



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 125/18

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
City Hall
600 4th Avenue
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room
Wednesday, March 7, 2018 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker
Russell Coney
Kathleen Durham
Garrett Hodgins
Kristen Johnson
Nicole McKernan
Julianne Patterson
Steven Treffers

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Jordon Kiel

Vice-Chair Deb Barker called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

030718.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

January 3, 2018
Deferred.

January 17, 2018
Deferred.

030718.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

030718.21 Wilsonian Apartments
4700-4710 University Way NE
Proposed tenant signage and window film

Karen Wallace explained the space used to be occupied by another tenant; the proposed signage will be similar to what was there but will be a bit smaller. They will use the same frame, attachments, and same holes. She proposed installation of frosted film on window to 34” to screen the back of counter; window is 12” off ground. She said cabinets are below 4’ so will not impact transparency. She said on the south side a cigarette display will be hidden by film; transparency will be retained. She provided street level views of the building.

Ms. Doherty passed samples around and clarified drawings and placement of frosted film.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Coney said it replaces signage that was there and is actually a bit less; they reduced signage per Ms. Doherty’s suggestion.

Mr. Treffers supported what was proposed and said it is consistent with existing fastener holes. He said the windows are not original and the film is reversible.

Ms. Doherty said the film on the south wall was crossed out; the applicant wants it back in. She suggested motion indicate approval for that conditioned on SDCI approval.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed signage and window film at the Wilsonian Apartments, 4700-4710 University Way NE, as per the attached submittal, with the condition that the window film on the south side is approved by SDCI.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed signage and window film 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 is compatible with the massing, size and scale 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/RC/JP 8:0:0 Motion carried.

030718.3 NOMINATIONS

030718.31 University of Washington – Canoe House
365 Walla Walla Road NE

Mike McCormick, University of Washington, noted the struggle to utilize and maintain the historic value of the buildings and at the same time support their dynamic mission. He thanked staff for working with them to allow them to do this in a proactive and logical way. He said it is the canoe house now, but it could have a new use.

Matt Newman, Direction, Recreation, University of Washington, said they are happy the Shell House has been taken care of; it is 100 years old. He said it is used as storage for boats and thinks that it can be more.

Susan Boyle, BOLA, prepared and presented the nomination (full report in DON file). She said the building has been turned into an inspirational place to visit and it is internationally known. She provided context of the campus and the history of University of Washington which was originally located downtown. She said expansions in 1915 included addition of two large plaza areas with linkages. The Montlake cut opened for a ship canal and connection to Lake Union and Elliot Bay. She said the emergence of the Medical School had a huge impact on the school. After the war; the campus was completely changed. She said there was a large rise of students due to the availability of the GI bill, especially in engineering. She said there was expansion in medical school, science, and law programs. She said the business school broke away in 1948. By 1948, post war era, there was a new era of recreation. She said that canoeing was a prominent activity; a 2006 map shows east Montlake area as largely recreational.

She said that the Canoe House was built in 1918 as a seaplane hangar; it was designed by L. E. Gregory, a Puget Sound Naval Yard engineer. The building was typical, standardized and noted the truss, expanse of windows, framing and outrigger, and sliding doors. She said it was never used as a hangar. It remained publicly owned until 1964 when it was deeded to the university. She said the crew used the building from 1920 – 1949. She noted the vision and role that George Pocock played in the design of boats. She noted that the 88' x 122' rectilinear building still occupies the same site.

The massive paneled wood doors on the south side were designed to slide open on metal tracks, supported above by horizontal outriggers, to provide a clear opening 70' wide and approximately 20' tall. These doors have been fixed in place in more recent years. There is a passage door within the lower panel of one of the sliding doors. A second passage door, located at the west end of the south façade, was removed and infilled at some point. Originally, there were six pairs of 9:9-light wood windows on the east façade, while on the west there were four identical pairs plus two smaller sets in the southern two bays, where the office and restroom would have been located. Another four pairs of these large wood windows light the north façade. The upper half of each of the sliding doors was also glazed with panels of divided lights to allow daylight into the interior of the hangar.

Ms. Boyle reported that in 1922, when the mezzanine was added at the north end to accommodate boat-building space for Pocock, a continuous clerestory window was inserted along the upper portion of the north façade. The space was accessed directly from outside, by an exterior stair that led to a door just east of center. This exterior stair and door were later removed, and the original window restored. At

some point, a shed addition was made to the northern end along the west side, resulting in alteration of the original west window openings. That shed addition was later removed, and windows/openings were restored.

She said the structure appears to have been a single open volume when it was built, with the exception of a small office and restroom space at the southwest corner of the hangar. The mezzanine on the north end of the building is approximately 20' deep, with a floor constructed of 2x14 joists at 12" on-center with plywood sheathing. It is now accessed by a stair on the interior. At some point during the building's use as a canoe rental facility, a private apartment was created for the Canoe Master and his family at the southeast corner of the building, with an exterior exit stair. While the apartment was later removed and the volume re-opened, the wall dormers with smaller 1:1-light windows remain. A space approximately 20' wide along most of the west side is partitioned off from the main volume to accommodate separate boat storage, accessible directly from the outside by a pair of doors near the west end of the north façade.

Ms. Johnson disclosed that her husband works for LMN Architecture.

Ms. McKernan asked if the sliding doors are still operable.

Ms. Boyle said the support hanger and embedded railing are there, but the doors have been fixed shut for some time.

Mr. Coney said Hangar 9 in San Antonio is supposed to be the oldest hangar; he wondered if this one might be older and if any others exist.

Ms. Boyle said the wood framed ones have largely been replaced.

Ms. Barker said to check out the seaplane hangar at NAS Whidbey.

Ms. Coney asked for more detail on changes that have been made inside and out.

Ms. Boyle said interior has the most changes; she noted the mezzanine construction, the installation and removal of the apartment, the locker room.

Ms. Patterson asked if the mezzanine shown in figures 25 and 26 is the same one where Pocock worked.

Ms. Boyle said she thought it was.

Mr. Newman said it was added for Pocock's shop.

Ms. Barker asked if Pocock did his work upstairs, leaving the ground floor open.

Ms. Boyle said Pocock had to build a new building.

Public Comment:

Daniel James Brown, author of *Boys in the Boat*, read from Chapter 12 of the novel:

The loft was bright and airy, with morning light pouring in from two large windows in the back wall. The air was thick with the sweet-sharp scent of marine varnish. Drifts of sawdust and curls of wood shavings lay on the floor. A long I beam stretched nearly the full length of the loft, and on it lay the framework of an eight-oared shell under construction.

Pocock started off by explaining the various tools he used. He showed Joe wood planes, their wooden handles burnished by decades of use, their blades so sharp and precise they could shave off curls of wood as thin and transparent as tissue paper. He handed him different old rasps and augers and chisels and files and mallets he'd brought over from England. Some of them, he said, were a century old. He explained how each kind of tool had many variations, how each file, for instance, was subtly different from another, how each served a different function, but all were indispensable in the making of a fine shell. He guided Joe to a lumber rack and pulled out samples of the different woods he used – soft, malleable sugar pine, hard yellow spruce, fragrant cedar, and clear white ash. He held each piece up and inspected it, turning it over and over in his hands, and talked about the unique properties of each and how it took all of them contributing their individual qualities to make a shell that would come to life in the water. He pulled a long cedar plank from a rack and pointed out the annual growth rings. Joe already knew a good deal about the qualities of cedar and about growth rings from his time splitting shakes with Charlie McDonald, but he was drawn in as Pocock began to talk about what they meant to him.

Joe crouched next to the older man and studied the wood and listened intently. Pocock said the rings told more than a tree's age; they told the whole story of the tree's life over as much as two thousand years. Their thickness and thinness spoke of hard years of bitter struggle intermingled with rich years of sudden growth. The different colors spoke of the various soils and minerals that the tree's roots encountered, some harsh and stunting and some rich and nourishing. Flaws and irregularities told how the trees endured fires and lightning strikes and windstorms and infestations and yet continued to grow.

As Pocock talked, Joe grew mesmerized. It wasn't just what the Englishman was saying, or the soft, earthy cadence of his voice, it was the calm reverence with which he talked about the wood-as if there was something holy and sacred about it-that drew Joe in. The wood, Pocock murmured, taught us about survival, about overcoming difficulty, about prevailing over adversity, but it also taught us something about the underlying reason for surviving in the first place. Something about infinite beauty, about undying grace, about things large and greater than ourselves. About the reasons we were all here.

"Sure, I can make a boat," he said, and then added, quoting the poet Joyce Kilmer, "But only God can make a tree."

Pocock pulled out a thin sheet of cedar, one that had been milled down to three-eighths of an inch for the skin of a shell. He flexed the wood and had Joe do the same. He talked about the camber and the life it imparted to a shell when wood was put under tension. He talked about the underlying strength of the individual fibers in cedar and how, coupled with their resilience, they gave

the wood its ability to bounce back and resume its shape, whole and intact, or how, under steam and pressure, they could take a new form and hold it forever. The ability to yield, to bend, to give way, to accommodate, he said, was sometimes a source of strength in men as well as in wood, so long as it was helmed by inner resolve and by principle.

He took Joe to one end of the long I beam on which he was constructing the frame for a new shell. Pocock sighted along the pine keep and invited Joe to do the same. It had to be precisely straight, he said, for the whole sixty-two-foot length of the board, not a centimeter of variance from one end to the other or the boat would never run true. And in the end that trueness could only come from its builder, from the care with which he exercised his craft, from the amount of heart he put into it.

Pocock paused and stepped back from the frame of the shell and put his hands on his hips, carefully studying the work he had for far done. He said for him the craft of building a boat was like religion. It wasn't enough to master the technical details of it. You had to give yourself up to it spiritually; you had to surrender yourself absolutely to it. When you were done and walked away from the boat, you had to feel that you had left a piece of yourself behind in it forever, a bit of your heart. He turned to Joe. "Rowing," he said, "is like that. And a lot of life is like that too, the parts that really matter anyway. Do you know what I mean, Joe?" Joe, a bit nervous, not at all certain that he did, nodded tentatively, went back downstairs, and resumed his sit-ups, trying to work it out.

Mr. Brown said the Pocock story is so representative about what is best about Seattle.

Judy Rantz, daughter of Joe Rantz, the #7 seat on the 1936 UW crew read from her letter:

In 1936 a team of nine boys from the University of Washington arrived in Hitler's Germany as the American Olympic eight-oar crew. And they pulled off a win that should never have happened. Those rowers were a group of sophomores and juniors – pitted against seasoned, government sponsored teams. They were assigned lane six, the outside lane – most exposed to the wind and commonly accepted to impose about a two-length handicap over the boat in lane one – which was assigned to the Germans. Trying to keep their shell straight in the wind, they missed the drop of the starter's flag and got off the line a stroke and a half later. Their stroke oar – the pace setter – was ill with what was probably walking pneumonia. Shortly into the 2,000-meter race he phased out – became unaware of his surroundings.

It wasn't until the last 500 meters or so that the stroke oar snapped back to awareness and began to respond to the coxswain's call to pick up the pace. It should have been too late. But their skill as a team, their wicked-fast racing shell, and the bonding between them which would not allow any of them to let the others down, enabled them to pull off an impossible win. In front of Adolph Hitler. By six tenths of a second.

Where did this amazing team come from? Not from any of the prestigious rowing programs of colleges back east. They trained right here in what was then the backwater town of Seattle, in an old building built to house seaplanes at the end of WWI. We are talking about that building today. Known then as the ASUW Shell House. A building which not only served as the training center for decades of Husky oarsmen but also housed the workshop of George Pocock. Racing shells built in his workshop were unsurpassed in speed and structure. They were used by colleges across the country and by Olympic competitors for decades.

And for decades also, in this shell house, the boys training for crew were privy to the wise counsel of George Pocock- a man who understood both the dynamics of rowing and the dynamics of the human soul. This is the boat house we want to preserve. Imbued with the history of the Husky rowing program and the legacy of George Pocock. We ask you to support our petition to give Landmark status to the University of Washington Canoe House- best known as the old ASUW Shell House.

Lenville O'Connell, said he rowed at UW and goes by the Shell house every day. He noted the historical significance of the building. He said it is the birthplace of modern American rowing. George Pocock is the godfather of American rowing; he constructed every winning rowing shell; had a tremendous influence on rowing. He said he interviewed Bob Will, who choked up when he talked about George Pocock and what he meant to every young man. Rowing was one of the most popular sports in Seattle and this building is a 'cathedral' to rowing. He said it is now a destination – people come to see it; there is a tour for the building. He said the building is the ASUW Shell House.

Jeff Murdock spoke on behalf of Historic Seattle in support of nomination. He said the building meets A, B, C, D, and F. He said rarely is Criterion C used and now it is for a humble building with a great novel behind it to convey the story.

Michael Herschensohn noted the critical link of lowering the ship canal. He said the building is visible from the new Montlake Bridge. He said he was glad UW was here to support nomination and noted it is a landmark day at the Landmarks board. He said it is a significant and marvelous transformation.

Kendra Canton, UW, recognized the indigenous land of the Muckleshoot / Coast Salish tribes and noted it was purchased from them for \$1.00.

Melanie Barstowe said she was a UW rower 2012 – 16 and that she loves the building. She said it has been untouched for 100 years and pays tribute to generations that have gone before. She leads tours of the building.

Al McKenzie brought photos. He said he is involved with the Pocock Foundation and rowing. He said Pocock's shop was on the mezzanine. He noted Pocock's rowing legacy. He said the building is in similar condition as it was when he rowed in 1965 and the same use continues. He said Pocock was awarded Sportsman of the Year. He said the ASUW Shell Building warrants recognition; it is a major landmark.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Treffers said it is clear cut and he supported nomination. He thanked the UW staff members and Ms. Boyle for the nomination. He said the report and public comment were interesting. The building is unique and significant. He supported including exterior, interior roof volume and truss and site. He asked for more information on seaplane hangars; he said it is a rare and unique resource.

Ms. McKernan thanked all public commenters and Mr. Brown. She noted overwhelming support for this deserving building. She supported inclusion of interior truss, exterior, and site.

Mr. Hodgins said it is such an easy decision and he thanked all commenters. He wants to hear more about Pocock and have a tour as well. He supported nomination.

Ms. Johnson supported nomination but noted Criterion E is not appropriate. She said it would be nice if all had a wonderful book to go along. She wants more information on the interior.

Ms. Patterson said it was a fun nomination to read and it is easy to support nomination. She appreciated the public comment especially the comments about Pocock and she appreciated Dan Brown reading from his book. She said the Pocock story is the most significant in the overall story. She said there were changes to interior, and addition of mezzanine. She thanked the UW for stewardship and the nomination.

Mr. Coney appreciated UW participation and for the public comment. He said it is easy to support. He wanted more information about Olympics. He wanted to know how much women participated and other participants in the Olympic squads. He said he wanted to tie it in with the lowering of Lake Washington and he wanted more information on seaplane hangars.

Ms. Durham appreciated the stewardship of the building. She noted a seaplane hangar at Puget Sound Naval Shipyards. She noted the unique relevance of seaplanes and Navy in the northwest. She appreciated the history of the crew and Pocock. She supported nomination based on Staff recommendation.

Ms. Barker echoed the other board comments. She thanked the UW staff for bringing the application forward and for Ms. Boyle's work. She said it means a lot to the preservation world and the path forward. She said it was a great report. She wanted more information and noted the amazing contrast of heavy timber; a tree dissected to make this huge volume. She said much of the building's claim to fame is boats, sails, and think boat shells. She wanted a picture of boat building and comparison of skin of board and massiveness of building. She said to nominate the entire exterior and interior and 20' around the exterior.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the University of Washington Canoe House / US Naval Training Hangar at 3655 Walla Walla Road NE 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; the interior of the building; and a portion of the site around the building perimeter measured twenty feet out from base of the building; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be

scheduled for April 18, 2018; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/GH/JP 8:0:0 Motion carried.

030718.32 University of Washington – Mackenzie Hall
4215 East Stevens Way NE

Susan Boyle, BOLA, prepared and presented the nomination report (full report in DON file). She provided context of the site and noted the campus plan started in this area. She said in 1959 McKenzie Hall, designed by Kitchin and Christenson, and Balmer Hall, designed by Ralph Decker and Paul Kirk, were constructed as Unit 1 and 2, respectively. She said that the buildings were rifting on a similar pattern of design: vertical, concrete frame, based on 9' foot module, first floor holds in from perimeter. She said the raised plinth idealized the topography that slopes to south. She said the offices on the upper floors are narrow and small. She said the first floor is curtain wall; the rest is not. She said there are double loaded corridors in the wider bays; single loaded corridors in the narrow bays. She said the two buildings are visually connected at entry doors. She said the conceptual plan showed a lot of vegetation and that in the courtyard, a 15' cylindrical planter was called out. The 1967 George Tsutekawa fountain is not part of the nomination. She noted the change of styles on the campus and said the new buildings adopted some of the colors of adjacent Collegiate Gothic but not the style. She said in the late 1930's new young architects embraced Modernism; after the war saw the ascendance of Modernism.

Ms. Boyle said that when parking lot was expanded, the entry sequence was changed. She said there is a small storage space beneath the plinth. The forecourt was shortened. She said the building design, 16' x 10' columns and 4 ½" concrete slabs, was a simple concept; columns identify the entry. She said there are three staircases, two within and one projects outside; they are modestly expressed on the outside. She noted the cantilevered corner and gold mosaic tile. She said the first-floor interior had the most change; the volume is the same but there are more partitions. She said the terrazzo floor is the same. She went over other Modern buildings on the campus including UW Faculty Club, Suzzallo Library addition; Sieg Hall, Wilcox Hall, Wilson Ceramics, among others. Other Modern office buildings in Seattle include NBBJ, Logan Building, AOUW, Seattle City Light, Pacific Architect and Building, and Shannon and Wilson, among others. She said this building vocabulary is similar to that use at the US Post Office in Queen Anne.

She said that Mackenzie Hall was designed by Decker, Christenson & Kitchin, Architects & Engineers. The multi-disciplinary firm provided both the architectural and the structural design. Original drawings for Balmer Hall indicate that building was designed by Decker & Christenson, AIA, Architects, and Paul Hayden Kirk, AIA, & Associates. The local chapter of the AIA recognized several other projects between 1950 and 1970, including Vernell's Fine Candies, Seattle Central Library, West Coast Phone Company (Everett), Star Machinery. They used similar vocabulary frequently.

Ms. Boyle said the building did not meet criteria A, B, or C. She said it was constructed to meet the growing needs of the business school and was part of a two-building assembly. She said the other post war buildings were built to host programs. It is only associated in a general way. She said it did not meet Criterion D; it exhibits some elements. She said the cladding, fenestration, and bay spacing are ill-proportioned and unresolved. She said the glazing at the first floor turns inward. She said it did not meet criteria E or F.

Ms. Patterson asked about the material between the windows.

Ms. Boyle said it is spandrel material and vertical panels of concrete aggregate; there is no vitreous material.

Mr. Hodgins asked how many other buildings of this type have courtyard space.

Ms. Boyle said the Faculty Club has a similar courtyard. She said that others have indentations that are treated as courtyard. She said this is the only one that has this kind.

Ms. McKernan said that Gould has a sunken courtyard student space.

Mr. Treffers asked if they looked at the survey or for National Register-eligible buildings.

Ms. Boyle said they looked at historical context remove, resources evaluation, recommendations as contributing to district or not; they do not have DAHP recommendations.

Ms. Doherty said the survey eligibility was just for the National Register.

Mr. Treffers said if not listed as National Register eligible it was identified as contributing.

Ms. Boyle said as a team they did surveys and discussed evaluation and thought it was better to have the same language and not go into details.

Ms. Sodt said the campus is eligible as a historic district; she said they were not talking about a district of Mid-century buildings, just a central campus district.

Mr. Treffers said they looked at the historic development of the school and this is part of that.

Ms. Sodt said yes.

Ms. Barker asked about skybridge.

Ms. Boyle said it was constructed when Unit 2 was built; both buildings had an entry opposite. The skybridge was an extruded box; it was removed.

Ms. Barker asked about the memorial for Ivar Haglund.

Ms. Boyle said that was the result of a donation.

Ms. Boyle said it is a plaque.

Ms. Barker asked about the list of changes and noted that most are basic tenant improvements; the building is intact.

Ms. Boyle concurred; most changes are to interior.

Mr. Coney said it is still occupied and has the same use.

Julie Blakeslee, University of Washington, said it used to be a more active area but now it is largely offices and is not used for teaching.

Public Comment:

Jeff Murdock spoke on behalf of Historic Seattle and noted supported for nomination; he cited criteria D and E. He said to look at it in a narrower history. He said the building was constructed during a period of rapid growth and expansion in the 1950's – 1960's. He said it is a design adaptation of a corporate building adapted for educational use. He said it stands alone, conveys integrity, is intact, has courtyard surround by building. He noted the different feel once in the courtyard; he noted the sculptural shapes of plants against structural rigor of architecture. He said the building still tells its story.

Ms. Doherty clarified the recommended features of the building and the boundary of the site.

Mr. Coney said these buildings are not as revered as American Gothic, Collegiate Gothic styles. He said the building maintains its square donut courtyard, has the same use. He supported nomination.

Ms. Patterson said the black and white photos of the building were much more compelling than those in color. As built, it has Modernist components, but the style is dependent on materiality. She said the board has the unique opportunity to look at the campus as a whole and it is valid to consider other Modern buildings on campus; there are several strong ones on campus and this is not one. She did not support nomination.

Ms. McKernan said it is an inward-focused building with corporate architecture. She said the focus is on its occupants; it is not welcoming. She said the increased parking diminished the significance and it is hard to tell the entry. She said the courtyard is only viewed from offices, not even from hallways. She said it is inconsistent in design and doesn't embody a style. She said if nominated she would want to hear more about the connection to the Balmer Building, but that she would not support nomination.

Mr. Treffers said it is a challenging one, but he would support nomination to learn more about the context of Modernism at UW. He said Corporate Modern is an apt descriptor; it was built for the Business School and corporate is reflected. He said the courtyard is unique to other Modernist Buildings at UW.

Ms. Durham said the building meets the textbook definition, the elements are clear and precise, but there is no significance; she noted the loss of Balmer and that connection. She wondered about the context of this building across the entire campus and how the Modern Buildings relate to one another. She said this should be looked at relative to other Modern Building. She did not support nomination.

Mr. Hodgins said the building has not aged well; it is ill proportioned, inconsistent and is not a landmark. He said it is a corporate building-turned-into-business-school. He did not support nomination.

Ms. Barker supported nomination and said the building has remarkable integrity. She noted the quiet quality of a background building with modern form. She said it slides in between Gothic and Brutalist. She said she was saddened she couldn't look at this with the Balmer Building still there but noted it can stand on its own. She didn't like the color of the aggregate. She appreciated Ms. Boyle's comments about looking at things that were slightly off. She said it is an intriguing square donut.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of University of Washington Mackenzie Hall at 4215 East Stevens Way NE 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; and a portion of the site around the building perimeter defined by the existing north edge of the north plaza, and measured five feet out from the base of the east, south and west concrete retaining walls, including the internal courtyard and perimeter breezeways; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for April 18, 2018; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/ST/RC 3:4:0 Motion failed. Mmes. Patterson, McKernan, and Durham, and Mr. Hodgins opposed.

Mr. McCormick thanked the board for the thorough discussion.

030718.4 BRIEFING

030718.41 American Meter and Appliance Building
1001-1005 Westlake Avenue North
Briefing on massing of proposed addition

Jessica Clawson explained that opinion from ARC was evenly split on options presented; they want more input from the full board.

Joe Herrin explained the proposal to add an addition to the landmarked building and turn it into a boutique hotel which offers the best opportunity for successful proforma. He noted the adjacency to Lake Union. He said they presented four massing schemes at ARC; two were dismissed. He discussed the complexity of the site; the front part of the parcel – 1,250 square feet – is unused. Scheme 2 shows a four-story atrium at the unused part of the parcel; glass will be transparent. He cited local precedent of the addition to be added to Federal Reserve Building.

Mr. Hodgins said the deck image on page 19 looks razor thin and asked how thick it will actually be.

Mr. Herrin said it is not fully developed yet but it will be differentiated.

Ms. Patterson asked if the clear glass as shown in the atrium will be doable with the energy code.

Mr. Herrin said that is the next level of development.

Ms. Patterson said it seems critical; if it isn't as transparent as shown, the board is being asked to approve something that won't happen.

Ms. Clawson said that is further down the line; they have worked successfully with energy code issues in the past.

Mr. Patterson said she wants to know that in evaluating a scheme.

Mr. Coney asked if the preferred concept is the atrium.

Owner said they want the atrium but like the other direction as well; they could go either way.

Responding to question about trees, Mr. Herrin said there will be a curb bulb at the end where there will be an opportunity for landscaping; this is where a buffer is desired.

Public Comment:

Jeff Murdock spoke on behalf of Historic Seattle and cited Preservation Brief 14. He said the biggest issue is compatibility. He said the scale is overwhelming. He suggested set back. He preferred scheme with no glass over the historic building. He wondered about the financial modeling. He said this is a prime location by the lake and they could afford a different assumption for cash flow. He said the more the historic building is exposed they way it has been, the better.

Ms. Barker suggested looking at Palladian, Vintage Park, Camlin for comparisons. She said she didn't think the numbers are realistic. She said she didn't see an apples for apples comparison of a warehouse conversion to hotel and what room counts are.

Mr. Herrin said having their business model is for a boutique hotel and the intent is to get room count up. He said the average hotel room size is 400 square feet; here it will be 290 square feet, which is a New York City size room.

Mr. Treffers appreciated the review. He said it is a very difficult site and he said he struggled with the SOI and how to add an addition. He said he is not in support of rooftop additions this size but Scheme F looks better than the other. He said the F opens up the landmark and frames it; you can still read the original building. He said all things considered it will be a compromise; they are on the right track. He said Option F highlights/frames the building in a way the others have not.

Ms. Patterson said options E and F are more attractive; she preferred the Pearl in Shell. She said Option F has the ground floor addition; she would rather get rid of the roof there as it seems random. Regarding the Pearl in Shell, she said that it is hard to believe that the glass will be that transparent and thinks it will end up being a blue or black box and we won't be able to see the historic building. She said she needs to know what will be allowed.

Ms. Durham said the composition with atrium works better and looks intentional. It is a difficult design problem. She said the massing is what it is.

Mr. Treffers said that Option F brings in other forms. He said the first floor feels intentional and forms are carried through in design. He supported mimicking columns that may be in building.

Ms. McKernan asked how much will be in shadow during the day.

Mr. Herrin said that the north façade never gets sun.

Ms. McKernan agreed that the rectilinear addition is more in line with the typology of the building. She said she keeps seeing support rather than the landmark; the atrium will focus on the landmark.

Mr. Coney said he leaned toward exposing the north façade but mimicking columns of the landmark. He said to pull the gasket in a little and to articulate from north to south. He said it is a heavy box and said to lighten it up. He said he was OK with no atrium. He liked the way it is going. He noted the pulled in upper floor with balcony.

Ms. Patterson noted page 11 and said atrium or not, line up horizontal and vertical with existing building.

Mr. Herrin said it needs to land on structure of landmark which sets up structural rigor.

Ms. Barker said the Pearl in Shell feels monstrous; it is awkward and precedent setting. She said she likes the 'Plop on Top'. She said they are trying to cram in too much.

Mr. Hodgins said his only concern is the north façade. The glass may or may not obstruct but he is leaning toward Option F.

Ms. Clawson said it is a split decision again.

Ms. Patterson said to work with cantilever.

Ms. Doherty suggested they look at V-shaped frame as an alternative.

Ms. Barker said try landscaping to meet goals, or a prow.

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator