



The City of Seattle

# Landmarks Preservation Board

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649, Seattle WA 98124-4649

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 188/19

## MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting  
City Hall  
600 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room  
Wednesday March 20, 2019 - 3:30 p.m.

### Board Members Present

Deb Barker  
Russell Coney  
Alan Guo  
Garrett Hodgins  
Kristen Johnson  
Steven Treffers

### Staff

Sarah Sodt  
Erin Doherty  
Melinda Bloom

### Absent

Manish Chalana  
Kathleen Durham  
Rich Freitas  
Jordon Kiel

Vice-Chair Deb Barker called the meeting to order at 3:45 p.m.

**032019.1**      **MEETING MINUTES**  
December 19, 2018  
Deferred.

**032019.2**      **CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

032019.21      Georgetown Steam Plant  
6605 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue South

## Proposed exterior stair alterations

Rebecca Ossa, Seattle City Light, proposed redesign of the south stair noting it has further deteriorated. She said a second means of egress is needed for life-safety code compliance. She said they looked at the historical design and the SOI Standards. She said a dog-leg plan is preferred as it has a deeper top landing, and the stair run is shorter because of the location of the landing at the turn in the stair. She said railing and pipe joint connectors were incorporated into the design. She said it will not block the historic doors below. She said they looked at a switchback stair plan, but it would block the doors, and a donut stair plan but it was too bulky. She said the guardrails will have cable added and will visually disappear from at a distance.

Rhoda Lawrence, BOLA Architecture + Planning, said the changes are required and are code related. She said they will fill in the risers and minimize space in handrail width.

Ms. Ossa said they will reuse existing wall balcony brackets and will add a vertical post.

Mr. Coney asked if the dog-leg plan allows a drop in elevation.

Ms. Lawrence said yes, and it also provides access to doors.

Ms. Barker asked if there will be a landing.

Ms. Lawrence said the existing one is wood; the new one will be large plank wood.

Ms. Barker asked what they are doing do prevent climbing / access.

Ms. Lawrence said the existing board is only there to prevent falling, not prevent climbing; the doors are locked, and the property is be fenced.

Mr. Hodgins asked if the handrail detail will mimic the original top rail.

Ms. Ossa said it will.

Ms. Lawrence said code requires guardrails and handrail; what is proposed minimizes impact.

Ms. Ossa said they looked at putting in an intermediate cross rail but decided using cable was a better option as it is visually less obtrusive.

Mr. Coney asked if the risers will be solid.

Ms. Lawrence said they will be steel mesh.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Doherty said ARC reviewed and asked to see how they got to the preferred option. She said they can't go more than 12' vertically without a landing. A straight run is really long, so the dog-leg pulls it closer to the building without covering the doors. This was the lightest in appearance. She said that Mr. Kiel thought it was compatible; she noted that his firm, Bassetti, designed the hybrid cable rail that this is modeled after. It is reversible, but also compatible.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations at the Georgetown Steam Plant, 6605 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed change does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance #111884, as the proposed exterior 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/GH/ST            6:0:0    Motion carried.

032019.22

Seattle Asian Art Museum

1300 East Prospect Street

Proposed changes to previously approved lobby features

Pamela Trevithick, LMN Architects, said they are under construction and noted a few unforeseen things have arisen. She proposed modification to hand rail design. She said they don't have the depth to get loading so need six additional posts with exposed round escutcheon anchor plate at auditorium. She said they will core drill through the slab. She indicated on page 9 of the plans the new entry lobby at Garden Court and said there is no change to rail location and layout. She noted page 10, and the clean design that had been approved. She said they now propose for stair 1 an exposed escutcheon; a handrail post will be connected through stair tread per Code at Garden Court and Gallery stairs. On page 11, all stairs with existing condition conflicts are shown; on page 12 they propose to add a few more posts in Stair 1; and return handrail back to the post as on page 13.

She said the entry vestibule is very small; fire inspector requires an additional sprinkler and smoke detector. She said there are not many ways to achieve that. On page 16 they show bringing up the pipe of 1 1/2" diameter through floor; a new jamb extension is proposed to hide it. It will come through the ceiling and will be centered with recessed head. It will mirror the jamb extension for symmetry and could conceal wires for smoke detector.

Ms. Doherty said she has looked at other design changes administratively where she can; like for sprinkler heads where it was easier to repair the scagliola wall rather than the gold leaf ceiling. But here she said, cutting a hole in the metal ceiling in vestibule is problematic as it is not easily repaired. The jamb extensions are also too visually obtrusive. She said she reached out to the fire inspector as there can be code exceptions for designated landmarks. She said that the vestibule is not separated by a

fire rated enclosure. All surfaces are non-combustible so she hoped they could be allowed some leniency. She said there are egress doors on either side of the vestibule. She said she will continue the discussion with the fire inspector if the Board agrees that these are issues for them.

Mr. Treffers asked if there are other options.

Ms. Trevithick said one option is to bring the pipe down through the gold leaf ceiling, but it would be visible. The could feed through the pilaster but the area is filled with existing ductwork.

Ms. Doherty asked if the only way to do the first option is to go across the gold leaf ceiling.

Ms. Trevithick said they could bring piping over and down but would still need the added jamb extensions.

Ms. Barker asked if the smoke detector would be triggered by a smoky day outside.

Ms. Trevithick said no. She said if smoke is detected pipes will fill with water; only fire would cause sprinklers to go off.

Mr. Hodgins asked the depth of mullion at door now.

Ms. Trevithick said 3”.

Mr. Treffers asked if there is glass on ceiling.

Ms. Trevithick said it is a metal ceiling.

Mr. Hodgins asked if they looked at locating it in the corner by the vent.

Ms. Trevithick said they did but they would still have to penetrate through. It is cleaner where proposed.

Mr. Hodgins asked about decision to have circular railings versus square.

Ms. Trevithick said round is easier for cutting terrazzo. She said it doesn't fit at all with historic character, metal is not prevalent. The existing handrails are ornate and beautiful but unfortunately don't meet Code. She said there are no escutcheons anywhere in the building and they need to cover the anchors.

Mr. Hodgins asked if they could get a new rail closer to what is shown.

Mr. Coney asked if there is any option to replicate existing somewhat to meet Code.

Ms. Trevithick said it is a structural issue. They are trying not to connect to the walls, which are made from hollow clay tile and clad in scagliola.

Ms. Barker asked if they plan to remove the existing railings.

Ms. Trevithick said no.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Hodgins said the vestibule location – where the mullion hits – is an impactful location.

Mr. Treffers recommended pushing back against having to include the fire detector and said that Code should allow that. He said it is such a small space but it is primary and character-defining. He encouraged the applicant to push back.

Mr. Coney also recommended pushing back and said it is such a small space and there is nothing flammable in there.

Mr. Hodgins said to push back but if necessary, to allow administrative approval on this option.

Ms. Johnson said it is worth pushing back; cutting into the metal and putting in smoke detector is awful. She said the board doesn't argue against life-safety, but in this case, it is worthwhile to do so because of the adjacent egress doors.

Ms. Barker said to push back; but if necessary, she is OK with this proposal. She asked board members for comment on handrail escutcheon.

Ms. Johnson said there isn't a 2' slab; there isn't much you can do about it. She said the original design was not meant to mimic historic detail.

Mr. Treffers agreed and said if there is a choice, he said the space is more rectilinear.

Mr. Hodgins said not a round post – everything else is round.

Ms. Trevithick said it is a round post and a round escutcheon.

Mr. Treffers thanked the applicant and said it is the best design possible for the situation.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed interior handrail alterations only at the Seattle Asian Art Museum, 1400 East Prospect Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance #125418, as the proposed 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/ST/BH          6:0:0    Motion carried.

**032019.3            TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS**

032019.31            Windham Apartments  
420 Blanchard Street

Ms. Sodt explained the Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program and that the board would verify the TDR eligibility. She said SDCI does the calculations which in this case are just under 13,000 square feet. She said the building must be a designated landmark with Controls and Incentives agreement; it must have been recently rehabilitated. She said the owner must execute and record the agreement. She noted she uses a template and adjusts it accordingly. She said the landmark must be maintained and Controls agreement adhered to.

Mr. Treffers asked if there is anything specific here.

Ms. Sodt said no; the template was created for downtown and is pretty standard.

Ms. Johnson asked about the current market.

Ms. Sodt said she has heard there is not a lot of TDR available.

Ms. Barker asked if TDR can be sold multiple times.

Ms. Sodt said they could, but that Historic Preservation doesn't track that; SDCI would.

Ms. Barker asked if there is anything related to duration of affordable housing.

Ms. Sodt said it is not relevant to TDR; they are not selling air rights – it is FAR.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board makes the determination that the Windham at 420 Blanchard Street 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. **122595**; that an authorization letter from SDCI has been received and has identified the number of transferable square feet to be 12,952 square feet; and, the building is not presently in need of rehabilitation, therefore no security is required.

MM/SC/KJ/GH            6:0:0    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 Windham Apartments at 420 Blanchard Street, per SMC 23.49.014D(4).

MM/SC/KJ/GH            6:0:0    Motion carried.

**032019.4            CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

032019.41            American Meter & Appliance Building / Frederick Boyd & Co.  
1001-1005 Westlake Avenue North  
Request for extension

Ms. Sodt explained the request for a three to four-month extension. She said there has been a change in legal counsel and architect.

Ms. Barker noted the board saw a briefing.

Mr. Hodgins said it was a hotel concept.

Ms. Sodt said the whole team has changed.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives of the American Meter & Applicant Building / Frederick Boyd & Co., 1001 – 1005 Westlake Avenue North for four months.

MM/SC/GH/KJ            6:0:0    Motion carried.

**032019.5            NOMINATION**

032019.51            (original) Van Asselt School  
7201 Beacon Avenue South

Ellen Mirro, The Johnson Partnership, presented the nomination report (full report in DON file). She provided context of the site and neighborhood. She said the original building was designed by Edgar Blair; it was built in 1909. Originally, there were no indoor toilets; separate toilet building was built in 1911. There have been additions to the site – toilet room, portable classrooms, new school building etc. She said on the east façade of the original building, plywood covering protect the original windows. She said the north façade shows phases of development. She said the west is a secondary façade. She said the original windows, main floor landing, and original casework remain; some lighting and mechanical systems have been redone and an elevator installed. Original windows remain in 1940 additions; each has its own original entry. She said the basement was originally indoor playrooms.

Ms. Mirro said the second building constructed in 1950 has had significant alterations, windows altered, new roof, brace frames added at several locations. The southern classroom wing originally contained six classrooms on either side of the double-loaded corridor; all windows have been replaced in 2006. The eastern façade is divided into six bays, each corresponding to a classroom at the interior. The wall at this façade is clad with Roman brick below a continuous precast concrete sill under the windows. Originally the spandrel above the windows and on the parapet was covered in painted asbestos cement board. Currently the four windows in this section

are mullied, aluminum-frame windows consisting of four lights above a row of three lights. The two interior units are 10'-2" wide, the two outer units are 6'-8" wide, per the original configuration, although originally the windows consisted of glass-block above a row of three lights. On the southern end of the wall, the brick cladding extends up to the spandrel. The brick wall returns 25'-0", forming a blank section of the southern façade. She said in the central classroom section the administration office is original; the western side of the corridor contains girls' and boys' toilets, passages to the play courts, the entries to the gymnasium, and one classroom on the northern end. On the eastern side of the corridor the main central entry is located opposite the gymnasium. South of the main entry are the administration offices. North of the main entry is the auditorium/lunch room, with a separate bar for the kitchen and storage, a book room, and, as the corridor turns the corner to the northern angled portion, the janitorial spaces and boiler room.

The plan of the north portion of the building is a double-loaded corridor with seven classrooms: three on the northeastern side and four on the southwestern side, two of which are kindergarten rooms, on the northwestern end of the wing adjacent to a separate paved play court. The northern façade contains three bays of a typical classroom façade, clad with Roman brick below a continuous pre-cast concrete sill under the windows, with painted concrete spandrels between windows and flanked at either end with full-height Roman brick. On the eastern and northern ends of the wall, the brick cladding extends up to the parapet cladding. These three classrooms contain the only remaining original classroom windows. Each 33'-7" window unit is divided into four sections with aluminum clad mullions. These units contain horizontal two-light fixed aluminum-sash view windows below large glass-block transoms that extend up to the parapet spandrel cladding. The southern façade is composed in two portions with two classrooms at each portion. The kindergarten classrooms contain reading alcoves and covered exterior doors to access the kindergarten play court under a lower roof that extends 98'-0" along the western end of the southern façade. Clerestory windows above the lower roof light the interior of the classrooms. These clerestory windows were originally glass block but have been replaced with aluminum sash windows. The alcoves originally had continuous ribbon windows above Roman brick walls and concrete sills. Those have been replaced with double-pane aluminum storefront systems with three square units below two-light horizontal transoms.

Katherine Jaeger, The Johnson Partnership, reported that the topography of the area, with steep slopes flanking the tide flats, meant that Beacon Hill was slow to develop. In 1885 Eugene Semple, the former Territorial Governor, proposed creating a canal from Elliot Bay to Lake Washington that would run through Beacon Hill. Work on the canal started, and 1,400 acres of Duwamish tide flats were filled in until the project stalled due to lack of support. The southern canal was abandoned, and in 1900 the state legislature approved building a canal north of downtown. The Lake Washington Ship Canal was built between 1911 and 1917, cutting through the Montlake, Fremont, and Ballard neighborhoods instead of Beacon Hill. The Van Asselt land was annexed by the City of Seattle in 1907, as part of a huge expansion that included all of Beacon Hill, the southern portion of Rainier Valley, West Seattle, and Ballard.

In 1933, the U.S. Marine Hospital was built on the site of M. Harwood Young's residence on the north end of Beacon Hill. Operated by the U.S. Public Health



Service, the facility cared for veterans from all divisions of the military. The Art Deco building operated as a hospital until 1981. From 2000 to 2011, online retailer Amazon leased a large portion of the building for its company headquarters.

Ms. Jaeger said Beacon Hill was one of the few areas where people of racial and ethnic minority groups were allowed to purchase property, due to racial restrictive covenants and the practice of "redlining." Redlining became popular in the 1930s as part of the Federal Housing Authority's home loan guarantee program. The FHA guaranteed loans for private homes in areas that were not considered "hazardous." The hazard rating of an area increased if the area contained any minority or non-white populations, along with other environmental factors such as propensity for landslides. The effect was that banks would not grant mortgages to people of color. Those areas with few racial restrictive covenants, such as some areas in southeast Seattle, became the available areas for minority populations and people of color to live. One result of redlining is that Beacon Hill's population has had much more racial and ethnic diversity than nearly any other Seattle neighborhood, a diversity which has persisted through the 20<sup>th</sup> century and up to the present day.

She explained that during World War II, the U.S. Army commandeered Jefferson Park to establish anti-aircraft artillery units and later a recreation center, gymnasium, and tents to house servicemen. After the war, the city deeded forty-four acres of land at the southwestern corner of Jefferson Park to the federal government for the creation of a veteran's hospital, now the VA Puget Sound Health Care System. The influx of defense industry workers to Seattle during World Wars I and II spurred the development of housing to accommodate the workers and their families. In 1953 the Seattle Housing Authority (SHA) took over ownership of Holly Park from the Federal government and converted the development to low-income housing. In the 1940s and 1950s most Holly Park residents had been white, with a small number of African Americans. By 1993, the racial makeup was 18% white, 33% African American, and the remaining 49% were comprised of Hispanic, Asian, Native American, and other racial minorities. In 1994 the Department of Housing and Urban Development granted the city \$47.1 million to rebuild Holly Park, which was considered the "most degraded and degrading" of the three developments originally built to house military industry workers.

Ms. Jaeger said due to the practice of redlining and racial restrictive covenants, in the early decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century the minority populations of Seattle were essentially shoehorned into portions of the Central District and into Chinatown and Nihonmachi (Japan Town)—now collectively known as the Chinatown-International District. Beacon Hill, thanks to its less restrictive housing options, was an appealing draw to Asian and Asian American families who wanted more space while also maintaining proximity to the cultural hub of the International District. By around 1920 Beacon Hill was home to only three Japanese families. The Japanese Language School provided language instruction and served as a cultural hub for the community, and its location immediately north of Beacon Hill helped draw Japanese families to the neighborhood. In the 1920s Japanese people replaced Chinese as the most numerous non-white group in Seattle.

She said by the 1930s North Beacon Hill was home to many Japanese-owned business in North Beacon Hill. The forced relocation and incarceration of the Japanese community in 1942 resulted in houses and businesses being abandoned.

After World War II, the Japanese community was slow to redevelop. By 1964, however, Japanese American students made up 22.2% of the student body at Beacon Hill Elementary, and more than 50% by the early 2000s. Seattle was also home to a sizeable Filipino and Filipino American population, many of whom also moved to Beacon Hill from the International District. In the 1970s there was a rise in the numbers of Japanese and Chinese communities in Beacon Hill. The mid- and late 1970s saw an increase in immigrants to south Seattle from Southeast Asia, fleeing the aftermath of the Vietnam War. By the 1990s the neighborhood was a robust "multiracial zone" of "Asians of many nationalities, Blacks, Whites, Native Americans, and Latinos.

Ms. Jaeger said African American people have had a presence on Beacon Hill since the late 1860s, when businessman George Riley purchased approximately ten acres of land lying between S Lander and S Forest streets, and 19<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> Avenues S. In the 1920s and 1930s a handful of black families lived on Beacon Hill. Although the Supreme Court had ruled racial covenants unenforceable in 1948, de facto segregation remained, due to realtors' and white homeowners' unofficial refusal to sell homes to people of color. As such, Beacon Hill was by necessity a popular choice for African American families moving out of the Central District. During the 1990s, King County saw an increase of refugees and immigrants from East Africa, many of whom settled on Beacon Hill. East African Community Services, located in the New Holly Neighborhood Campus, located just east of the subject building, offers social and education support to refugees and their families. New Holly contains the largest number of Seattle Public School students living in public housing; of this subset, more than 65% are of East African descent.

She said in 1972 funding cuts to a federal anti-poverty program resulted in the City of Seattle eliminating the Adult Education program at South Seattle Community College (now South Seattle College). Angered at the loss of their educational home, approximately twelve Latino students, SCC faculty and staff, and supporters occupied the building that had formerly housed the Beacon Hill School. The school had moved to a new facility in 1971, and the 1904 building, designed by former District Architect James Stephen, was standing empty. The action was spearheaded by Mexican American activist Roberto Maestas, who had been selected to run the English as a Second Language (ESL) program at SCC. El Centro de la Raza, the group that was born out of the occupation, leased the building from the district for \$1 per year. Today El Centro de la Raza offers a multitude of services, including childcare, language programs, tutoring, cultural education workshops, healthcare and hunger outreach, community building and activism, environmental advocacy, and more. El Centro de la Raza eventually purchased the building.

Ms. Mirro said the school building typology is about plan organization, and style is applied. She said there are not many buildings using the Tudor style; it was applied later in the 1920's and 1930's and was used in Seattle early on. She said that in 1908 a fire in Ohio where 172 students were killed prompted change in how schools were built; there was movement from wood to fireproof schools. She said that the original school was built in 1909 and didn't conform to the district standards. She wasn't sure if construction was delayed but noted that no other wooden school were built after except for Maple School or temporary structures. After WWII there was a huge demand for schools, and they were built with a modernistic expression. Other area schools include Beacon Hill School (now El Centro), Original Van Asselt, Cleveland,

Van Asselt, Aki Kurose, Asa Mercer, Rainier View, Kimball, Dearborn Park, and the African American Academy.

She said the school may qualify for designation under Criterion D but that she didn't think the 1950 portion met any criteria. She said Edgar Blair was a district architect who began under James Stephens in 1906. He had more variety in his designs, and he used space in creative ways; many of his outstanding works are his schools. Jones and Bindon designed the 1950 addition. Other buildings designed by them include the Civil Engineering Building, University of Washington, Seattle, WA; Electrical Engineering Building, University of Washington, Seattle, WA; Student Union Building, University of Washington, Seattle; Conibear Shell house, University of Washington, Seattle; Van Asselt Elementary School, Seattle, WA; University Congregational Church, Seattle; Office building for American Telephone & Telegraph Company, Seattle; Equipment building for Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Company, Seattle, among others. She said the neither the 1909 nor the 1950 building is highly visible and may not meet Criterion F.

Mr. Treffers asked about the 1950's building - alteration to the cornice (fascia).

Ms. Mirro said they added rigid insulation in 2011 and noted it is a pretty common alteration.

Ms. Johnson asked if Queen Anne Elementary School was built at the same time as the original building and what other school buildings from that era still exist.

Board members noted John B. Allen, Old John Hay, University Heights, and Interlake school buildings.

Mr. Treffers asked if bond measures were associated with 1950s building.

Ms. Jaeger said they were struggling to accommodate student fluctuation.

Ms. Barker wanted more information about that.

Mr. Treffers asked if any 1950 article mentioned the 1909 building.

Mr. Coney said an elevator was installed in the building in 2002 so they were still using it. He said they moved to another facility so now it is a temporary school.

Public Comment:

Jennifer Kovach, Assistant Principal of Van Asselt School, said the subject school buildings closed in 2009 and students were moved to the African American Academy. She said all the conflict and pain of those decisions was not mentioned. She said the 1909 building has been empty for a while. She noted her current school's desire to no longer be called Van Asselt. She said they love their new home in the African American Academy Building. She said the subject property became known as Old Van Asselt. She said these buildings are amazing and have cultural significance. She said this is Duwamish land and the 1909 and 1950 buildings are not actually on the Van Asselt claim. She said she looked at plat maps and this was Maple land; Henry Van Asselt

married a Maple. Henry became a cabinet maker. She said he was a great farmer and marksman and interacted with Chief Sealath. She said the claim is important. She said Van Asselt's descendent, Marlys, has given permission to remove the Van Asselt name from their current school location. She said that Cecile Hanson, Duwamish Chairperson, attended Van Asselt and lived in the projects. She reiterated this is Duwamish land and the landmark nomination offers an opportunity to tell stories. She said there are few like this. She said this is further south than Beacon Hill – it is more Rainier Valley. She said the school is culturally significant and culturally diverse.

Angela McKay said the site is further south than reported. She said that Van Asselt and Maple staked claims on Duwamish land before Denny. She said they were the first settlers. She said they logged trees on Beacon Hill and sent them to Yesler's Mill. Van Asselt was a key figure in Seattle history. She said that Olmsted designed the boulevard system for Beacon Hill and it still exists. She said the 1909 Van Asselt building stands out and it is sad to see it boarded up. She said the 1909 headmistress was transferred to another school because of men returning from WWII and needing jobs. She said after the war, Holly Park transferred to Seattle Housing Authority. She said a cabinet built by Henry Van Asselt and owned by A. A. Denny is at MOHAI. She noted adjacent development and noted the importance of holding on to history. She said her house was sold to her as a 'tear-down'; it is an original 1919 farmhouse which she still lives in. She said that Japanese and Japanese-Americans did not abandon their properties in the 1940s, they were forcibly removed.

Jeff Murdock, Historic Seattle, supported nomination of both buildings. He said the 1909 building has integrity. The 1950 building is a significant mid-century suburb school form. He noted its stretched-out linear plan, horizontal features, and cantilevered roofline.

Four letters of public comment were received by staff and provided to board members.

Mr. Treffers supported nomination and said the 1909 building has integrity and is a clear case. He said the 1940 additions don't detract. He supported inclusion of the interiors as well and noted the stairways and classrooms. He said the 1950 building has integrity issues but is a unique rambling linear form. He said the replacement of windows and roof form detract. He said there are only three buildings of this era designated in the City. He asked if it was associated with a bond measure and noted it was one of the earlier post war schools maybe one of the first in the area. He noted the public comment which noted cultural significance. He said Van Asselt was a significant individual, but the school was built after his death, so it is recognition in name only.

Mr. Coney said he agrees with Mr. Treffers. He supported nomination of the 1909 building; he noted the integrity of the wood style architecture. He supported inclusion of the interior. He noted the impressive windows. He said the 1950s building is nice in the early pictures, but just OK now; he would support nomination of it just for further assessment.

Ms. Johnson supported nomination. She said the 1909 building is unusual for the area and she wondered how many others still exist. She said it is remarkable and intact and she supported inclusion of interiors for consideration. She said the 1950 building is OK but there are better examples of schools of that era. She said the form is still legible, but the loss of windows impacts it.

Mr. Guo supported nomination of the 1909 building especially. He said the association with Van Asselt is not strong; his land was not that close. He supported inclusion of interior.

Mr. Hodgins supported nomination of interior and exterior of 1909 building. He said the 1950 building is interesting that it is not connected to the original building and the original building was not knocked down. He said the original window block was cool, but it has been lost.

Ms. Barker supported nomination of 1909 and 1950 buildings, including the interior of the 1909 building. She said the size of the parcel has been that way for a long time – it is a huge site. She said she was intrigued why the 1950 building was crammed in where it was, and they didn't take advantage of the large parcel. She wanted to know the rationale for placement of the 1950 building. She suggested inclusion of interiors on 1909 and 1950 buildings and to include the 1940 additions.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the (original) Van Asselt School at 7201 Beacon Avenue South 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 entire interior and exterior of the 1950 school building; the entire interior and exterior of the 1909 school building; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for May 15, 2019; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/ST/GH            6:0:0    Motion carried.

## **032019.6**

### **BRIEFING**

032019.61

#### Sheridan Apartments and Griffin Building

2005 and 2011 Fifth Avenue

Briefing on proposed development

Ian Morrison, McCullough Hill Leary, said they are working through SDCI. He said ARC suggested to bring this to the full board.

Ellen Mirro, The Johnson Partnership, said the building is an old business college; the 1927 Griffin Building was designated under criteria C, D, and E; the 1915 Sheridan Apartments Building was designated under criteria D and E.

Lee Loveland provided context and orientation to the site with visual images of the street. He went over design iterations to date and noted two design options would be presented today.

Mr. Morrison noted the importance of Landmark board support.

Joel Riehl explained that two vocabularies were used to deal with tower massing and were inspired by early high rises – the early forests.

1. Stacks of cedar lumber to inform massing of tower; works with cantilever, creates interest and outdoor spaces; up to 160' level; setback on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue at 20'. Visual representation as seen from the street, how setbacks work. Parking – flush with setback.

Mr. Coney asked about relationship to Vulcan Building as shown on page 14.

Mr. Riehl said it is based on MUP representation.

Ms. Barker noted the Vulcan building jogging to the top.

Mr. Riehl said they are doing something similar but with a slight angle.

Ms. Barker asked if they could bring in the Vulcan plan.

Mr. Riehl said they don't have it.

Mr. Morrison asked the design team to walk through the separation.

Mr. Riehl said there is 45' tower separation. He said on the south the tower is off the Griffin for the first 160' and there is setback on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue 20' over the Sheridan.

2. Tall sailing ships with billowing sails; the idea of cantilevering the building out is more interesting than cubic form. He noted the opportunities for outdoor space, mechanical, etc. He said the base elements remain the same. He noted the vertical separate between tower and historic building and said the cantilever happens gradually. He said the setbacks to the north are the same as Option 1.

Ms. Barker asked what happens underground.

Mr. Riehl said the newer part will be parking (the vacant lot and Sheridan building). He said parking is not required but is needed for the program.

Ms. Mirro said they want to get permission for developing and then work through how.

Mr. Treffers asked which concept complies more with the SOI.

Mr. Riehl said both do.

Ms. Mirro said she provided the team with information about differentiation and to take a modern approach to the design rather than mimic historic.

Mr. Riehl said they don't vary at street level.

Mr. Morrison said the design team is looking to the board for feedback on which, if either, is more successful with regard to SOI.

Mr. Riehl said they will use the new building to support the old; at the Sheridan new construction – not the first bay – would provide seismic support.

Public Comment:

Jeff Murdock, Historic Seattle, cited the SOI regarding scale. He said they are sacrificing one landmark for another and it isn't appropriate. He said that financial feasibility was used as rationale for decision-making.

Mr. Hodgins said it feels like a lot is going on that dwarfs the landmarks.

Mr. Hodgins said that options 1 -3 were financially not feasible. He said to max out the site; they need FAR and so maybe they are doing everything they can to get there. He preferred the sail option more because it feels more subtle and he preferred the street level better.

Mr. Coney said setting it off the Griffin and street is a positive; it blends with streetscape. He said there is a continuum with how much massing is above the landmark and how much is feasible. He said the City Code discusses financial feasibility on fair market value. He said it is possible fair market value is less than the purchase price. He said they need to discuss what fair market value is. He said it is a lot of massing. It is next to the monorail and may not be highly visible from the street. He said he was not overtly opposed and either one is acceptable. He said his concern is with the impacts to the landmark buildings.

Mr. Treffers said he has a hard time with a building on top that swallows the landmark. He said he was happy they backed off the Griffin building and allow it to read as it did historically. He said there is some recessed portion off the Sheridan and the cantilever over at least has breathing room. He said parking lot infill to mimic streetscape to maintain original height and scale is on the right track. He said the starting point should be the landmark.

Ms. Mirro asked if he preferred a modern expression of Beaux Arts.

Mr. Treffers said to go back and look at the landmark with acknowledgment of original building and the width of the bays – that should be the inspiration. The inspiration should be the buildings.

Ms. Johnson said at ARC part of the problem was talking about design of tower and if it is even acceptable to put tower there so wanted full board review. She said ARC asked for the step back off the corner. She said the streetscape responds to the landmark. She said the site is unusual with the monorail in front and it is hard to get a view. She noted Mr. Kiel said that once you are at 60' you might as well go 160'. She said the tower is possible because it is an unusual site. She said it is important the way effort has been made to respond to the rhythm of the historic building and the tower to be separate. She said the lumber option has too much happening but there is more of a separation of that from the ground.

Mr. Treffers said financial feasibility is a moot point. He said the tower will still be tall; we are looking at a very large addition.

Mr. Coney noted the Federal Reserve Building project where the whole thing is visible.

Mr. Hodgins said he has no problem with a tower whether it is two-story or maxed out; he appreciated the team working with the board and responding to comments. He said it steps

back but then pushes right back out; he asked is the happy medium. He said how much will the developer give up and where is the breaking point. He said just because you can, doesn't mean you should.

Mr. Guo preferred the 1<sup>st</sup> option and said it almost looks like a separate building. He said with the monorail on one side you can't really tell. He said the sail looks like a giant block on the building.

Ms. Barker said the sail theme makes more sense to her than Ballard lumber. She said to look to Union Square where they did waves, movement, and water more successfully. She said she was troubled with the overhang on Option 1; she said it disrespects the landmarks and is hostile. She said the sail has a smoother overhang and the building is not as threatened by it. She said by the parking lot the 3<sup>rd</sup> pattern is too distracting and to bring the sail to the ground. She said the monorail comes in at the second level of the landmark and that needs to be put on the drawing. She said to show all views. She said she is not a supporter of a tower on a landmark. She said they should maximize the vacant lot and asked by the set back is there. She said push the bulk to parking lot building around landmark. She didn't like the blockiness. She said some members are missing and some are not comfortable with any addition on a landmark. She said we are not there yet.

**032019.7 STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator