



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 472/17

### MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting  
City Hall  
600 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room  
Wednesday, July 5, 2017 - 3:30 p.m.

#### Board Members Present

Deb Barker  
Russell Coney  
Kathleen Durham  
Garrett Hodgins  
Robert Ketcherside  
Jordon Kiel  
Kristen Johnson  
Julianne Patterson  
Steven Treffers  
Emily Vyhnanek

#### Staff

Sarah Sodt  
Erin Doherty  
Melinda Bloom

#### Absent

Matthew Sneddon

Chair Jordan Kiel called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

**070517.1**      **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**  
May 3, 2017 and May 17, 2017  
Deferred.

**070517.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

070517.21 University Heights  
5031 University Way NE  
Proposed chimney alterations and selective removal

Matt Hamel, BOLA, explained proposed building envelope repairs. He said that one original chimney has been removed and two are still visible above the roof. He said they are unreinforced masonry; both are located near the ridge line making bracing complicated and visually obtrusive. They propose to remove the non-functioning chimney on the west side, and rebuild the more prominent central chimney. He said the height of the chimney has been altered. He said they will salvage and reuse the brick as a veneer matching the historic details. He said they will remove the north chimney entirely, down through the attic space. He said they will salvage the bricks and palletize them for storage and future use. He said they will retain the roof as-is with improved flashings.

Ms. Doherty said the flashing details were reviewed administratively as part of a larger in-kind repair and maintenance project.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Treffers said ARC reviewed and thought the approach was reasonable. Retaining brick for salvage is a good approach and the central chimney reconstruction meets the SOIS.

Mr. Coney said it improves symmetry.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for chimney alterations and selective removal at the former University Heights Elementary School, 5031 University Way NE, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed central chimney alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 125216, 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 proposed north chimney removal will affect the features specified in Ordinance No. 125216, but the applicant has demonstrated the necessity to remove it for improved safety, and has documented that it has been significantly altered in the past.

3. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/DB/RK 10:0:0 Motion carried.

070517.22

Garfield High School

400 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue

Proposed installation of four portable classrooms

Mr. Kiel recused himself.

Mike Barrett, Seattle Public Schools, explained the need for four additional portables. He said that they proposed to put them on the east side between athletic field and east façade; there are portable classrooms there now. He said mechanical equipment faces toward the south; egress pathways go out to field; one of the classrooms is separated from the others by a pathway. They will add aluminum platforms, ramps, and stairs. Responding to questions he said they have no sunset date for the installation although there are other solutions coming. He said they would like to be able to remove them without coming back for review.

Mr. Ketcherside asked if there will be impacts to parking.

Mr. Barrett said there will be no modifications to curbs. He said there will be some concrete platforms, seismic pins, and skirting. He said they will do in-kind patching at anchor points when they are removed in the future.

Ms. Patterson asked about the yellow annotations.

Mr. Barrett said they indicated traffic and connectivity back to main building.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Johnson said it is reasonable and there are already portables at this location.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the proposed portable classrooms at Garfield High School, 400 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed portable classrooms do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Report on Designation (LPB 242/03), as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is easily removed in the future without impairment to the

historic property, as per Standard #10 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.

2. The portable classroom buildings may be removed at any time in the future without review by the Landmarks Board, and the site will be repaired in-kind.
3. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/RC/RK 9:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel recused himself.

070517.23

Roosevelt High School

1410 NE 66<sup>th</sup> Street

Proposed installation of four portable classrooms

Mike Barrett explained the need for four additional portable classrooms bringing the total at this site to six. Installation will be in the same general area – west of the gym building, north of the athletic field. He said as part of the previous approval they had a sunset date of June 2019.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Coney said it is simpler and they don't impede anything.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the proposed portable classrooms at Roosevelt High School, 1410 NE 66<sup>th</sup> Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed portable classrooms do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Report on Designation (LPB 180/02), as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is easily removed in the future without impairment to the historic property, as per Standard #10 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. These portable classroom buildings, and those previously approved under Certificate of Approval LPB 495/16 will be removed before the end of July 2019, and the site will be repaired in-kind.
3. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/RC/JP 9:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel recused himself.

070517.24      Securities Building  
1900 Third Avenue  
Proposed signage

Ms. Sodt explained the proposal to switch out name on awning.

Mr. Treffers said it is a non-original awning and no original materials are impacted.

Ms. Doherty said they reused the connection points to the metal awning.

Mr. Ketcherside asked if it was the same size.

Ms. Barker said it is the same height, just a longer word.

Mr. Treffers said it is the same or very similar.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed signage, at the Securities Building, 1904 Third Avenue.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 123204 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/KJ/EV      10:0:0 Motion carried.

070517.25      Colonnade Hotel/Gatewood Apartments  
107 Pine Street  
Proposed exterior alterations

Keith Wilson, Gensler, provided an overview of the hotel and explained they proposal to put in a new storefront and hotel entry. He said the west side will remain as it is.

Ellen Mirro, The Johnson Partnership, said that all storefronts were installed in 1990.

Mr. Wilson indicated the light court and the context of the building to the parking lot. He said on the north they will put in a new awning, storefront, paint existing storefront and upper windows. He said that all wood windows on the north and west will be painted. He said that on the west they will put in a new awning, lighting, and paint storefronts and upper windows. He said they will paint the south façade and replace billboard lights. He said they will enlarge skylights in the light court and provide new access door on the roof with stair; they will add new painted structural brace frame and paint façade. He said they will put in new HVAC, electrical. He said they will add a metal canopy on the north and striped awnings at the storefronts. He said they will re-expose the keystone at the existing/original entry/ it will become a walk-up coffee window. Color samples and material specs were provided. Fabric awnings will be blue and cream and the restaurant canopy will be shallower, with a scalloped edge. The hotel entry will be delineated from the restaurant; it will have a different transom.

Ms. Mirro said that they are working with DAHP in order to get historic tax credits.

Mr. Wilson said they will leave the 1990 bracing. He said they will install new downlights at the entry alcove on the underside of a new metal canopy. He said that they will put in new globe lights at the front edge of the restaurant awning. He said the storefronts will be all wood. He said that on the west elevation there was a revision at the transom level; they explored HVAC options and determined that the best option was to put louvers there. They will be tucked up inside the awning space.

Ms. Mirro said they will only be visible if under the awning, looking up.

Ms. Barker asked if there will be hot air venting.

Mr. Wilson said it will be supply and release.

Ms. Barker asked about lighting.

Mr. Wilson showed examples of what will go under the canopy.

Ms. Mirro said the billboard lighting will replace what is there in kind; they will be suspended between structural bars.

Mr. Coney asked if the awnings are closable.

Ms. Mirro said they are removable; and they remain open.

Mr. Coney asked if brick work will be done.

Mr. Wilson said that they will assess it structurally. He said there is no need to repoint.

Mr. Coney asked if anyone has assessed brick; he said brick is porous.

Mr. Wilson said there is nothing dangerous.

Ms. Mirro said that sometimes cleaning does more harm.

Ms. Sordt said she can review cleaning administratively, if they come back with that.

Ms. Vyhnanek asked if they have examples of other upper level awnings.

Ms. Barker said that historically they are all over.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Johnson said that there is no canopy at the coffee window because they wanted to expose the keystone but otherwise it is straightforward.

Ms. Barker said the building is representative of the era of the Regrade where the north façade was chopped off. She said she appreciated the dignity applied to the changes. She appreciated the darker cornice and said the applicant was responsive to ARC.

Mr. Kiel said they applied a light touch to the storefronts.

Ms. Patterson asked about the north side windows.

Mr. Wilson said they are blocked now and will remain so.

Ms. Barker note the signed is in the old cornice level.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations, at the Colonnade Hotel/Gatewood Apartments, 107 Pine Street.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Designation Report as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.

2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/KJ/DB 10:0:0 Motion carried.

The following **Controls and Incentives** item was reviewed out of agenda order.

070517.52

Bleitz Funeral Home

316 Florentia Street

Request for an Extension to negotiations of Controls and Incentives

Ms. Doherty explained the request for an extension.

Ms. Barker commented they had just provided a good briefing to ARC.

Rich Hill said they requested an extension until November 15, 2017.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for Bleitz Funeral Home, 316 Florentia Street, until November 15, 2017.

MM/SC/DB/RK 10:0:0 Motion carried.

**070517.3**

**DESIGNATIONS**

070517.31

Sheridan Apartments

2011 Fifth Avenue

Rich Hill, McCullough Hill Leary, said the building was nomination unanimously. He asked the board not to designate.

Ellen Mirro, The Johnson Partnership, explained she would focus her presentation on responding to questions board members had at the nomination meeting. She provided an overview of the context of the building in Belltown and as it relates to the Denny Regrade. She reported that the Sheridan Apartments is an “H”- shaped, six-story terra cotta-clad apartment; almost all of the windows in the building have been replaced with aluminum sash sliding windows or aluminum sash fixed and awning windows. She said the terracotta surrounds and cladding are intact. The eastern façade of the building is the only façade clad in terra cotta. The entablature above the main entry consists of a white terra cotta frieze inscribed with the name “Wm D. Perkins”, the building developer. Above the frieze, a dentil band supports a larger cornice with rectangular modillions, capped by a bed course and crown molding. She said there is a light court on the south side. The roof is a flat membrane roof, with an access penthouse and small roof deck at the eastern side.

She said the entry way has been altered and doesn’t meet Code. She said the Alaskan marble, the stairs and the plaster work are original. At the top of the entry stair is the elevator area and original mailbox. She said there is no continuity of experience because of the new entry door; the entry doesn’t meet

ADA requirements and will need to meet code for the future use of the building. She said the original windows were 8/1 wood sash, the interiors have changed over time, and sprinklers were installed in 1974.

Ms. Mirro said the building did not meet criteria A or B. She noted the Ben Gifford of Death Cab for Cutie spent one year there but more than one year residence was needed to be significant. She said that she looked for more information on Hazel Bloss but there was no involvement in different tenants' rights legislation. She said the building did not meet Criterion C; it was built in 1915 before the second regrade. She said it was built in the line of fireproof buildings. She said the building could meet Criterion D for its Beaux Arts / American Renaissance style and detailed ornamentation but cited the Frye Hotel and Arctic Building as better examples. She said the building is a good example of David Dow's work and the building could meet Criterion E. She was doubtful the building could meet Criterion F.

Lee Loveland explained issues with entrance, landings and handrail and said there is no solution to resolve them to meet code requirements. She said that the upper lobby and rental lobby have no workable options to be brought up to code; it is a confined space which prevents options. She said a ramp is not viable.

Mr. Hill said that while the integrity is good, the building didn't meet any of the criteria in a significant way that would be worthy of designation.

Mr. Ketcherside asked when the door was installed.

Ms. Mirro said the door frame was shown in a 1937 photo.

Ms. Sodt said she did not recommend including interior because it is not accessible to public.

Mr. Kiel asked if it is significant to the significance of the building.

Responding to questions about Hazel Bloss, Ms. Mirro said she couldn't find anything more on her.

Mr. Treffers asked if the rooms were rented just to women.

Ms. Mirro said that the demographics show a high number of residents were women but there was no specific advertising to women.

Mr. Coney asked about Tiffany walls in largest unit.

Ms. Mirro wasn't aware of them and said they weren't there anymore.

Public Comment:

Steve Hall, Friends of Belltown, supported designation and called it a ‘slam dunk’.

Tiffany Jorgenson, Friends of Belltown, supported designation based on criteria C, D, and F. She said the building is intact and contributes to the neighborhood. She noted the association with initial period of City expansion, David Dow, and its location at a neighborhood crossroads. She said her grandparents lived in Belltown and cleaned apartments; she is the third-generation work force resident of the neighborhood and her daughter is the fourth.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Johnson supported designation on Criterion D; she noted the building’s classic, composed façade, beautiful terracotta. She said the building is distinctive. She was unsure of Criterion E. She was not supportive of including the interior because it was a challenge to the usability of the space.

Ms. Durham supported designation on Criterion D and said the Beaux-Arts façade is exceptional. She did not support E and said she did not know enough about David Dow. She did not support Criterion C.

Mr. Hodgins supported designation on Criterion D and noted the terracotta. He said that Dow did great work and he would like to see more. He did not support inclusion of interior.

Ms. Patterson supported designation on Criterion D and said that Beaux Arts style is unique on residential buildings. She supported inclusion of the interior with reasonable accommodation and said the board could be an asset in re-design. She supported Criterion E as well and noted David Dow.

Mr. Treffers supported designation on Criterion D and said there are not a lot of Beaux Arts with this level of terracotta. He did not support inclusion of interior; it is not as critical to convey significance.

Mr. Coney supported designation on Criterion D and noted the entire terracotta façade. He wished there was more information on Hazel Bloss who ran the apartment building and fought for renter rights; he noted there was lots of anecdotal. He said this was one of the earliest buildings built in the Regrade; he supported Criterion C.

Ms. Barker supported designation on Criterion C, D, and E. She noted the terracotta and said she was thrilled the cornice survived. She said the building set the standard for what was to come after the first Regrade; she said it met

Criterion C. She appreciated the stairway and entry and said to consider that public peers into window which extends this area to the public realm. She supported inclusion of the interior.

Mr. Ketcherside supported designation on criteria D and E. He appreciated public comment and letters, and additional information provided by applicant. He said he couldn't pull enough together to meet Criterion C. He said the terracotta architectural characteristics are odd as apartment building. He said the staircase is not public and he did not support including it.

Ms. Vyhnanek supported designation on criteria D and E. She said Beaux Arts style for an apartment is unique; she said that reinforces her support of Criterion E.

Mr. Kiel supported designation on criteria D and E. He said the stairs are not defining characteristics although the material is nice; he hoped the marble would be saved and reused. He did not support inclusion of interiors.

Ms. Patterson said the interior is not essential but she noted the quality of material; she commented on the marble and plaster detail. She said it is a nice feature which paints a more complete picture.

Ms. Barker said it carries the grandeur of terracotta into the building.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Sheridan Apartments at 2011 Fifth Avenue as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards D and E; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the exterior of the building.

MM/SC/RK/GH 10:00 Motion carried.

070517.32

Griffin Building  
2005 Fifth Avenue

Rich Hill, McCullough Hill Leary, explained that the nomination was unanimous. He said they have questions about the structural integrity of the building and provided a structural report. He asked the board not to designate.

Ellen Mirro, The Johnson Partnership, said she explored the iconographic themes on entry and noted the long arch there. She said the acanthus leaves, grape leaves, quatrefoil, and cartouche are decorative elements and there is no specific association with education or gothic style. She noted decorative elements at Savery Hall, and Daniel Bagley School: shield, lamp of learning, wise owl, and book. She said the decorative elements here are generic in form.

She said the building is a storefront with three stories above. She noted the segmental arch parapet and said it is similar to the long arch on the Mann Building. She said the entry has three original glazed wooden entry doors with a cast metal head with a central cartouche flanked by torches. The upper arched transom windows are tripartite, with the center light having an upper operable hopper window. The storefronts have green marble wainscots and a wide spandrel mullion separating the storefront windows from the large upper transom windows. The southern bay contains a double store-door entry and an ATM. The façade's four vertical shafts emerge from the sidewalk levels and rise as above the parapet. The façade's four vertical shafts emerge from the sidewalk levels and rise as above the parapet. The western façade is a utilitarian combination of reinforced concrete and brick masonry infill.

She provided comparison photos of the building from 1928 and now. She said the balconies were enclosed with glass; ornament removed from spandrel; new stucco applied to upper arches; transoms at storefront are now recessed spandrels; the door to the mezzanine was removed; alley windows replaced; north light court has been changed; and there are no original elements left on interiors.

Ms. Mirro went through Designation Standards and said the building does not meet A or B. She said that it is associated only tangentially with C because of its association with the Regrade. She said that business colleges were mostly in Pioneer Square until the fire; after that they were spread out and most moved north. She said there were other types of vocational schools at the time: barbers, technical school, extension schools. She said the building may or may not meet C. She said that there are other, better, example of Gothic Revival buildings in Seattle: Terminal Sales, Shafer, Medical Dental, Mann. She said that vocational schools rented in building; this building was purpose built. She said Frank Fowler built the Wintergarden Theater, Wilsonian Apartments, Alta Casa, The Cornelius among others. She said the building doesn't meet F because it is blocked by the Monorail.

Bruce Hawn, structural engineer, DCI Engineering, said he evaluated the building and it is far from meeting code. He said it needs seismic retrofit, the pinnacles are not reinforced and are seismic dangers; he said the brick terracotta is impossible to anchor and the terracotta façade is impossible to anchor without changing its appearance.

Mr. Hill asked the board not to designate the building. He said it doesn't meet the criteria and doesn't have integrity. He noted the enclosed balcony, altered spandrels, façade and window alterations, and doors replaced on Stewart. He said there are other, better examples of Gothic Revival in the City and the building is a good design by Fowler but questioned if it is outstanding. He said the building is not prominent from 5<sup>th</sup>; all windows on Virginia have been altered.

Mr. Coney asked if Wilson was the biggest vocational school.

Ms. Mirro said it was; it survived everyone else; it transitioned to Racine, the was out of business for ten years and then Griffin took over.

Mr. Treffers asked if there are examples of other vocational schools that building their building.

Ms. Mirro said there was one on 2<sup>nd</sup> but she didn't find others.

Mr. Treffers said it was not commissioned in the same way this building was.

Ms. Patterson asked if she had info on the open air balcony.

Ms. Mirro said it is where the offices were; it was enclosed by 1937.

Ms. Patterson asked if there was anything that proved it to be an open air balcony besides the photo.

Ms. Mirro said that the plans specified it as glass.

Ms. Barker asked about the types of classes provided and the length of time.

Ms. Mirro said there were students as young as 8<sup>th</sup> grade; classes included accounting, English, grammar, and business machines. She said there were various classes – like a community college.

Mr. Kiel said the off-center entry is odd and asked if there are other similar examples.

Ms. Mirro said it was programmatically driven. She said there are other examples of Gothic Revival with a side entry.

Mr. Coney said that the Sheridan was already there with an offset entry.

Ms. Mirro said it was an applied style and it doesn't ready through to massing.

Public Comment:

Steve Hall, Friends of Historic Belltown, said the building is clearly a landmark building. He said even with the changes it is able to convey and embody the characteristics of the style.

Tiffany Jorgensen, Friends of Historic Belltown, said that integrity is different from condition. She said that Wilson's was there three generations. She asked

if the building on 2<sup>nd</sup> was still extant and noted this building was purpose-built. She supported designation.

#### Board Discussion:

Ms. Vyhnanek supported designation and said that regarding Criterion D it is clearly Collegiate Gothic Architecture; the vocational school used it to convey it is a school and was piggybacking off larger university. She said that it meets Criterion C because it was purpose-built for this school; vocational education was hugely important at this time.

Mr. Ketcherside supported designation and noted it met Criterion D for its association with vocational schools. He said that it has the integrity to convey its significance. He noted the Collegiate elements in the grand entryway, cornice, columns, uniformity around both facades, wood pieces around the windows, cartouche idea that continues around the whole building.

Ms. Barker supported designation on criteria C, D, and E. She said the building is instantly recognizable because of the upper levels, cornice, linear qualities. She said that not everyone can go to university; this building sought to evoke 'university' architecturally. She said it was an economic alternative. She said the photo of the classes showed what was going on – there were lots of men; she said that in 1942 they were out of business because of the war. She said that this was a unique project for Frank Fowler, who melded broad window with terracotta formality; it was a nice project.

Mr. Coney said vast number of people who went through these colleges had a significant impact on community, city, state. He said the building was purpose-built. He said it was not a typical school; it was a blend of two styles which made it unique. He said it wasn't known if there were others built in the Pacific Northwest but this is unique; he noted the gigantic windows. He supported designation on criteria C, D, and F.

Mr. Treffers supported designation on criteria C, D, and E. He noted the business development of this area of the City and the school's prominence for 50 years. He said it was a purpose-built building in the heart of the business district at the time. He said this is the only example of Collegiate Gothic urban infill in the city. He said this is an outstanding work of Frank Fowler. He said that structural integrity is different from integrity the board considers. He noted the terracotta, primary entrance, and window openings to bring in light still read.

Ms. Patterson supported designation on criteria C, D, and E. She said it was purpose-built for the vocational school. She noted the Collegiate Gothic style and said the school offered the college experience without a campus.

Mr. Hodgins supported designation on criteria C, D, and E. He said the building conveys its significance and has integrity. He said the loss of windows doesn't define it; it was purpose-built. He said business school was not glamorous back then and this was a more elegant building. He said Rockefeller went to a school like this.

Ms. Durham supported designation on criteria C, D, and E. She noted the Collegiate Gothic style symbolized the aspirations of the students; architecture was used as advertising for what they were offering.

Ms. Johnson supported designation. She said the Gothic building draws the eye up. She said it was purpose-built in a style that said "I am in college".

Mr. Kiel supported designation on criteria D and E but not C. He said it was a purpose-built building.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Griffin Building at 2005 Fifth Avenue as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C, D and E; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the exterior of the building.

MM/SC/ST/EV 9:1:0 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel opposed.

**070517.4 NOMINATION**

070517.41 Avalon Substation  
3243 SW Genesee Street

Rebecca Ossa prepared and presented the nomination report (full report in DON file). She provided context of the site and neighborhood of the restrained Streamline Moderne building. She provided elements of the style and noted the smooth exterior that was devoid of detail, flat roof. She said the design was done in-house. She walked the board around the building via photos and noted the driveway, roll-up door, rounded corner overhang, pedestrian access gate to electric yard and circular openings where conduit came through. She noted the simple architectural form, shallow pilasters, horizontal lines and flat roof. She said the interior has an open floor plan, trench with floor drain and concrete beams.

She provided a history of Seattle City Light, which was established in 1910; there was a lot of expansion after the war and became the sole provider of electricity. She said this building was built in 1954 on land acquired in 1948; 100 nearby residents signed a petition against the substation being located there. She said the substation was de-energized in 2002; in 2007 equipment

was removed and the building was used for storage. She said of 15 rectifier substations, seven remain.

Ms. Barker disclosed she served in advisory capacity to the Junction Neighborhood Association; there was one meeting about the Avalon site.

Neither the owner nor other board members were concerned with her participation.

Mr. Treffers asked if there are any designated substations.

Ms. Ossa said the California substation.

Ms. Durham asked if the five substations in 1954 were the same.

Ms. Ossa said they were similar but not identical.

Ms. Barker asked about permits.

Ms. Ossa said there weren't any.

Mr. Treffers asked about architectural styles of earlier and later examples.

Ms. Ossa said the earlier ones were a different style; in the 1960's they were architecturally designed and unique to the location.

Ms. Durham asked if there was any correlation of the rectifier technology to the design style.

Ms. Ossa said there wasn't. She said the purpose and style was to protect the equipment; all sites had fences.

Mr. Ketcherside asked what the draftsmen did.

Ms. Ossa said they worked for City Light doing drafting of transmission lines, distribution.

Mr. Treffers asked why Criteria D was noted.

Ms. Doherty said it is representative of the modern era; the classic, simple utility, curved fin, and incised line.

Ms. Barker asked where the Modern features are.

Ms. Ossa said the front smooth concrete surface, horizontal incised line, and shallow pilasters on north three bays; the thin concrete overhang over front door entry.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Doherty said one letter of public comment was received (in DON file).

Ms. Barker did not support nomination.

Ms. Vyhnanek did not support nomination.

Mr. Hodgins did not support nomination but appreciated the thorough report. He said he envisioned a fire or pump station but was disappointed when he looked at the photo.

Ms. Patterson did not support nomination. She said she needed to see curves expressing the Moderne style. She said that there are other, better substations.

Ms. Durham did not support nomination. She said while there are small details it doesn't rise to the level of significance.

Ms. Johnson did not support nomination.

Mr. Ketcherside did not support nomination. He said he wanted to under Criterion C but the story isn't strong enough. He said the substations were decommissioned after the trolley buses went to diesel. He said he was interested in the evolution of streetcars to buses; this building is too late to be tied to the bigger story of that transition.

Mr. Coney said the style is Brutal as well. He said it is a relic that is part of history. He was undecided.

Mr. Treffers supported nomination, hesitantly, to learn more about substations in Seattle and Washington. He said the architectural application of what was going on at the time was applied in a restrained way to utilitarian use.

Mr. Coney said there are not many left.

Mr. Kiel did not support nomination.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Avalon Substation at 3243 SW Genesee Street 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 August 16, 2017; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/ST/RC 2:8:0 Motion failed. Mmes. Barker, Vyhnaneck, Durham, Patterson, Johnson, Messrs. Kiel, Hodgins, Ketcherside opposed.

*Ms. Johnson left the meeting at 7:40pm.*

**070517.5 CONTROLS AND INCENTIVES**

070517.51 Seattle Asian Art Museum  
1400 East Prospect Street

Ms. Doherty read through the signed Controls and Incentives agreement (in DON file). She said she received a public comment letter about the camel replicas at the gates. She said that it is typical for art to be excluded from controls to enable it to be moved around. She said that the removal of art work in Volunteer Park was excluded in that agreement as well.

Mr. Coney said the original camels were moved.

Abbey DeWeese, Hillis Clark Martin & Peterson, said the camels belong to the museum and they have no intention of removing them from the building. She said they are replicas from 1991.

Ms. Doherty said the Yellin Gates are different; they were designed for the building and donated by Director Fuller's sister. They are architectural elements. They belong to the museum's collection and are not owned by Parks and Recreation. They were designed specifically for that opening and will remain in the building as long as the Seattle Art Museum is the tenant. She said the front doors are part of the building. She responded to board questions about landscape maintenance and said it will be consistent with the park agreement.

Ms. Barker asked about the scagliola.

Ms. Doherty said it is at the Garden Court; it is plaster work that looks like marble. Responding to clarifying questions she explained that the Controls and Incentives process is an ongoing process separate from the Certificate of Approval process. She clarified which items are being reviewed administratively, and said that if deemed necessary, those items could be deferred to the board for consideration.

Public Comment:

Kathleen Connor, DOPAR, said the superintendent signed the document. She said they strive for consistency in agreements; it is easier for caretakers, groundskeepers, and management. She said this is consistent with their approach at MOHAI and the Aquarium.

Action: I move to approve Controls and Incentives for Seattle Asian Art Museum, 1400 East Prospect Street.

MM/SC/DB/JP 8:0:1 Mr. Coney abstained.

070517.53 Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center  
4000 NE 41<sup>st</sup> Street  
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for three-month extension and said it is consistent with the previous requests. She said the owners indicated that they are reviewing offers from potential buyers.

Mr. Treffers expressed concern about the lack of upkeep.

Ms. Doherty said there are ongoing comments from the community about maintenance of the buildings and landscape. She said the landmark ordinance has no minimum maintenance requirement. She said the board has been encouraging them to establish a vegetation management plan.

Ms. Barker said she had been asking for three years.

Ms. Doherty said the property owner claims it is not within their operating budget.

Ms. Barker said it irks her and she didn't want to approve an extension.

Ms. Doherty said the owners want to sell the property, so it makes sense for her to extend the negotiations. The potential buyers will know that it is a landmark and she is available to them for any questions. If it is sold, she will engage with the new owner and continue the negotiation process with them.

Mr. Treffers said everything remains under board control until the agreement is signed.

Public Comment:

Colleen McAleer, Laurelhurst Community Club, said she had nothing to say as there is nothing on the table.

Mr. Ketcherside said the board will continue to review everything.

Mr. Hodgins said the property is for sale and penalizing the owner means nothing.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives of Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center, 4000 NE 41 Street for three-months.

MM/SC/RK/EV 8:1:0 Motion carried. Ms. Barker opposed.

**070517.6 STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator