of the premier firms; buildings attributed to them include United Methodist Church, Liggett Building, Polson Building, and Norton among others. He said the building was an average not outstanding work of the designer. He said that the building contributes to the character of the area but more as a background building and does not meet F.

Mr. McCullough said that the building has integrity but needs to convey its significance. He said it is not the best work of the architects or in this neighborhood. He said that there are other brick apartment buildings and this one is just average. He said there is no cultural significance. He said the building does not warrant nomination.

Mr. Luoma asked about the windows.

Mr. Johnson said they were decent until recently boarded up. He said the sashes are there and are restorable. He said that the 2nd and 3rd floor windows are original.

Public Comment:

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, said she did some research and this was an apartment zone of the City in the 1920s. It was developed between regrade phases. She said it doesn't have to be the best; it exemplifies the style and period. She said the building is simple and has elements of the style. She said that the Belltown cottages are designated landmarks; there use to be a lot here but now those are the only ones. She said we don't want just one brick building. She said that condition is different from integrity. She supported nomination and asked the board to as well.

Jennifer Mortenson, Washington Trust, supported nomination on criteria C, D, and E. She said it is a remarkably intact Georgian Revival; it is distinct. She said there aren't so many brick apartments that we can afford to lose this. She said it is significant and historic and deserves to be protected before we reach crisis mode. She said to look at this building on its own merits as opposed to comparing it to others.

Evan Clifthorne, Tom Rasmussen office, spoke in support of nomination. He encouraged the board to take a closer look and not to get distracted by recent activity in the building but to look at the merits of the building. He said he lives across the street in the Charlesgate building. He said that the building meets Criterion F – it defines the cultural character and significance of the neighborhood apartment district; along with the Charlesgate, and Adams apartment the building defines the character of the Bell Street Park. He said that the original work on Franklin is still there and the siting in context of other buildings around demonstrates how much this building defines the character of the neighborhood.

Tiffany Jorgenson supported nomination. She noted it was one of Lawton's early works and noted its simplicity and the terracotta. She said that the apartments in the neighborhood were for the working class – studios and one-bedrooms for downtown workers. She said that said the building has integrity – original floors, original marble, windows, and stairwells are still there.

Steve Hall supported nomination. He said that the building stands out and he noted the location in Belltown is important; it is on the edge of Bell Street Park, a pedestrian oriented area. He said that it stands out and is an architectural gateway to Belltown; it is significant and able to convey it.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Kiel supported nomination and was interested in hearing more about the building.

Mr. Sneddon supported nomination suggesting C, D and F. He said the building has a significant connection to the development of Belltown. He said the apartment district

zoning was significant in planning a city. He said that the single purpose apartment embodies the Georgia Revival Style; he noted the symmetry and tripartite composition. He said he was blown away by the integrity and said there are not too many with this integrity. He said the apartments were for a new workforce type to the city – young clerical single women and men.

Ms. Anderson supported nomination and said there are a lot of multi-use buildings but this one was just apartments. She said it has structural integrity and it is in good condition for its age. She requested more information about the architects and more information on the building and how it ties into Belltown, and working class people.

Mr. Ketcherside supported nomination to continue the conversation. He said he was less convinced that all should be preserved starting with the lowest of them.

Ms. Barker supported nomination and cited former board chair Ms. Walker Brems who said simple buildings deserve their due and shouldn't be dismissed. She said that the building has strong integrity inside as well. She suggested criteria C, D, E and F.

Mr. Stanley said there is some value but that he did not support the Staff Report. He said the building is not significant; there is no story. He said it is not outstanding. He said it has integrity and distinct character of the style.

Mr. Luoma said a simple building relies on high level integrity; he said this building has a distinct style and has high integrity. He said it provides housing in Belltown and that people were housed in Belltown is significant. He said it is dangerous to use comparative logic; he said it should be looked at on its own design and integrity merits. He said it is small and he noted its equivalent – the Adams Apartments. He said that it brings character and quality to the neighborhood.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of Franklin Apartments at 2302 Fourth 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 be scheduled for December 2, 2015; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/DB/MSN 7:0:1 Motion carried. Ms. Pattern abstained.

102115.5 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator