



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 571/21

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

Remote Meeting

Wednesday December 15, 2021 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Dean Barnes

Roi Chang

Kristen Johnson

Ian Macleod

Lora-Ellen McKinney

Lawrence Norman

Harriet Wasserman

Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Melinda Bloom

Absent

Taber Caton

Russell Coney

Matt Inpanbutr

John Rodezno

Acting Chair Kristen Johnson called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

In-person attendance is currently prohibited per Washington State Governor's Proclamation No. 20-28.5. Meeting participation is limited to access by the WebEx Event link or the telephone call-in line provided on agenda.

ROLL CALL

121521.1 PUBLIC COMMENT

Jeff Murdock, Historic Seattle spoke in support of designation of University of Washington’s Faculty Club and Wallace Hall. Historic Seattle supports the nomination and designation of the two U.W. buildings coming before the Board this week. He said each individual resource should be considered for its own significance. The University of Washington Faculty Club building is one of the great examples of Pacific Northwest regional modernism in the city and is one the most loved buildings on campus. Adhering to its rigorous structural expression, the building seems to float in the forest (exemplified by Steinbrueck’s sketch at the beginning of the nomination report) and its projecting eaves focus views on Lake Washington and beyond. It is noteworthy that the design represents collaboration by Paul Hayden Kirk & Associates and Victor Steinbrueck, since both important architects were proponents of the advancement of this style of modernism unique to our region. The Faculty Club received an AIA Honor award in 1960 and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

A more recent design at the opposite side of campus, also eligible within its own context, is the former Academic Computer Center (ACC), designed by Seattle architect Ibsen Nelsen. The ACC was the first dedicated computer building on campus, serving all students from various disciplines, providing for increasing main-frame computing requirements. The building’s 1970’s architecture represents a subsequent chapter of modernist design in Seattle, influenced by European brutalist design as well as Scandinavian modernism; its focus on sustainability is also noteworthy. Ibsen Nelsen won local, regional and national design awards; his work was published nationally and internationally. Nelsen’s tight designs and efficient use of materials reflect his early training in cabinetmaking, and his Scandinavian heritage. The board-formed concrete work on the ACC is quite beautiful, and the unique sectional qualities of the design, including the entry bridge, are noteworthy. The building has also been recently determined by the state Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP) to be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. While current or future use is not part of the Board’s purview, Historic Seattle believes the building provides exciting opportunities for adaptive reuse.

121521.2 MEETING MINUTES

October 20, 2021
MM/SC/HW/IM 7:0:0 Minutes approved.

November 3, 2021
MM/SC/HW/IM 5:0:2 Minutes approved. Mr. Barnes and Ms. Chang abstained.

121521.3 BRIEFING

121521.31 Seattle Public Schools
Multiple Properties
Briefing on temporary tents / site furnishings for pandemic

Tingyu Wang, Seattle Public Schools explained the need for temporary tents to address issues relating to the pandemic. Gatewood will have two tents with the rest having just one.

Ms. McKinney said the pandemic is new and it makes sense to have to do something unexpected.

Ms. Wang said they received an emergency permit from the Seattle Fire Department. The tents will be removed when the pandemic is over.

Ms. Doherty said if there is desire to retain tents beyond the pandemic, the applicant will come back for a Certificate of Approval unless there is language in an agreement that excludes tents. She said it is easily reversible.

Ms. Johnson said it is reasonable and noted the need to keep people dry. She said it is temporary.

Ms. Doherty said the tents are rented.

121521.4 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

121521.41 Lake Union Hydro House
1179 Eastlake Avenue East
Proposed exterior alterations

Brian Rich, Richaven Architecture and Preservation said the structure was the first that supplied power to Seattle from the water supplied by Volunteer Park Reservoir. He said the building is used as a food service venue now and proposed changes will support its use as a new food service business. He provided photos of original and existing conditions of the building and noted changes that have occurred over time. He proposed painting the exterior and said that a historical paint analysis revealed the building was originally painted white and gray which led to the new color choices. He proposed changing doors to accommodate ADA with new hardware that will reflect, not copy, the building period. He said new lights will reflect period and will not be faux historic.

Ms. Chang was glad to see the changes and said the report was well put together. She asked if upgrades were being made to the overall building.

Mr. Rich said yes and showed photos of proposed interior finishes. He said the deck was installed in 2000 and is not historic; parts of the deck need improvement.

Ms. Chang said it is nice to see seismic upgrades being made voluntarily.

Ms. Wasserman said they had done a wonderful job and noted the planning and the paint analysis. She said it is a pretty little building, the first electric plant with power

from the reservoir. She said the applicant answered all questions that ARC had, she said it was well done.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application and issue a Certificate of Approval for the exterior building and site alterations at the Lake Union Hydro House, 1179 Eastlake Avenue East as per the attached submittal.

EXPLANATION AND FINDINGS

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Ordinance No. 117251, as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, as per Standard #9 of the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/LM/IM 7:0:0 Motion carried.

Ms. Sodt left the meeting.

121521.42

Seattle Yacht Club
1807 E Hamlin Street
Proposed exterior alterations

John Brenneis, The John Brenneis Architects, Inc. provided a summary of proposed work including:

- Replacement of existing cedar shingle siding which is failing in places; current cedar is laid at 9" and propose to install new 7" to the weather; install at 4" on roof.
- Adjust color of shingles
- North façade portico, replace railing and soffit.

He said the Seattle Yacht Club was established in 1832. Architect John Graham designed the building which was constructed in 1919 and finished in 1920. He said a 1963 addition was designed by John Graham, Jr. He said the building is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Mr. Brenneis created hand drawn as-built elevations of the building. He said the roof above the portico space is unoccupied mechanical space. He proposed removal and replacement of all original exterior door and window sash that do not already have insulated glazing with new wood units to exactly match original. He proposed removal of shiplap down to the studs and noted concern with rot and mold. He said any asbestos found would need abatement, knob and tube wiring will be replaced, and seismic upgrades done with new ¾" plywood sheathing.

He said the proposed gray is more in keeping with a maritime / seashore building with darker accent color on south wall portion and soffits. He said 8' long panels instead of individual shingles will be used; shingles are applied to plywood, driving nail through cedar and plywood. He noted the lost art of installing individual shingles. He said the shingles will be face primed and primed on back for good durability.

He said the new railing will be close to original design and will conform to Code. He said the awning will be removed, reconditioned and re-installed. He said the beaded soffit boards will be removed, fire suppression piping relocated and concealed with only sprinkler heads visible. He said the soffit will be cleaned up and enhanced as much as possible. He said existing light would be reconditioned and reinstalled and augmented with recessed LED fixtures. Existing sheet copper roof will be replaced in kind. He said the portico railing was replaced when new deck was installed; the style is not appropriate, and it is not to current code. He proposed replacing the railing with what was there originally, but to current code.

Mr. Macleod noted the thorough presentation. He said the main elements are the shingles, spacing of coursing, paint and railing. He said the gray is a great substitute which doesn't alter the appearance of the building.

Ms. Wasserman said the new rail will look better than what is there now. She said she likes the colors – it will still be a light color gray and the darker gray will be helpful. She said the hand drawings are lovely and she hoped they would be featured somehow in the remodeled building.

Mr. Brenneis said the building was constructed in 1919; \$50,000 was budgeted and \$130,000 was spent. He said high grade materials were not used. He said proposed work is more faithful to historic reports than what is there now.

Ms. Johnson said ARC was pleased with the proposal. She said it is a beautiful building and it is being returned to its original design intent.

Mr. Barnes said he appreciated all the detail.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application and issue a Certificate of Approval for the exterior building alterations at the Seattle Yacht Club, 1807 E Hamlin Street as per the attached submittal.

EXPLANATION AND FINDINGS

This action is based on the following:

1. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 A, *the extent to which the proposed alteration or significant change would adversely affect the features or characteristics described in Ordinance 122702.*

- a. The proposed alterations and changes to do not dramatically alter the appearance of the building.
- 2. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 B, *the reasonableness or lack thereof of the proposed alterations or significant change in light of other alternatives available to achieve the objectives of the owner and the applicant.*
 - a. The applicant has demonstrated the need to make alterations based on the age and performance of materials and components.
- 3. The factors of SMC 25.12 .750 C, D, and E are not applicable.
- 4. The proposed work as presented is consistent with the following Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation as listed below (or cite other applicable standards):

Standard #9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

MM/SC/IM/DB 7:0:0 Motion carried.

121521.5 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

121521.51 Ingraham High School
1819 N 135th Street

Ms. Doherty went through the signed agreement. She said the only parts of the school landmarked are the exteriors of the gym building and auditorium. She noted the high integrity and representation of thin shelled construction. She said there is nothing unusual and the agreement is consistent with others.

Mr. Macleod asked if the roof is included.

Ms. Doherty said when exterior is designated, it means all exterior. She said the roofs here are unique, hyperbolic paraboloid thin shell concrete construction. She said the gym has repetitive barrel vault span.

Action: I move to approve Controls and Incentives for Ingraham High School, 1819 N 135th Street.

MM/SC/IM/DB 7:0:0 Motion carried.

121521.52 Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center
4000 NE 41st Street
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for a six-month extension.

Nathan Rimmer said they have been working with the board and a new design team to move a proposal forward. He said they will present to board on January 5 meeting with Bassetti team.

Ms. Johnson said it is a reasonable request since things are moving along.

Mr. Macleod said it is a big site and it was nice to have taken a recent tour.

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

MM/SC/IM/DB 7:0:0 Motion carried.

121521.53 Hotel Elliott/Hahn Building
103 Pike Street
Request for extension

Ian Morrison, McCullough Hill Leary said the building was designated after they had submitted for MUP for a multi-story addition. He said they hope to provide a variety of options to present to board. He requested extension to April 6, 2022.

Ms. Chang asked if it would come to ARC and noted she is curious to see design options.

Mr. Morrison said it will when Ms. Sodt puts it on the schedule.

Ms. Doherty said she would share Mr. Morrison's comment with Ms. Sodt.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Hotel Elliot / Hahn Building, 103 Pike Street until April 6, 2022.

MM/SC/DB/LW 7:0:0 Motion carried.

121521.6 DESIGNATIONS

121521.61 University of Washington – Faculty Club
4020 E Stevens Way NE

Julie Blakeslee, University of Washington said there are no plans for either building, they just want to clarify their status. She noted there are several new members on the board and explained the question of whether UW is subject to landmark ordinance was resolved. She said four UW buildings have been landmarked in the last three years.

Susan Boyle, BOLA Architecture + Planning presented (full report in DON file). She said it is a striking 1960 building. She read a quote from architectural critic Lawrence Cheek:

It's right on the centerline of the International Style — no mitigating shingles or wood beams here — and it defiantly rejects the neo-Gothic idiom that prevailed elsewhere on the postwar campus in an effort to relate the new buildings to the historic context . . . It's so self-assured in its immaculate, elegant, sparse lines . . . As if this weren't enough, the building thrusts itself off a hillside so as to create a vivid illusion of flying when you're seated in the dining room. So, there's our contradiction: a straightforward, mild-mannered building conceals a heart of drama.

She said there were two prior clubhouse buildings. The first University of Washington Faculty Club was located on 15th Avenue NE just outside of the central university campus. A simple house, this structure remained the clubhouse until after the Alaska-Yukon Pacific Exposition of 1909 when the club was moved into the former Lumberman Associations Hoo Hoo House. This half-timbered, Elizabethan-style building was designed by noted Seattle architect Ellsworth Storey, and it remained a beloved location of the club for nearly 40 years. She noted separate entries for men and women.

Ms. Boyle said prior to WWII the campus was largely made up of Collegiate Gothic Revival buildings. In 1948, the University's basic campus plan was again updated. By this date the design of campus buildings had departed from the Gothic Revival style to embrace a wide range of Modern styles, new materials and expressive structural qualities. She noted the emergence of the International Style outside the campus and cited the abstract forms, post and beam construction.

The Faculty Club was designed as a unique collaboration between two of the most celebrated architects in the Pacific Northwest during the middle of the 20th century: Paul Hayden Kirk and Victor Steinbrueck. In 1957, Kirk had just formed a new firm, Paul Hayden Kirk & Associates, and both these company names appear on the 1959 drawings for the Faculty Center Building. Kirk's firm transitioned to the name Kirk, Wallace, McKinley & Associates in 1960 and the firm produced a huge body of work. A few award-winning buildings attributed to Kirk and his firm include McMahon Hall, Magnolia Library, and Civic Center Playhouse. She noted the emergence of something more than simple post and beam construction with Scandinavian and Japanese influences.

She said Kirk collaborated with Victor Steinbrueck on this building. She said Steinbrueck is known as the 'savior' of the Pike Place Market but he was more than that. She said he was a modern style practitioner who created remarkable residential structures; he was co-creator of the Space Needle; and a teacher, author, and a big voice in the city that led to the preservation of the Pike Place Market. He worked in collaboration with Kirk and also with Minoru Yamasaki's office in Detroit for a while.

Ms. Boyle said the original landscape designer was Garrett Eckbo of the notable firm of Eckbo, Dean and Williams of San Francisco. She noted the building setbacks on either side and said both were filled with northwest native species. She said she provided a memo (in DON file) which cites specific large trees by species and size; most are still present. She noted the building setback but held above the rich landscape.

She noted the building has a big footprint and noted the lower floor is smaller while the upper floor hovers above and extends over the parking area on the east side. The second floor is a complex assemblage with floor planes, a central courtyard, and lightwells that reach down to grade below. She said the building is entered by 9'-wide ramp that comes up to center. She said from there, there are 9' wide corridors that pass the central courtyard and lead into dining room. She indicated how drawings show the building hovering over the hillside. She noted the modularity of the steel frame with 18' base that is divided in 9' and 4.5' modules. She noted the raised roof and ceiling level that rises 6' above surrounding 10'-tall main floor ceilings to allow for clerestory window band to surround the dining room with additional natural light.

She said Progressive Architecture had an extensive article about the building in 1961. She noted lower floor plans and said it is a complex assemblage of space, almost cubist in solidity and passage and openings. She said section drawing shows entry into the building through gallery space, pass through half the lightwell to the raised dining room which is the volume over the parking area below. Via site plan, she indicated delineated portions of the site to be included in designation including the landscape, front and south setback areas, full paved parking lot to east and driveway on north side.

Dearborn-Massar Photographers who Kirk used them frequently. She said Kirk was humble and modest, yet he sought and got recognition. She said he typically had Dearborn-Massar photograph his works and noted the collection of photographs of this building. She noted the lightwell that divides the east and west portions of the building. Interior photo exhibit how the ceiling is raised in the dining room and the size and expanse of windows allowing light in. She said many events have been hosted at this site which provides a view of the northwest by the view over Lake Washington over to the Cascade mountains. She noted simple modules and framing on interior. She noted interior social spaces including billiards room, conference room.

She noted the increased density of campus and surrounding area and post war construction. She said the building turns its back on Stevens Way and focuses inward to campus. She noted the simple clarity of white stucco cladding on west portion. She noted the simplicity of solid and void of building. She noted service yard view and small 10' x 15' kitchen expansion, clad in gray metal which differentiates from rest of building. Kirk used outrigger elements to expand frame consistent with the modules. She noted ramp, lower brick clad ground floor, and cast-in-place concrete cantilevered exterior stair.

She said the board asked about landscape features: included memo with excerpt from tree survey. There are some conifers, and lower scale evergreen plants. She noted a column capital from original territorial university and noted that hadn't been substantiated.

1970 sculpture on the paved patio was done by George Tsutakawa is a noteworthy influential artist and teacher who is known for fountains. She said many pieces of campus art have documentation about their commission or placement and there is nothing on this piece. She said the sculpture is not original to the building. She said she is not sure how the George Galucsik concrete sculpture was placed there. She said Galucsik was a mid-century graphic artist, designer, artist. She said the reclining figure reportedly, according to his son, was cast in place by excavating soil and adding rebar. She said neither artwork was intended in original drawings or documents. She said the artwork is owned by UW and are separate from the nomination.

She said Kirk had polio as a child; he used cane and created ramps before ADA She said a lift added to stair in 1981 for accessibility, two ADA gender neutral restrooms added, and flat bar and square tube railings were kept at ramps and staircase.

Ms. Blakeslee said the University agrees with the Staff Report.

Mr. Macleod asked how much of the billiards room is original.

Ms. Boyle said the finishes are original and some of the wood was salvaged from the Hoo Hoo House.

Ms. Blakeslee said wood from the Hoo Hoo House is on one wall in the lounge.

Ms. McKinney said it is remarkable how beautiful everything is when seen together. She said she noticed lots of deciduous trees in the photos and asked if people brought plantings in and if native plantings have been disturbed.

Ms. Boyle said there are some deciduous trees in the photos now; original trees were all evergreen.

Ms. Blakeslee said smaller plants and bushes were added and noted plantings change over time.

Ms. Boyle said included a small excerpt from the survey and said she included identification of everything and 5" was the smallest. She said there are a lot of Vine Maples and as she reviewed the survey she noted much seemed to be of a northwest palette. She said the UW does extensive work with groundskeepers; at what point do we say this point the landscape has integrity.

Ms. Chang asked about the back of house kitchen addition.

Ms. Boyle indicated location on plan view and said it was to the kitchen and she indicated location on plan.

Ms. Chang said it is clearly back of house.

Ms. Boyle said the building is such a rich experience and to her experience it is the best building in Seattle.

Ms. Johnson said it is a well-kept building and changes are in keeping with the feeling of the original. She said it is a beautiful building and the Staff Report indicates features to include description of interior volume on upper floor.

Mr. Barnes asked for clarification on courtyard.

Ms. Johnson described the experience of walking into the building. In terms of materials – there are some original, some from the Hoo Hoo house, and some new. If interior is designated, she would recommend the interior volume. The difference between interior space, open space and exterior and how those bleed together, you don't want to divide up space because that is what is special about building. She said preserving volume is what makes sense. She said there are nice spaces downstairs, but it is the upstairs that feels like the 'main space'.

Mr. Barnes asked if Ms. Johnson was speaking about the patio courtyard or landscape portion and noted that plants come and go as Ms. McKinney commented.

Ms. Johnson said she was referring to the internal central courtyard.

Ms. Doherty said the way the Staff Report is written – in some cases the courtyards appear as part of the site and in others as part of building. She said she referred to the courtyard as part of site and building. The courtyards are hard to categorize, and she didn't want future confusion about them. The site with mature trees is defined by Ms. Boyle's plan; landscaping would be the natural landscaping that surrounds the building. She said that some of it is tucked in beneath, but all is included.

Ms. McKinney said you can't contain the wind or prevent seeds from blowing over; it has changed quickly.

Ms. Doherty said if the board designates, the negotiated Controls and Incentives will talk more about the landscape; it will be looked at more carefully.

Mr. Barnes said to be reasonable in landscaping. He supported designation on criteria C, D, and F.

Ms. Wasserman supported designation and said she appreciated staff slimming down the description from nomination meeting. She supported criteria C, D, E, and F. She said she worked at the campus during this time and noted the outstanding work.

Mr. Macleod supported designation and said it is a remarkable building. He said he had a drink there the last day of architecture school. He said it is an amazing space and meets criteria C, D, E and F. He said it is one of Seattle's really remarkable buildings. He agreed with Staff Report. He said he would like to include the lower floor but agreed the main floor is the star.

Mr. Norman supported designation on criteria C, and D. He said it is an amazing building and once you are aware of it, you look for it.

Ms. McKinney said it is remarkable. She said when inside the feeling of being in a building falls away and you feel like you are in the middle of the sky.

Ms. Chang appreciated the presentation. She said it is an outstanding and striking building. She agreed with the Staff Report and said she was happy to include the site as shown as it gives room to the building itself and retains views. She supported criteria C, D, E, and F.

Ms. Johnson agreed. She said it is a striking building but not flashy. She said it is a special building and she noted the way the space is connected interior to exterior.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the University of Washington Faculty Club at 4020 E Stevens Way NE as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C, D, E and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the site (as illustrated in Figure 3 of the nomination application), including courtyards; the exterior of the building, including courtyards; and the open interior volume and plan layout of the upper floor.

MM/SC/HW/DB 7:0:0 Motion carried.

121521.62 University of Washington – Wallace Hall
3737 Brooklyn Avenue NE

Julie Blakeslee, University of Washington (UW) said they are interested in the building's status for planning purposes. She said the site is planned for green area and they want to understand status for planning purposes.

Susan Boyle, BOLA Architecture + Planning said the building was constructed in 1976. She said it is a simple rectilinear mass with clerestory windows on east side. She said it is an inward-turning building visually defined by simple massing, textured concrete, 70' ramp leading to second floor.

She said the west part of the campus was part of post war planning with large numbers of returning vets. She noted the growth of this area and the pushing out of campus boundaries. Using aerial photographs, she showed the early mills and marine industries in the area and in the 1920s, the start of fisheries-related buildings. A 1934 plan showed the expansion of the campus. The Northlake Urban

Renewal project established cooperative development between the City and the University of the area south of NE 40th Street between 15th Avenue NE and Roosevelt Way NE. She noted the reorientation of major streets and the expansion of the campus even though local marine industries resisted and were not happy.

Ms. Boyle said math and engineering departments were the first groups to use computers with the main frame in the basement. She said the needs of the equipment required a centralized site. She said this site was not easily accessible and students couldn't gain access until after 10:00 pm because the equipment was being used until then. The university's new computing center was operated by the Departments of Mathematics and Business Administration, and it served the institution's administration and academic units. It later offered services to other institutions and businesses with contracts for payroll and inventory management, and other time-consuming calculations.

She said within a decade the need for specialized computer buildings had evaporated as main frames were left behind for personal computers, laptops and phones.

Ms. Boyle said the south side of the site is just a driveway and parking lot. She said the building has two primary faces and two secondary faces. The building has a larger first floor footprint. She noted the commons, study hall, library, computer room keyboard room on the first floor and series of small narrow offices, circulation space on the second floor. She said the windows on the west were simple; on the west windows are a serrated wall of narrow openings. She noted the roof deck and skylights.

Ms. Boyle said the building is constructed with a slab-on-grade, poured-in-place concrete columns and one-foot-wide pre-cast concrete and reinforced CMU walls, along with steel floor and roof joists, metal panel cladding, aluminum windows and skylights on raised curbs, and painted steel pipe railings. Portions of the original first floor were raised for electrical access. The mass is generally a flat-roof, and rectangular shaped.

The wall plane of the primary (east) facade is setback 3.25 feet along the northern seven bays adjacent to the 11' wide steps and paved walk leading to the main entry along with a prominent, 6' wide, 70' ramp and landing leading to the second-floor entry. The 10' deep setback is matched also at the east facade's southernmost bay. Entries on both floors are recessed and set within 10' wide openings with splayed walls that extend to 20' wide perimeter openings. An access door to the west loading dock is similarly positioned within a recess with splayed wall. To the south of the first-floor entry the east wall plane projects forward 3.25 feet, with sloped clerestories and a band of windows set into the concrete facade. Adjacent to the main first floor entry there is a sheltered bike parking area announced by a large circular cut out in the ramp wall. She said the south façade is dramatic in its simplicity and abstract quality. She noted how the grade change is incorporated into building design.

She said current aerial photographs show the area is densely populated with recent development along the shoreline. She noted the concrete surroundings. The two main lobby entries are set within recesses on the east side of the building, with the secondary lobby at the first floor and the main entry lobby (one leading to administrative offices) on the second floor accessed by the long cast-in-place concrete ramp. The first-floor entry is distinguished by the angled wall, a circular opening in the outer ramp wall, and a single cast concrete column that supports the upper landing. Both straight and curved concrete walls are carried into this lobby and reflected in smooth curved walls, corners, and casework.

She noted the beautiful spatial qualities and interior finishes. Both straight and curved concrete walls are carried into this lobby and reflected in smooth curved walls, corners, and casework. Within the lobby a free-standing stairway is encircled by smooth walls and a custom banquette. The building's original first floor was devoted largely to computers, while presently it houses primarily administrative and faculty offices. South of the entry lobby there was a 110' by 19.5' keypunch room along the east and adjoining computer and input/output rooms in the center with stock rooms, electrical and mechanical spaces along the west side. The building's first floor currently provides space for the Program for the Environment (POE) Commons, a seminar and presentation room at the northeast corner of the first floor. This space, originally a study hall, features the large curtainwall windows and views of the north yard landscape. The upper east wall of the double-height space was once open to the second floor, but that opening has been infilled by a solid flush wall. This eliminated an overlook from the second floor and connection between the two levels, but it provides acoustical separation between the adjoining spaces.

Ms. Boyle said Ibsen Nelsen was a prominent, influential and civic-minded local architect who was involved in community-based and arts organizations. He worked at NBBJ before leaving to start his own firm in 1953. The following year he formed a partnership with Russell Sabin. The firm of Nelsen & Sabin (1954 - 1960), later Nelsen, Sabin & Varey (1961 - 1967), designed a variety building projects throughout the Pacific Northwest. In his early residential projects, Nelsen committed himself to creating simple, affordable designs. He and other emerging architects of the post-war era believed that young families deserved well-designed and affordable family dwellings. Houses that he designed frequently appeared in the early decades of the Seattle AIA Home of the Month program, which was publicized in *The Seattle Times* beginning in 1954. Nelsen also contributed to the Home Plan Bureau, which published residential designs for the emerging middle-class families.

In 1968, Nelsen established an independent practice and began to work on commercial interiors and large-scale projects. Nelsen was a Modernist mentor to other architects. Well known Seattle architects who he employed included Ivo and Lidija Gregov, two senior associates in his firm, along with Rick Sundberg, Rich Cardwell, David Hewitt, and David Wright – all of whom went on to lead their own firms. The firm's work was promoted at Western Washington University, in Bellingham, by a friend and colleague of Nelsen, George Bartholick, who was the campus architect. There, Nelsen's commissions included Bond and Miller Hall,

Arntzen Hall, the Social Science Building, and the Northwest Environmental Studies Center, which won an AIA Honor Award in 1981. When built, the latter building was reportedly the first environmental sciences facility on a university campus in the nation. Designed in a Brutalist style, it was detailed with human scale interior elements and wood finishes. In addition to the WWU academic buildings and the ACC, Nelsen designed one other project for the UW – the 1968 renovation of the ca. 1931 Playhouse Theater – completed by Nelsen, Sabin & Varey.

Ibsen Nelsen's his later work includes several well-known Seattle buildings, such as the Museum of Flight and the Red Barn Renovation in south Seattle. His late commercial and residential projects included the Inn at the Market in the Pike Place Market, and Merrill Court townhouses in the Harvard Belmont Historic District on Capitol Hill. She said that Ibsen had a varied career; he showed lots of talent in new design and historic projects.

Ms. Boyle said the Brutalist style was common on university campuses in the 1960s and noted several UW examples: McMahon Hall, Oceanography Building, Condon Hall, Gould Hall. Because of the use of board-formed, unfinished concrete, the Wallace Building can be seen as an example of a Brutalist style building, but the design seems to have been influenced by Scandinavian Modernism as well. A relatively small structure, it includes many details not often seen in institutional buildings, such as the curvilinear ramp and wall, which carries into the interior first and second lobbies and the POE Commons, the carefully angled entries and placement of perimeter window walls on the second floor, sky lit interior office spaces, and originally the west roof terrace. Although it pales in contrast to current performance-driven buildings, thought was given to the building's conserving energy features, such as the orientation and size of openings, and daylight and natural venting operable windows. She said the style is rigorous, not romantic, indulgent or decorated. She noted comparable university computer facilities including those at MIT, and University of Oregon. She said the era of such facilities has passed. She noted the myth of computer startups in garages.

Ms. Boyle said according to permit records the original builder of the University of Washington Computer Center was Baugh Construction of Seattle. Baugh Construction was founded by Lawrence "Larry" Baugh three decades before the building was constructed. The company started small, and reportedly advertised for its construction services for \$3.50/square foot. Its business grew quickly in Seattle's booming post-war economy, and it incorporated in 1952. Baugh Construction developed into a major construction company. Construction projects undertaken by Baugh include Ballard High School Addition in 1956, Bricklayers Union in 1959-60, and the Frye Art Museum Expansion in 1967 among many others.

Ms. Boyle said prior planning preceded the historic 2003-18 survey of the campus. The university has been looking at development of the west campus.

Mr. Barnes asked the current use of the building.

Ms. Boyle said it is vacant now.

Ms. Blakeslee said it was vacant last year during remote work but there are offices there now.

Mr. Macleod asked if there was more information on Ivo Gregoff.

Ms. Boyle said Gregoff was involved in the music union headquarters building at 3rd and Wall. He and his wife, Lidija worked with and for Ibsen. She said the drawings are signed by Ibsen Nelsen. She said it was a collaborative firm.

Mr. Macleod said you can see a bit of Ibsen here, but it is a bit of a departure.

Ms. McKinney said she spent a lot of time in this building. She said the building looks like a box of punch cards. She said the building was hot, uncomfortable and busy.

Mr. Norman asked about the proposed green space.

Ms. Boyle said it is in the 2003 plan.

Ms. Doherty suggested thinking of it as master planning, not everything comes to fruition.

Ms. Chang appreciated the thorough presentation. She said she had mixed feelings about Brutalist architecture, and this is a striking representation of this. She said she studied engineering and spent a lot of time in these buildings – Brutalist, dark, with few windows. She wanted to hear from other board members. She said because it is not considered beautiful doesn't mean it is not worthy of landmark status.

Ms. McKinney said it doesn't have to be beautiful to be important or representative stylistically. She said architecture is meaningful. She asked if there has been a shifting of sightlines inside the building.

Ms. Doherty said in the double height space there used to be more connection to rooms but there have been some internal revisions.

Ms. Doherty provided the Standards for Designation.

Ms. McKinney supported designation on criteria B and E. She said there are not a lot of buildings with this dedication and noted Lakeside School and Harborview Hospital had dedicated additions. She said a standalone building was new and this building represents the criteria.

Mr. Norman said there are lots of great Brutalist buildings all over Seattle. He said this building is okay, but he would not support designation.

Mr. Macleod said he supported designation on criteria C and E. He said it is unfortunate that this building was reviewed after the Faculty Club. He said this building is not beautiful nor is it Nelsen's best work. He said architecturally it is a

cohesive building, intentional. He said it is not the best example of Brutalism but does the job nicely and interfaces well with the street. He said it is not a complete eyesore. He said it is a physical embodiment of main frame computing and was purpose built for this technology. He said like the earlier reviewed Hydro House it is important to acknowledge history. He said so much innovation came out of Building 20 at MIT. He said this is not a bad building, but it is not Nelsen's best. He said it has nice moments like the entry way that punches through.

Ms. Wasserman said she spent many nights working in this building; you got more time on your account late at night. She said it was an era that is important in cultural history. She said you don't have to have a Paul Allen or Bill Gates associated with it; this was an academic computer center. Many went on to teach or manage computer labs. She said the building was purpose-built. She supported designation and cited criteria C and D. She supported inclusion of the building exterior and the site.

Mr. Barnes said he appreciated the comments. He didn't support designation and noted there are numerous Brutalist building examples in Seattle and on campus. He noted the historic aspects of a computer center but said it was only used for ten years.

Ms. Johnson said she agreed with Mr. Barnes. She noted Ms. Wasserman and Mr. Macleod's enthusiasm for an early building for computers and said that maybe that is enough, but when she looks at the building it doesn't convey that. She noted the entry and window wall and the building's big massing. She said there are taller and more dramatic moments on other Brutalist buildings and this one looks like a big box. She said it is a nice building with nice moments but not the best example. She said it was one of the earliest buildings built for computer but doesn't convey that.

Ms. Chang said comments on both sides are strong, but she was pulled toward supporting designation. She said it is an important building, purpose built for a specific use. She said criteria D and E fit.

In response to a question, Ms. Doherty noted that a designation motion requires a majority of confirmed board members, which is 6.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the University of Washington Wallace Hall at 3737 Brooklyn Avenue NE as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards B, C, D; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the site (as illustrated in Figure 40 of the nomination application) and the exterior of the building.

MM/SC/LE/HW 4:3:0 Motion failed. Messrs. Barnes and Norman and Ms. Johnson opposed.

121521.7

STAFF REPORT