



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 193/15

### MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting  
Seattle Municipal Tower  
700 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 40<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Room 4060  
Wednesday, April 1, 2015 - 3:30 p.m.

#### Board Members Present

Deb Barker  
Nick Carter  
Robert Ketcherside  
Aaron Luoma  
Jeffrey Murdock, Vice Chair  
Sarah Shadid  
Mike Stanley  
Alison Walker Brems, Chair

#### Staff

Sarah Sodt  
Genna Nashem  
Melinda Bloom

#### Absent

Matthew Sneddon  
Elaine Wine

Chair Alison Walker Brems called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

**040115.1      APPROVAL OF MINUTES**  
March 4, 2015

**040115.2      CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

040115.21      Fort Lawton  
Montana Circle and Officers Row  
4404-4426 W Montana Circle, 4000-4012 Washington Ave W,  
4200-4218 Washington Ave W

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Amendment to previously approved alterations, installation of exterior building lighting, painting of doors and porch decking, and site improvements.

Ms. Nashem explained that all work has been approved conditioned on providing more details; she said they meet the condition of the Certificate of Approval. She said the Board should focus on changes and new items.

Mark Sindell, GGLO said that changes related to buildings and site and landscape would be reviewed with focus on new elements.

Susan Boyle, BOLA, explained the proposed changes to prior approval to: 1) chimneys; 2) garage door; 3) additional paint colors; and 4) exterior lights. She said they eliminated the single story addition at the back of six Officers Row duplexes and the proposed hipped roof on four Officer Row duplexes but the proposed rehabilitation of the porches will be done. She said that they propose to remove secondary chimneys, brace primary chimneys and add exterior light fixture to porches.

Ms. Boyle said that Montana Circle refinements include exterior light fixtures and to maintain existing basement stairs. She said that the chimney on the primary facades are more elaborate and serve fireplace where those on the back were exhaust from boilers. She said they propose to brace 18 chimneys and remove 12. She said the chimneys to be removed are associated with the boilers and are non-functioning and one primary façade chimney that is no longer functioning will be removed.

She said they changed the garage person door from four to five panel; the painted steel garage door will be five panel. She said they will not use terracotta paint on doors and propose black in its place. She said that it will be used on one single family house – both on the front and the back. She said they have spec'd dark gray porch boards. She said that jelly jar style light fixtures will be placed above entry doors and in ceilings of existing porches.

Mr. Sindell said they have discussed landscape proposal with DOPAR. He said they have focused on areas immediately around the homes. He said that on Officers Row landscaping will go in front yard, side yard, around garage, nicer street trees will be planted, entry pier, low evergreen hedge, low flowering shrubs, low ornamental plantings, lavender. He said that landscaping will be representative of the stature and quality of the homes. He said the plants will be drought tolerant and will provide a seasonal palette.

He said that there will be one entry pier per entry; he provided material sample of the brick veneer in warm gray. He said there will be a precast plinth and base. He said the side yards will have low plantings and hedges; they will be diminutive along the access paths. He said most patios are brick but a couple locations will be replaced with brick for consistency. He said

they will use porous pavers in neutral gray to allow drainage in the front of the homes.

Mr. Sindell said that play structures at Officers Row will be removed and instead a victory or veggie garden will be put in. He said that there will be a gazebo that will work with plants and topography, a fire pit with automatic shut-off and seating area. He said that they propose a swing set in black powdercoat.

Ms. Walker Brems asked if they have deer in the area.

Mr. Sindell said they have a few.

Ms. Walker Brems asked where trash cans will go.

Mr. Sindell said trash enclosures are part of prior Certificate of Approval.

Ms. Boyle said that small wing walls come out to screen trash can storage.

Mr. Luoma asked if Kansas is a service road.

Ms. Boyle said it is.

Mr. Luoma asked about park boundary and possible public views.

Mr. Sindell said the area is heavily treed.

Ms. Barker asked about satellite dishes.

Ms. Boyle said they are private installation requested by homeowners.

Mr. Stanley asked about ground cover under swing set.

Mr. Sindell said it is a mulch bed of engineered wood chips. He said the border is low profile.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Murdock said they did a good job of clarifying what the changes are.

Mr. Luoma said that ARC had concern about chimney work and asked for better visuals which the applicants provided. He said that the Montana Circle amenity space breaks up the larger view.

Ms. Barker said that they provided proposed photos.

Mr. Murdock said they balanced the increased busy-ness of the chimney bracing versus maintaining the character of some chimneys.

Mr. Luoma said the bracing is visible.

Ms. Barker said the bracing is not as bad as she thought and that she hated to see the chimneys go; she said they tell a story.

Mr. Stanley asked how they would vent.

Gary Blakney, said they use gas now and they used to use oil. He said they will vent out horizontally above the footing.

Ms. Shadid said the historical photo shows all the chimneys; she said they tell stories and she is not bothered by the bracing.

Mr. Murdock asked if the chimney was removed inside.

Ms. Boyle said they were removed to open up the floor plan; it is not good to have the just the exterior chimney sitting on top.

Ms. Walker Brems said the landscape is beautiful and the lights are elegant. She said that the chimneys tell a story about how the houses were heated. She said the bracing is iffy but that she was open.

Mr. Stanley asked about precedents for bracing.

Ms. Boyle said they haven't seen other examples of bracing in other military forts around the state.

Mr. Luoma said he didn't mind the chimney removal because this is a district scale landmark and not just one building. He said there are a lot of other details associated with the landmark. He said that the amenity is tucked away and clearly new.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board issue a Certificate of Approval for the proposed work to amendment to previously approved alterations, installation of exterior building lighting, painting of doors and porch decking, removal of some chimneys and bracing of the remaining chimneys and site improvements including new amenity spaces, address entry piers and additional landscaping.

The proposed exterior alterations meet the following sections of the District ordinance and The Fort Lawton District Guidelines:

District ordinance

The proposed restorations plans as presented April 1, 2015 do not adversely affect the special features or characteristics of the buildings as specified in Ordinance #122750.

The other factors of SMC25.12.750 are not applicable

### The Fort Lawton District Guidelines

## **DISTRICT-WIDE GUIDELINES**

### ***Site Characteristics***

Maintain Streets, walkways, stairways and other features as they are or replace in-kind except as approved by the Landmarks Preservation Board.

### ***Landscaping***

If replacement of a tree is necessary, a species similar in form and size must be used. Trees planted to replace mature trees must be planted in compliance with SMC 25.11, Tree Protection. If replacement trees are to be removed before they reach the size of a mature tree, a Certificate of Approval will be required.

### ***Exterior Lighting***

All exterior lighting shall provide an appropriate level of lighting for security, safety and utility, while being as unobtrusive as possible. To the extent possible, lamps should use the lowest wattage for the purpose and be shielded and directed away from adjacent areas.

Exterior light fixtures should be of the minimum size for the purpose and in character with the historic character of the district.

Lights with motion sensors are preferred where appropriate.

## **Zone 3: WASHINGTON AVENUE (OFFICERS' ROW)**

### ***Site Characteristics***

Maintain streets, walkways, walls and other features, or replace in kind except as approved by the Landmarks Preservation Board, Certificate of Approval LPB# 317/11

### ***Additions/Enlargements and New Construction***

Porches Certificate of Approval LPB# 316/11.

Trash enclosures, approved as part of Certificate of Approval, LPB# 316/11 are approved within the courtyard of each duplex and to Building No. 670 to define and enclose trash and recycle containers.

Additional garage/storage buildings are allowed directly behind existing residences, in the same style and proportion as existing garage buildings and of the same materials and as approved by the Landmarks Preservation Board, Certificate of Approval LPB # 317/11 which allows the demolition of garages No. S-641, S-645, S-671, S-673 and S-677.

***Roof Materials***

In the future, when roofing materials are provided for new roofs or replacement in this zone, consistent composition shingle or metal panel types will be used.

New roofing on primary and dormer roofs, and those currently clad with shingles, will be premium composition shingle, installed 5.5” exposure to match the existing roofing shingle exposure, as manufactured by CertainTeed “Hatteras,” 235#/sq. with minimum 40-year warranty, in “Stormy Night” color that is selected to approximate the color of original slate shingles.

***Paint Colors***

Front and back doors of the buildings only may be repainted using one of the following colors:

- C2 “Whiteout” Paint No. C2 480W, semi-gloss sheen;
- Sherwin Williams “Marooned” Paint No. SW 6020, semi-gloss sheen;
- Sherwin Williams “Courtyard” Paint No. SW 6440, semi-gloss sheen;
- C2 “Espionage” Paint No. C2-244, semi-gloss sheen; or
- Sherwin Williams “Brandywine” Paint No. SW 7710, semi-gloss sheen

In all cases, the same color is to be used on both the front and back doors of an individual building.

***Landscaping***

Maintain lawns, foundation plantings and planting beds with appropriate, non-invasive plants.

Foundation plants should be small in scale and spaced so that the porches and the building foundations remain largely visible. If replacement of plants and/or shrubs is necessary, use plant materials similar in size and form, as far as possible.

***Temporary Structures and Other Elements***

Children’s play structures, gazebos or garden sheds are allowed between Oklahoma and California streets. Structures must have a total footprint of no more than 50 square feet. Gazebos and sheds must be less than 8 feet in height and of wood construction and require a Certificate of Approval from the Landmarks Preservation Board.

**ZONE 4: MONTANA CIRCLE**

***Site Characteristics***

Maintain streets, walkways, staircases and other features, or replace in kind.

***Additions/Enlargements and New Construction***

Alteration to rear exterior, Certificate of Approval LPB# 316/11.

***Roof Materials***

In the future, when roofing materials are provided for new roofs or replacement in this zone, consistent composition shingle or metal panel types will be used.

New roofing material on existing and new porches of this zone will be metal standing seam panels with battens at 1'-4' and concealed fasteners, 24 gauge, "Select Seam Narrow Batten, Zincolume" in "Cool Metallic Silver" color with factory-applied sealant, as manufactured by AES Span, Tacoma. The material is selected to match the metal roofing material on the existing porch roofs of the wood-clad duplexes in this zone.

***Paint Colors***

Front and back doors only of the buildings may be repainted using one of the following colors:

C2 "Whiteout" Paint No. C2 480-W, semi-gloss sheen;  
Sherwin Williams "Marooned" Paint No. SW 6020, semi-gloss sheen; Sherwin Williams "Courtyard" Paint No. SW 6440, semi-gloss sheen;  
C2 "Espionage" Paint No. C2-244, semi-gloss sheen; or Sherwin Williams "Brandywine" Paint No. SW 7710, semi-gloss sheen.

In all cases, the same color is to be used on both the front and back doors of an individual building.

***Landscaping***

Maintain lawns, foundation plantings and planting beds with appropriate, non-invasive plants.

Foundation plants should be small in scale and spaced so that the porches and the building foundations remain largely visible. If replacement of plants and/or shrubs is necessary, use plant materials similar in size and form, as far as possible.

***Temporary Structures and Other Elements***

Children's play structures and gazebos or garden sheds are allowed. Structures must have a total footprint of no more than 50 square feet. Gazebos and sheds must be less than 8 feet in height and of wood construction and require a Certificate of Approval from the Landmarks Preservation Board.

**Secretary of the Interior Standards 2, 5, and 9**

Guidelines for Site

Guidelines for Setting

MM/SW/NC/JM 8:0:0 Motion carried.

040115.22

University Heights Elementary School

5031 University Way NE

Proposed site improvements at south end of property.

Mr. Luoma recused himself.

Kelly Goold said that the lot adjacent is surface parking; they will maintain some parking. He said they will do concrete paving with expansion joints. He said they will add plantings, benches, basketball hoop and ADA compatibility. He said they will add bronze inlays at the corner entries of the site.

Ms. Walker Brems asked if they will retain entry gates.

Mr. Goold said they will be set in paving below.

Ms. Sodt said the applicant took ARC feedback into consideration – the play area would have blocked view of building; they simplified and made it more formal.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Murdock said he appreciated formalizing the path and a clear pathway will incorporate different uses.

Ms. Barker said it is comprehensive and suitable.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed site improvements at the University Heights Elementary School, 5031 University Way NE, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed site improvements do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Report on Designation (LPB 102/77), 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/JM 7:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Luoma recused himself.

040115.23 Seattle Center Armory  
305 Harrison Street  
Proposed exterior signage.

Christine Mongey explained the proposal to update the logo and illuminated sign and noted they will use the same attachments. She said that at night there will be a glow around the sign; the red will not be lit and the white letters will glow. She said they will use LED bulbs. She said the blade sign will reuse the same hanger and will be non-illuminated.

Ms. Sodt said that ARC requested full visual picture of signs and the applicant provided that. It shows the outline of the other sign; all signs are in the same line.

Ms. Walker Brems asked if there is a signage plan.

Ms. Sodt said no but that over time blade signs are similar shape and size.

Ms. Barker asked if the string of light will go away.

Ms. Sodt said they have nothing to do with MOD Pizza; Seattle Center and Ms. Doherty are following up on that.

Mr. Murdock said that the application is okay – it increases symmetry and balance.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board members determined they had enough information to make a decision.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed signage at the Seattle Center Armory, 305 Harrison Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed signage does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 123298, 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/AL/JM 8:0:0 Motion carried.

040115.24

Schoenfeld Building

1012 First Avenue

Proposed rehabilitation and penthouse addition

Matt Aalfs said that one modification was made in response to ARC comments. He said that two portions were modified at street level. He said that the interior brick on parti-wall will be protected and preserved. He said they will add a new top floor office, do seismic bracing, structural upgrades, life safety, mechanical, electrical elevator upgrades. He said the building will be retail and office use. He said that building services will be off the alley. He said that they propose to remove one non-structural partition and expose timber columns, beams and brick. He said they will modify the storefront and preserve historic elements. He showed a rendering of visibility of brace frame from the front.

He said they will add concrete sheer walls and brace frames and located them for board members. He said that they will add bike storage, shower, trash area, and said that elevator/stair/restrooms in the core. He said that the skylights will be brought up one level. He said the addition will be set back one structural bay. He said that fire escape and ornamental wood cornice were added in the 1920s and windows have been changed over time. He said that the cast iron columns are original and the 1920s wood cornice will remain with new elements – contemporary black steel storefront panels, wood windows and entry door - recessed back.

Mr. Aalfs said that the material palette is black – 70% gray, with walnut stain windows; he said windows will be painted to be unified in appearance. He said that they will use concealed metal fastener siding; they will tuck point and clean brick; they will fill holes when fire escape removed and will likely have to repaint the brick. He went over the brace frame configuration. He said that awnings will be retractable and noted that there will be limited view of the 6<sup>th</sup> floor penthouse.

He said that they will clean up the alley back and add windows to get more light in. He said they will use existing opening for trash and exiting. He said they will keep the first floor tin ceiling. He said the 4<sup>th</sup> floor timber and corbelling will remain exposed. He said that the worn fir floors will be maintained and seismic diaphragm will be done below the floors. He said that on the 6<sup>th</sup> floor they moved the swing door on the operable wall over to line up with what is below. He provided material samples. He said that they have really good energy code compliance on the 6<sup>th</sup> floor addition to balance out what they don't meet in historic areas.

Ms. Walker Brems asked if the parapet is tall enough to act as a guard rail.

Mr. Aalfs said they will use structural steel to brace it.

Mr. Luoma asked if the green would be a similar value as the gray.

Mr. Aalfs said that the green is chalky and faded and is lighter but close to the value of the gray.

Ms. Walker Brems commented that they were thoughtful about the awning. She asked about proposed signage.

Mr. Aalfs said wall signage will be inside; Schoenfeld was a credit innovator and they may use historic art to reflect that. He said they will follow up with signage.

Ms. Sodt said that the ground floor will likely be just one tenant.

Mr. Aalfs said it will probably be a local restaurateur.

Mr. Stanley asked about the 1920s arched window.

Mr. Aalfs explained that the low mezzanine was installed in the 1920s – the window breaks up the tall aspect of the façade and is not in serviceable condition. He noted the “hodge podge and jumble” of storefront windows and said there wasn’t enough to keep.

Ms. Shadid asked why the fire escape would be removed and commented that it is lovely.

Mr. Aalfs noted the challenge of safety and liability and maintenance. He said they put in modern egress. He said they would have to remove platforms and keep frame only to retain look without functionality. He said the building has an interesting façade – flat and unornamented – and provides a juxtaposition with the adjacent Holyoke Building.

Ms. Sodt explained that fire escapes in Pioneer Square have been handled with removal of platforms and retention of vertical elements.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Murdock noted setbacks that will allow character defining elements to be legible. He said that the addition is set back and will not detract from the character of the building.

Ms. Barker noted the contrast of new and old. She said the cross bracing is visible but won’t be as obvious as the rendering.

Ms. Walker Brems said it was a refreshing proposal and noted that Mr. Aalfs did the nomination, designation and now remodel/rehab.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations, at the Schoenfeld Building, 1012 First Avenue.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Report on Designation 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/AL/NC 8:0:0 Motion carried.

The following items were reviewed out of agenda order.

#### **040115.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

040115.41 Post-Intelligencer Globe  
101 Elliott Avenue West  
Request for an extension

Jack McCullough said that they have finalized the document language and sent it back to New York. He said another thirty day extension should cover it.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Sodt explained that Controls and Incentives are the third step in the designation process. She said it more clearly outlines board purview, controls on designated features. She said that the globe is complicated because of the search for a new location and they will move ahead with the agreement before that happens.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Post-Intelligencer Globe, 101 Elliott Avenue West, for thirty (30) days to May 6, 2015.

MM/SC/NC/DB 7:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Stanley abstained.

040115.42 Lloyd Building  
601 Stewart Street  
Request for an extension

Jack McCullough said that it was useful to team up their architects with architects locally with an appreciation of historic buildings. He said they hired Susan Boyle and

have toured the site. He said they are exploring how to fit a hotel program into a small building and are looking at feasibility and ninety days will allow for this process.

Mr. Murdock asked if they were no longer planning to integrate the building into a larger development.

Mr. McCullough said they are looking at alternatives.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Lloyd Building, 601 Stewart St., for ninety (90) days to July 1.

MM/SC/JM/AL 8:0:0 Motion carried.

040115.43 Ainsworth & Dunn Warehouse  
2815 Elliott Avenue

Ms. Sodt explained the request for extension to the first meeting in August. She said they are under contract to sell the building and want future owner to be involved with Controls and Incentives process. She said that it is the intent of the potential buyer to preserve the building and develop the lot to the south which was not designated.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Ainsworth & Dunn Building, 2815 Elliott Avenue, to August 5.

MM/SC/NC/DB 7:0:1 Motion carried.

040115.44 White Motor Co. Building  
1021 E. Pine

Jessica Clawson said she had a good meeting with the client and Ms. Sodt and asked for an extension that would line up with the Kelly Springfield building.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the White Motor Company Building, 1021 E. Pine, for two and a half (2 ½) months.

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

*Ms. Barker left at 5:10 pm.*

**040115.3 NOMINATIONS**

040115.31 Old IBM Building  
1929-33 Fifth Avenue

Jack McCullough said that an earlier board declined designation 9 – 0 in 2007.

Larry Johnson prepared and presented the nomination report (full report in DON file). He provided context of the building and neighborhood. He said that the east façade is non-original, the parapet and pinnacle removed, entries rearranged and eliminated, painted cast stone and masonry, cartouche removed, a portion of brick veneer fell down in 2010; he said the building lacks integrity. He said that the interior has been changed.

He said that the building does not meet criteria A, B, or C. He went over the Denny Regrade and said this building was on the edge of it. He noted the new commercial density of the area following the regrade. He noted the association with IBM but that this was just a branch office. He said it did not meet criterion D and said there are better examples of store and loft buildings in the area. He said that the building did not meet criterion E. He said that Shack Young and Meyers was one of the most successful design firms of the 1920s and there are much better examples of their work including First United Methodist Church and the UW's Hansee Hall. He said that the building did not meet criterion F and said the monorail dominates the views. He said that the integrity was marginal.

Jack McCullough said that in 2007 deliberations all of the board members noted integrity issues.

Ms. Shadid asked about IBM's association with the building.

Mr. Johnson said this was just a branch office and that the main office was in New York.

Public Comment:

Albert Cheng asked about the alley door way "none of us".

Mr. Johnson said it is a non-original entry to private party rental space.

David Benzine said it is still called the IBM building. He noted the contrast between old and new in the area and how the connection to the past is being lost. He said it is an intriguing building and other similar properties are gone now.

Jerry Meier said a number of old buildings have been torn down that were great examples providing texture and patterning on the streets. He spoke of what he called the 'Manhattanization' of the city.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Carter did not support nomination and said the building lacks integrity.

Mr. Ketcherside did not support nomination and said the building lacks integrity.

Mr. Stanley did not support nomination and said the building lacks integrity; he said the scale was nice.

Ms. Shadid did not support nomination because of integrity issues.

Mr. Murdock did not support nomination. He said it is a significant building relevant to its context in the neighborhood but that it did not have integrity.

Mr. Luoma did not support nomination because of lack of integrity and the inability to convey significance. He said the association with IBM is significant and interesting but that the new IBM building has a stronger cultural connection.

Ms. Walker Brems said the building has no integrity. She expressed concern with buildings being torn down and noted that the SEPA process requires review.

Action: I move that the Board not approve the nomination of the (Old) IBM Building at 1929-1933 Fifth Avenue as a Seattle Landmark, as it does not have the integrity or ability to convey its significance, as required by SMC 25.12.350.

MM/SC/AL/SSH 7:0:0 Motion carried.

040115.32

National Cash Register Building  
1923-1927 Fifth Avenue

Larry Johnson prepared and presented the nomination report (full report in DON file). He provide context of the mid-block building that takes up the whole lot. He said cream terracotta has 26 elaborate tile patterns. He said the original ten finials are gone but said the black beam marble is in good condition. He noted the carved relief over the door lintels, the mahogany doors, transoms. He said the terracotta is in good condition although some of it is weathered. He said the stairway has been closed in and the upper transom window has been closed off. He said there are non-original metal panels in the storefront transoms.

He said that the building does not meet criteria A, B or C. He said that NCR was only indirectly associated with the Denny Regrade. He said that NCR was a regional sales office and housed various tenants over time. He said the upper terracotta cladding is okay but the marble lower is disharmonious and detracts from the building; he said it seems like two buildings. He compared it to Times Square, Arctic, and Kress among other terracotta buildings and said there are better examples so it doesn't meet criterion D. He said that architect John Kruzer worked on better buildings than this – First Covenant Church, Medical Dental Building, and El Rio – and this was not an outstanding example of his style. He said the monorail dominates visually and this building does not meet criterion F.

Mr. McCullough said the 2007 board said no 7-2. He said that the building has received little attention in 100 years. He said that Jeffrey Ochsner did not mention the building and Section 106 analysis was done and it was deemed not significant. He said it lacks coherent composition and doesn't embody an architectural style. He said it is an ordinary building that doesn't have a sense of composition. He said that Henry Matthews said in 2007 that it didn't pass the threshold and nothing has changed.

Public Comment:

Donna Benzine said that NCR was important in 20<sup>th</sup> Century and paralleled Amazon. She supported nomination and noted it is in an area where old commerce meets new commerce and meets criterion C.

Albert Cheng said the color of glaze – polychrome blue - is unique and rare. He noted the terracotta splendor and richness and variety. He hoped the polychromatic blocks will be preserved. He said so many gorgeous terracotta buildings have been torn down and destroyed.

Jerry Meier said that the visibility of this building from the monorail is a highlight of the ride.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Ketcherside supported nomination to err on the side of nomination and take a closer look at the exterior. He supported the Staff Recommendation and Criterion D. He said it is obvious the integrity is there.

Mr. Luoma supported nomination to err on the side of nomination. He said the terracotta and ornament are well detailed and valuable and much has been lost in the City. He said it is difficult to preserve for just an element and not the building as a whole. He said the marble is not great but it may be a unique composition that is worth preserving. He said the Ordinance speaks of value and character adding to the City. He said the terracotta is valuable but with the marble it is a struggle. He said as a whole he was not sure he would want to point to the building as significant. He said culturally it is significant in business and contribution to neighborhood but he wondered how it could convey that.

Mr. Murdock said the building speaks of accounting and banking and with its granite base looks like it would sell adding machines. He agreed with public comment on the quality of the polychrome terracotta. He said that more and more buildings are disappearing. He said we won't see this again even in repair terracotta is not being used. He said the cast bronze window system is beautiful, fine grained and incredible. He said the integrity is remarkable and the changed window is not a major issue. He said that the finials are not real visible in historic photograph.

Mr. Carter supported nomination to err on the side of caution. He said it is two completely different buildings.

Ms. Shadid supported nomination and noted the elaborate terracotta and marble. She noted the lack of coherent composition but that is the best part.

Mr. Stanley did not support nomination and questioned what had changed since last nomination.

Ms. Walker Brems responded that the board has changed. She supported nomination and said she appreciates small utilitarian buildings. She noted the development of craftsmanship and the 26 different tile patterns on this building, and the carved relief on door. She said the integrity is there.



Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of National Cash Register Building at 1923-1927 Fifth 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 May 20, 2015; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/RK/AL          6:1:0    Motion carried. Mr. Stanley opposed.

**040115.5          STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator