



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 792/14

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
Seattle Municipal Tower
700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor
Room 4060
Wednesday, December 17, 2014 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker
Nick Carter
Aaron Luoma
Jeffrey Murdock, Vice Chair
Valerie Porter
Sarah Shadid
Matthew Sneddon
Elaine Wine

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Genna Nashem
Rebecca Frestedt
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Linda Amato
Robert Ketcherside
Alison Walker Brems, Chair
Mike Stanley

Vice Chair Jeffrey Murdock called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

121714.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

November 19, 2014

MM/SC/DB/AL 7:0:1 Minutes approved. Ms. Wine abstained.

121714.2 SPECIAL TAX VALUATION

Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

121714.21 619 Western Avenue

Ms. Nashem explained that the Pioneer Square Preservation board reviewed and recommended approval; she noted that \$8,296,869.74 was submitted and \$8,208,364.74 allowed. She said the work met the criteria of the program and the building is a contributing building in Pioneer Square. Responding to questions she said all structural support work has been done and the building is ready for occupancy.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Carter said that it looks good.

Ms. Wine agreed.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: Western Building, 619 Western Ave, that this action is based upon criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; and based upon the recommendation of the Pioneer Square Preservation Board which made the following findings at its meeting of December 17, 2014, that the property is a contributing building located in the Pioneer Square Preservation District, and has not been altered in any way that adversely affects those features that identify its significance or contribution to the Pioneer Square Preservation District; and that the property has been issued Certificates of Approval as required in the District; and has been substantially improved in the 24-month period prior to application, and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Landmarks Preservation Board and the owner.

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

121714.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

121714.31 Fort Lawton Landmark District
678 Washington and 907 Montana
Proposed relocation of replacement trees

Ms. Nashem provided a brief overview of the previously approved soil remediation project and explained that due to a sewer easement, newly planted trees need to be relocated.

Doug Crummy explained the need to relocate three trees about 10'; he provided photos showing that the view corridor will not be negatively impacted. He provided an aerial shot which showed sewer line path. He said they have an arborist working with them who will do the work. He said that all trees to be relocated are less than 1 ½' – two Maples and one evergreen.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Luoma said it seems fine. He said the Guidelines say to protect views and this is pretty minor.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board issue a Certificate of Approval for the proposed work to relocate the replacement trees at 678 Washington Avenue Officer's Row & 907 Montana Circle housing.

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

District ordinance

The proposed restoration plans as presented December 17, 2014 do not adversely affect the special features or characteristics of the buildings as specified in Ordinance #122750.

The other factors of SMC25.12.750 are not applicable

The Fort Lawton District Guidelines

DISTRICT-WIDE GUIDELINES

Landscaping

Preserve existing trees.

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

Zone 3: WASHINGTON AVENUE (OFFICERS' ROW)

Landscaping

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

ZONE 4: MONTANA CIRCLE

Landscaping

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

Secretary of the Interior Standards

Guidelines for Site

Guidelines for Setting

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

121714.32

Harvard-Belmont Landmark District

1117 Boylston, Eddy Residence

Proposed demolition of non-original porch and rebuilding as breakfast room

Mark Daniels explained the intent to remove existing porch which was built in the 1990s and rebuild on the same footprint. He went over the details of the proposed reconstruction per the drawings and said they intend to retain the rail design. Responding to questions he said he knows the porch was not original to house because of 1979 permit drawing which doesn't show the porch. He said there was a separate permit for building the porch in 1991.

Mr. Sneddon asked if the new breakfast nook will require demolition of the original wall.

Mr. Daniels said that they want to increase the opening and to do that requires removal of the two side lights and center door.

Mr. Murdock asked if the Harvard Belmont committee reviewed the work.

Ms. Nashem said they had a site visit on December 12, 2014.

Mr. Luoma said he attended and they felt the additions are sympathetic although there was some concern about removal of original fabric – two sidelights and door – but opening up helps the use of the space. He said the other two members were not as concerned. He said it is relatively small amount being removed and it is not real visible from the right of way.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Sneddon said that irreversible damage will be done to historic fabric. He said that while it is a sympathetic design it is contrary to the Secretary of Interior Standards.

Ms. Barker said she had no problem with the addition just removal of fabric.

Mr. Luoma said the applicant was asked if they would consider leaving portions and just take out door but they need the seating.

Mr. Daniels said they intend to put in a banquet and the area will become a dining area in the kitchen.

Ms. Shadid asked about flooring impacts.

Mr. Daniels said that the existing floor is vinyl and they propose to replace with wood.

Ms. Sodt said the interior is not designated.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for rebuilding of the exterior covered porch and conversion to enclosed space including construction of a new smaller covered porch element.

This action is based on the following:

The proposed changes are addressed on the following sections of the Harvard-Belmont District Development and Design Review Guidelines:

Guidelines C 1 Individual Buildings / Addition or Renovations:

- *Additions should be sympathetic to the original design and should not, except as additions, change the character of the original structure which is preserved.*
- *The exterior materials used for additions shall be similar to exterior materials used in the original building and should be finished in ways that are consistent with the original building.*
- *Preserve the visual quality of individual facades including use of materials, form and structure.*

While it appears from previous photos and permit drawings that the porch was not original the “X” pattern that is found in railings and another porch is continued in this design. The size of the rebuilt porch is the same size as the existing porch. Materials are wood and wood windows are the same brand as other existing non-original windows.

MM/SC/EW/AL 7:1:0 Motion carried. Mr. Sneddon opposed.

121714.33

Columbia City Landmark District

4801 Rainier Ave. S.

Proposed storefront revision on the west façade.

Ms. Frestedt provided the staff report and an overview of recent approvals related to the final design of the new development. She said the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the proposal on December 2nd. She said the Committee discussed the material alternatives that were considered for the exterior wall finish and determined that the proposed material is preferred over introducing a new

material. The said the Committee unanimously recommended approval of the alterations, as proposed.

Guy Peckham, Bumgardner, explained the desire to replace Hardi-panel with an aluminum storefront system on the southernmost portion of the west façade. It will create a more consistent look and will add more visibility to improve safety and security. He said the storefront will be aluminum with aluminum panel. He said they will match details on the building.

Ms. Wine asked if the glazing is more continuous than shown in the drawing.

Mr. Peckham said that it spans the vestibule area and stair and referenced a west elevation in the presentation materials; he pointed out where new glazing will be added. Responding to clarifying questions he said that there is a structural column coming down and he noted that there are other places where there are columns behind windows.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Wine said that additional transparency is an improvement.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for revisions to Final Design located at 4801 Rainier Ave. S. This action is based on the following:

The proposed exterior alterations meet the following sections of the District ordinance and the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines:

Relevant Code citations

SMC 25.20.070 – Approval of changes to buildings, structures and other property

Relevant Columbia City Design Guidelines:

Guidelines/General

2. The District should be pedestrian-oriented on the street level.

13. New Construction

e. Materials, Colors and Finishes. Materials commonly used on historic buildings in the District are preferred. Colors should be subdued and consistent with the historic buildings within the District.

i. Commercial

A. Building facades should be brick, wood, stone, and stucco, or a combination thereof.

B. Storefront materials should be brick, wood, concrete, stone, glass or tile.

C. Wood windows and doors are preferred. Metal windows and storefront systems will be reviewed for compatibility with neighboring historic buildings. Vinyl and other synthetic materials are discouraged.

Secretary of the Interiors Standards 9 & 10

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

121714.34 Dearborn House
1117 Minor Avenue
Proposed fenestration alterations to the carriage house.

Laura Lenss, SHK, explained that the carriage house was converted to offices in 1980 with changes made to accommodate that – drop ceiling, changed windows, and carriage door gone. She said that it was landmarked in 2007. She went over area of work on floor plan and said that a new double hung window will replace a fixed non-original window. She said that new openings will be created on an elevation not visible from the street. She said they will relocate the existing HVAC compressor. She said that they will match proportion of double hung windows, replicate existing wood profile and sill that appear elsewhere. She said they will use custom windows and sills. She said they will match the deep green color of the carriage house and mansion windows.

Mr. Sneddon said that ARC reviewed the proposal and said the building had been pretty altered and what was proposed was not a real concern. He said the double hung windows are an upgrade.

Ms. Wine said that the placement of the windows at the rear and that they scaled to the window above is good.

Mr. Sneddon said that the window widths are characteristic of others.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

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

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 122591, as the proposed exterior alterations are compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

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

121714.35 Seattle Center House / Seattle Armory
305 Harrison Street
Proposed exterior signage

Peter Cassidy, Blue Water Taco Grill, went over drawings and proposed locations of signage. He said that they referenced previously approved signs for Mod Pizza and Starbucks for examples of scale, placement and size.

Ms. Wine said that ARC asked for clarification on the drawings and said that the applicant clarified that page 7 is accurate. She said that the blade sign is lit and noted that others are not.

Mr. Cassidy said that Starbucks sign is lit and Mod Pizza is not.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

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

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

This action is based on the following:

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

121714.36 McGilvra Elementary School
1617 38th Avenue East
Proposed chimney alterations

David Van Galen, Integrus, explained the proposal to take down a portion of the chimney because it has been deemed unstable and a safety hazard per a 2009 structural study. He said its height has already been altered once, and they want to shorten it by an additional 14'-0". He said that the chimney is on the back side of the building and citing a historical image he said that even at its original height the chimney was not visible from the main street view. He

said that they will put a metal cap on that is the same size as the current pre-cast cap.

Ms. Barker asked why there are two different colors of brick.

Mr. Van Galen said he didn't know but he thought it was original.

Ms. Wine said to preserve as much height as possible. She asked for clarification on the course detail shown on the drawing.

Mr. Van Galen said they will maintain six brick courses, measured above the upside of the roof slope.

Ms. Doherty clarified that they showed three brick courses at ARC, and have now increased it to six.

Mr. Murdock asked if the cap is the same height.

Mr. Van Galen said that it is about 4" high; 43'-9" to top of cap.

Ms. Wine said that ARC noted that the chimney had already been altered and there was probably less concern because of this. She also noted that the chimney no longer functions. She said that the chimney is a contributing historic element and ARC wondered if it could be structurally reinforced from interior – the applicant said it could not. She said that ARC understood the safety implications and tried to keep as much height as possible.

Ms. Barker said the alternative bracing scenario would require 4" wide steel angle kickers on three sides, braced back to the roof. She thought this would be less visually obstructive than reducing the chimney height.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Murdock said they worked through it at ARC and preserved as much as possible.

Ms. Barker said the visual of the cap is better.

Ms. Wine said that it is not visible from the primary elevation.

Mr. Sneddon said it still preserves the history of the boiler function.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed chimney alterations at the McGilvra Elementary School, 1617 38th Avenue East, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed chimney alterations will not adversely affect the character of the property as specified in the Report on Designation (LPB 615/14), as the existing chimney was previously substantially altered.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

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

121714.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

121714.41 McGilvra Elementary School
1617 38th Avenue East

Ms. Doherty went over the signed document with board members.

Ms. Wine said she was glad it was signed so quickly.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

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

Action: I move to approve the Controls and Incentives for McGilvra Elementary School, 1617 38th Avenue East.

MM/SC/NC/VP 8:0:0 Motion carried.

121714.42 The Theodora
6559 35th Avenue NE
Request for an extension

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

Jessica Clawson said they have been briefing the ARC on the proposed addition, and request a three-month extension.

Ms. Doherty said they are continuing with briefings related to the proposed additions, and rehabilitation of the existing building and site; she said the request is reasonable.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for The Theodora, 6559 35th Avenue NE, until March 18, 2015.

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

121714.5 NOMINATIONS

121714.51 White Motor Company Building 1021 E. Pine Street

Jessica Clawson, McCullough Hill O’Leary, said she represented the owner who asked that the building not be nominated.

Larry Johnson prepared and presented the report (full report in DON file). He provided context of the site and the building. He noted the terracotta arch at the main entry, terracotta on the north façade, and variety of glazing types. He said that the former vehicle entry had been converted to an entry. He said that the lower bull’s-eyes used to have sconces and the mustard colored squares used to have cartouches but only one remains. He said that there are some integrity problems with the glazed terracotta. He noted the exposed timbers on the third floor interior and the old elevator loft.

Mr. Johnson said that some elements are missing – sconces and cartouches are gone and rosettes are missing. He said that the vehicle entry was adapted to an additional entry and elevator was added. He said that the building still has sufficient integrity to convey its historical significance. He said that the building did not meet criteria A or B. He said that while it was associated with the development of Capital Hill and REI other aspects were more significant: street car, Yesler Way cable car, city trolley line and Puget Sound Power, and Cal Anderson Park and reservoir.

Mr. Johnson said that White Motor Company’s west coast offices were in San Francisco. He said that White Motor Company made delivery vehicles and logging trucks. He said that REI expanded into this building in the 1950s and at one time expanded to the entire block; all buildings were connected. He said the building lacks the double significance of criterion C.

Mr. Johnson said the building did not meet criterion D. He said that terracotta was associated with early auto culture and the large showroom windows, eclectic styling and fantasy oriented showrooms; he provided examples of others such as the 1909 Packard on Pike, the 1920 Great Western, the 1920 former Templar Dealership, the 1922 Ford and 1925 Pacific McKay buildings among others. He

said that there are a lot of terracotta buildings in the city and this is more typical than outstanding.

He said that there are better examples of architect Julian Everett's work which includes Pilgrim Congregational Church, Pioneer Square Pergola, and the Leamington Hotel and Apartments among others. He said the building did not meet criterion E. He said that while the building is on a corner it is viewable only at the intersection and questioned if people gave directions by this building; he said it did not meet criterion F. He said that it is a borderline building.

Jessica Clawson said that she reviewed public comments and noted accusations that the owner removed decorative terra cotta features from the building; she said it is patently false and insulting. She said that Mr. Johnson said that the building retains integrity.

Mr. Luoma asked if the two trucking companies (White Motors and the adjacent Kelly Springfield) competed.

Mr. Johnson said they did.

Mr. Luoma asked if it was advantageous to be close to competitor.

Mr. Johnson said that they tended to congregate.

Ms. Barker asked if White was more successful than Springfield.

Mr. Johnson said that White was known as being more expensive and had a good reputation for durability. He said it was built after Kelly Springfield building and is larger.

Ms. Barker asked about the REI aspect of this building.

Mr. Johnson said there were offices above; the main entrance was on the first floor and they likely had street presence as well.

Ms. Shadid asked when the sconces and cartouches were removed.

Ms. Clawson said they were removed prior to this ownership's purchase of the building in 2006. She said that the cartouches and terracotta were removed as repair to ensure integrity of building.

Ms. Barker asked if there was an appendage to the architectural drawings.

Mr. Johnson said that in a previous version the building looked different.

Mr. Sneddon asked about window modifications.

Ellen Mirro, the Johnson Partnership, said that they put in smaller double glazed windows on the lower floor.

Mr. Johnson said that there are original mullions are above.

Public Comment:

Joshua Gurney, Capital Hill resident, supported nomination of the building; he said it is a landmark.

Dennis Saxman, resident, said that he has researched auto row in the neighborhood. He said the building qualifies for nomination on criteria A or C. He said the introduction of autos transformed the state, the west coasts, tourism. He said that REI was part of that. He said that the building is significant to the neighborhood, national register and to state development. He said the building meets criteria D and F. He said that pictures downplay the spatial location and said that the building is very noticeable. He said that in he watched workers remove ornamentation from the building and said he has pictures of it and will provide them. He said that this was done after the building changed ownership. He said that the same crew was doing the interior and the fence outside. He said that he was at the bus stop and watched the ornamentation being removed. He noted the significance of the truss at the upper level and the mezzanine. He said he supports nomination and wants to get to the bottom of what happened.

Mark Borrenca, REI, said that REI members brought the nomination to his attention and that he had been unaware of it. He said that REI owned Kelly Springfield building and occupied the White Motors building. He said that the ground floor was a bike shop back in the day. He said the site was where for 30 years a co-op grew up. He said that in the 1960s they had 20,000 members and ½ million in sales; now they have 5.4 million members and 137 and two billion dollars in sales. He said that REI has heartfelt warm memories of shopping and a deep sense of connectedness to the smell of creosote. He said that they are lucky to be a co-op as they can operate to their core values of humility and respect.

Mr. Borrenca said the operation was a humble one – lightly finished, creosote, cardboard – and they are humbled by the nomination. He said they have no plans to reoccupy the space. He said they respect the strength of their membership and said people feel deeply about REI; he said their membership grew there.

Andrew Haas, neighborhood resident, said that the building is an outstanding example of the auto row building and meets the criteria. He said it is remarkably intact with the original terracotta, windows, auto lift penthouse and the airy quality as you walk in. He said that the original trusses are still there and there have been no major alterations or additions. He said that in September 2013 the original rosettes were removed by the owner to the dismay of community

members. He said they did the same thing to the Kelly Springfield building. He said that the building is remarkably intact and retains integrity. He said that the building owner has rosettes in storage. He said the building meets criteria B for Lloyd Anderson – founder of REI, and Jim Whitaker – first American to climb Mt. Everest, criteria C, D, E and F.

Chris Moore, Washington Trust, said the building has integrity and meets the threshold. He said it meets criterion D and noted the visual characteristics are there. He said that he didn't know how many extant terracotta buildings there are but noted this building is three stories which is significant. He said the building meets criterion B. He said that REI started there in 1950s and was still there in 1990. He said that REI is a big deal and history in the building is significant. He said that Jim Whitaker – the first full time employee – was the first American to ascend Mt. Everest.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, agreed with Mr. Moore's comments. She said that Historic Seattle did their own study of auto row and White Motors stands out; she said there are very few terracotta clad buildings. She said it is not fair to compare it to Smith Tower or Joshua Green buildings as they are in a different category. She supported nomination and designation on C, D, and E. She said the building is prominent in the neighborhood, visible and is used as a marker. She said to clarify window issues and said the building has lots of integrity; she said to be clear about what is original and what is not. She said REI's association is significant.

Ms. Wine said the interior truss system is significant. She thanked the community for the comments.

Mr. Murdock thanked the public for their comments noting they were well-written and to the point and to the standards.

Ms. Barker supported nomination on the Staff Report, criterion C, D, and F and said she has given directions by the building. She said that this building glows and provides strength to the corner. She said it has integrity. She said she wants to see the photo documentation. She said she bought her first bike at REI. She said the terracotta makes this building stand out. She thanked the community and said it was great to see public participating in the process. She reminded them to stay engaged - if it is designated - for the Controls process.

Ms. Porter supported criteria C and D; she noted REI and its growth as significant. She said that it is a three-story example of auto row building. She said that the building still has the gable over the front entrance. She said the terracotta is interesting and the building has strong integrity.

Mr. Carter supported nomination and said the Kelly Springfield building is more associated with REI. He noted this building's distinctive style and said it has the

integrity to convey its significance. He said that it meets criterion F. He said that there are not many three-story auto row buildings.

Mr. Luoma supported nomination and said it is unfortunate that the building lost its ornamentation. He said that it is an auto row building that still retains the form of the vehicle lift in the penthouse. He said the building is significantly associated with cultural aspects of auto row and the REI association doesn't hurt. He said that he supported criteria D and F. He noted the street corner presence and three-story height and said that the nearby park space will always allow a view.

Ms. Wine supported nomination and said the building has integrity and can convey its significance. She noted the terracotta, the large expansive window openings and intact high floor to floor height and said the building was charming. She said that it is on a corner lot which plays to its significance. She said that even without auto row and REI the building could be landmarked on criterion D alone but noted that the history is significant and contributes to its significance. She said selling trucks for use in logging industry is significant and layering REI on top of that is significant.

Mr. Sneddon supported nomination on criteria C, D, E and F and said the case could be made for C. He said that buildings were designed to sell cars – the model was picked out and delivered later. He said that this was important to how neighborhoods developed and that national trends translated regionally. He said that an auto row historic district is long overdue. He noted REI's association with the building. He said that this building adds to the diversity of type and noted the three stories. He said that Julian Everett built few commercial buildings and he noted the further rarity of the use of terracotta. He noted the similarity of motifs he used on the entry with those he used on churches. He said this building is interesting in comparison to the building next door. He said the building also meets Criterion F because it is on the corner and very distinctive. He noted the extensive public comment that the building is irreplaceable and adds to the distinct quality of the neighborhood.

Ms. Shadid supported nomination on criteria C, D, and F. She noted the significance of REI, the terracotta, and the association with auto row. She said that the building is a landmark and she has given directions using it as a landmark. She appreciated the three stories.

Mr. Murdock supported nomination and noted the heavy timber truss system. He said the building is very evocative of its style. He said that the interior should be included in nomination.

Mr. Carter supported nomination and appreciated the heavy timber truss system but questioned if it should be included.

Ms. Sodt said that if that is to be included to include the entire interior at this time. She said a tour is needed.

Mr. Sneddon said that the structural system is part of the design to open up the windows.

Ms. Barker said that the new REI building has trusses.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the White Motor Company Building located at 1021 E. Pine 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 interior and exterior of the building; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for January 21, 2015; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

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

121714.52

Hahn Building
103 Pike Street

Rich Hill, McCullough Hill Leary, said that the owners have owned the building since 1986 and have no plans; they just want to know its status. He said that in 1999 the board denied designation 7 – 1.

Larry Johnson prepared and presented the nomination report (full report in DON file). He provided context of the building and site. He said that there are two entries on the west façade which was renovated in the 1980s. He said that the entry is non-original and the storefronts have all been replaced. He said that the tracery was originally pedimented and the entry had columns. He said that the cornice is non-original and the original frieze is gone. He said that the east alley face is utilitarian. He said that the interior cafés are non-original; the basement is non-original; and the old entry to the hotel was gutted in the 1980s. He said that the building doesn't meet any of the criteria and that it lacks the integrity to convey it even if it did.

Responding to clarifying questions Mr. Johnson said that the bottom floor has always been retail and the building has been an SRO since 1905. He said that nothing exists of the 1897 building and the period of significance is 1908 – 1930 when the building started losing features. He said that the Green Tortoise has operated there for six years. He said that the intent of the 1981-83 improvements was to bring the building back from derelict to functional.

Ms. Shadid agreed with the Staff Report and said that the building is so altered but noted the window pattern is distinctive.

Mr. Sneddon said that the building has two parallel stories: the top floors are an SRO hotel and tell the story of work force in this part of the City and the building still conveys that. He said that there have been many changes to the ground floor and there is no integrity to the original design. He did not support nomination.

Ms. Wine said she was 'torn' and questioned if the major changes from 25 years ago had gained significance. She said the building is recognizable and noted its relationship to Pike Place Market. She said the building conveys historicism. He said that the housing aspect upstairs continues to this day. She said the building is indicative of an SRO hotel or housing. She said that she was less concerned with the changes at the commercial storefronts because that is typical. She said that this is one of the most prominent corners in Seattle and she was loosely supportive of nomination.

Mr. Luoma did not support nomination and said that the changes at the commercial/retail are typical the 1980's renovation is faux historicism.

Mr. Carter did not support nomination. He said the 1980's remodel tries to make it look like it used to look which is not true. He said the building can't convey its significance.

Ms. Porter agreed with Mr. Carter and said that as a whole the building can't convey any significance and has no integrity.

Ms. Barker said she was torn. She said that it is a prominent street corner and that the form is still there. She did not support nomination because it did not meet any of the criteria.

Mr. Murdock said First Avenue is 'bi-polar' in that Pike Place Market on the west side was preserved but the east side was not. He said that the SRO component is important.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Hahn Building at 103 Pike 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 January 21, 2015; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/EW/MSN 2:6:0 Mmes. Barker, Porter, and Shadid, and Messrs. Carter, Luoma and Murdock opposed.

121714.6 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator