



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 98/20

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

600 4th Avenue

L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room

Wednesday January 15, 2020 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker
Manish Chalana
Roi Chang
Matt Inpanbutr
Jordon Kiel
Kristen Johnson
Ian Macleod

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Rebecca Frestedt
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Russell Coney
Harriet Wasserman
Kathleen Durham

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

011520.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

October 16, 2019

MM/SC/DB/IM

4:0:2 Minutes approved. Ms. Chang and Mr. Inpanbutr abstained.

011520.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

011520.21

Columbia City Landmark District
4824 Rainier Ave S. – Rainier Valley State Bank Building

Proposed installation of a two-sided blade sign and two illuminated wall signs for Olympia Coffee. Exhibits included plans, photographs and samples. The Rainier Valley State Bank building was constructed in 1922. It is a contributing building, within the Columbia City National Register District. On January 7, 2020 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. Following a presentation by the applicant and Committee discussion, the Committee recommended approval for the signage, as proposed.

Applicant Comment:

C. J. Williams, Western Neon, explained the sign is similar to the previous Starbucks sign. The new tenant is Olympia Coffee. He said the materials and design have been coordinated with architect. The powder coated stainless-steel and aluminum sign is durable. Attachment is above sign band. He said illuminated wall signs will attach below cornice. Blade sign is non-illuminated.

Mr. Kiel said it looks like what was previously there and is appropriate.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signage at 4824 Rainier Ave. S., as proposed

This action is based on the following:

The proposed signs meet the following sections of the District ordinance, the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards:

Guidelines/Specific

11. Signs. All signs on or hanging from buildings or windows, or applied to windows, are subject to review and approval by the Review Committee and Board. Sign applications will be evaluated according to the overall impact, size, shape, texture, lettering style, method of attachment, color, and lighting in relation to the use of the building, the building and street where the sign will be located, and the other signs and other buildings in the District. The primary reference will be to the average pedestrian's eye-level view, although views into or down the street from adjacent buildings will be an integral feature of any review.

The regulations in Seattle Municipal Code Chapter 23.55 (Signs) and the following guidelines shall apply to signs in the District. The provisions of these guidelines apply to at least the following: (1) any sign located out-of-doors; (2) indoor signs located within three feet of a window and visible from the street, sidewalk or other public place; and (3) "place of business" identification signs.

The intent of sign regulations is to ensure that signs relate physically and visually to their location; that signs reflect the character and unique nature of the business; that signs do not hide, damage, or obstruct the architectural elements of the building; that signs be oriented toward and promote a pedestrian environment; and that the products or services offered be the focus, rather than the signs.

Window Signs and Hanging Signs. Generally, painted or vinyl letters in storefront windows and single-faced, flat surfaced painted wood signs are preferred. Extruded

aluminum or plastics are discouraged and may not be allowed. Window signs shall not cover a large portion of the window so as to be out of scale with the window, storefront, or facade.

Blade Signs. Blade signs (double-facing projecting signs hanging perpendicular to the building), that are consistent in design with District goals are encouraged. Blade signs shall be installed in a manner that is in keeping with other approved blade signs in the District. They shall not hide, damage or obscure the architectural elements of the building. The size should be appropriately scaled for the building.

g. Sign Lighting. Sign lighting should be subdued and incandescent. Back-lit signs are prohibited. Signs that flash, blink, vary in intensity, revolve or are otherwise in motion or appear to be in motion shall not be permitted.

Secretary of the Interior Standards

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

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

MM/SC/DB/MC 6:0:0 Motion carried.

011520.22

Sunset Telephone & Telegraph Exchange / Q.A. Masonic Temple
1608 4th Avenue West
Proposed site and exterior building alterations

Seth Hale, MAS Architecture proposed conversion of building into two dwelling units and doing a seismic retrofit. He said brace frames will be installed at all perimeter walls. He said tube steel columns and beams on interior; there will be no exterior penetrations. He said all of the non-original windows will be replaced. He said the west façade has had the fewest alterations over time. He said the masons cut door in and installed fire escape on east façade; all north and south facing windows were bricked up. He proposed removal of the fire escape.

Ms. Doherty said the building was designed as a telephone exchange and was later converted to a Masonic Temple.

Mr. Hale went through design packet and proposed replacement of the north sidewalk. He said the two concrete staircases and stoops at entry will have guard rails installed. He said they will remove the ramp. He said the parking area will be cut back; excavation will be done on alley side to allow garage access in the basement. He said landscape plan is minimal – boxwood hedges and low plantings that will not screen the building. He said infilled windows on the west façade will be opened and true divided lights and sash installed. He proposed repainting the building. He said the wood letters will be removed and a new sign – black metal letters with Queen Anne Masonic Temple symbol between

– will be installed. He said on the north side all windows will be replaced with Anderson Fibrex windows in black. Fire escape will be removed; window will be cut larger to provide access to new balcony. Large metal exhaust will be removed and bricked over. He said on the east side windows will be replaced. The entry door will be replaced by double doors and transom, centered. Black metal balconies will be reminiscent of the fire escape. He said brace frames on interior will reduce visibility from exterior. He said the upper portion of the south façade will have windows opened up; two new windows will be added for basement space for west unit. He said the building color was white with evidence of blue, gold, green, and brown having been used on trim. He proposed a more monochromatic façade – gray with darker gray for trim. He said the casing around windows will be black; casing will be replicated where it can't be repaired. He said original cornices were removed, an outline remains. He proposed construction of new cornices that would be adhered to building.

He noted the non-conformity of the building and said they need to provide a rooftop structure / amenity. Penthouse will setback 7' on north and south; 6' on west; and 9' 8" on the east. He said the guard rail will be only 20" taller than perimeter parapet which helps minimize visibility. Alternative roof form is angled to minimize shadowing to building on the north. He said the square shape (flat roof) adds a little visible impact or shadow. He provided photos at 25' intervals and noted that both options were visible further back. His preference is for the square option.

He went over materials as noted in packet and proposed replacement of existing doors at all openings. Window frames will be black, true divided lights windows on the west, casing will be replicated at all windows, garage door will be black; flush mounted light at front door entry alcove, down lights on penthouse, restoration above north entries and tile pattern at front door, and add building number.

Ms. Chang asked if they explored other rail options.

Mr. Hale said that only a handrail is required.

Mr. Macleod asked what original lighting was like.

Mr. Hale didn't know. He said currently there is conduit all over the place.

Mr. Inpanbutr asked if the right-hand door on north elevation was original.

Mr. Hale said it is original. He said the image on sheet 23 shows existing door. There is evidence of brackets on either side, same on all windows.

Mr. Chalana asked the age of existing sign.

Mr. Hale said it was maybe 20 years old.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Deliberation:

Ms. Barker said she appreciated applicant response to ARC request for penthouse information and impacts of both designs. She said the garage doors are a nice alternative solution. She supported the proposal.

Mr. Kiel said the applicant did a good job of responding to ARC comments. He supported approval of either penthouse design but preferred the flat rectangle.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed site and building exterior alterations at the former Sunset Telephone & Telegraph Exchange, 1608 4th Avenue West, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Report on Designation (LPB 333/19), as the proposed work 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/DB/IM 6:0:0 Motion carried.

011520.23

Central Building
810 Third Avenue
Proposed lobby interior alterations

Matt Aalfs explained the interior upper floor project necessitates some lobby modifications. He proposed adding handrails to monumental stairs to second floor. Slim steel with flat back custom-fabricated rails will be anchor-bolted to concrete substructure floor and will be in line with the banister. He proposed enclosing the east side of the lobby opening with glass, butt jointed panels; attachment to non-original sheetrock clad header. He proposed changing back door to restaurant, to match other door to Cherry Street Coffee; frame to be black. He said they will re-use the art panel in lobby now in the sidelight.

Ms. Barker asked if the doors are lockable.

Mr. Aalfs said they are.

Mr. Kiel asked about hardware finish.

Mr. Aalfs said they propose brushed chrome.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Barker said it was straightforward and addressed safety issues.

Mr. Kiel said it is all reversible.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed interior lobby alterations at the Central Building, 810 Third Avenue, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics as specified in Ordinance No. 122592, as the proposed work 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/IM/DB 6:0:0 Motion carried.

011520.3 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

011520.31 Roy Vue Apartments
615 Bellevue Avenue East
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty said they are actively negotiating and thinks they are getting close; she said the owner requested an extension.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Roy Vue Apartments at 615 Bellevue Avenue East for two months.

MM/SC/DB/MC 6:0:0 Motion carried

011520.32 líq'təd (Licton) Springs Park
9536 Ashworth Avenue North
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for a three-month extension. She said the property owner, Seattle Parks and Recreation said they will negotiate. She said the draft is consistent with other park properties although some text will be tweaked. She said they want illustration of the area of controls to be clear, and that the open lawn area feels distinctly different.

Mr. Kiel asked if there is a way for community groups to be part of the process.

Ms. Doherty said the negotiations are between the property owner and the City. She said she will share the completed agreement with people who gave public comment, in case they want to submit additional public comment.

Public Comment:

Ken Workman addressed the Board in Lushootseed and English thanking them and the staff for their warm hearts, and the big work they are doing for líq'təd Sprngs.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the liq'ted (Licton) Springs Park at 9536 Ashworth Avenue North for three months.

MM/SC/DB/IM 6:0:0 Motion carried

011520.33 Franklin Apartments
2302 Fourth Avenue
Request for extension

Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill Leary explained the request for extension to April 15, 2020. He said the ownership team has submitted an ARC packet to Ms. Sodt.

Ms. Barker expressed concern about security.

Tyler Kurz, Toll Brothers said they heard board comments and the ownership is working hard to get the building secured and cleaned up. He said it is boarded up and they have had lots of difficulties. He said they have a quality clean up crew. They first boarded up the large opening. Contractors who specialize in biohazards cleaned out the building. He said this was followed up with general contractor boarding up any openings. He said the building is all secured. He said someone is on site weekly to monitor. He said the alley is an issue. He said there is another vendor cleaning that area weekly. He said they are getting demolition and abatement permits for the sites to the north. He said in September they submitted permits for shoring on Franklin building. He said they are awaiting response from SDCI.

Mr. McCullough said they are also awaiting response from Parks because of location on Bell Street.

Shuchi Hsu, Toll Brothers said they need to brace the building and need to access Parks' space.

Ms. Sodt said now they are only submitting for preliminary design Certificate of Approval.

Ms. Barker asked if demolition to the north includes the north side of the Franklin Building.

Mr. Kurz said no that the light well will be cleaned out and access points from top to bottom will be secured. He said construction fencing will go up.

Mr. Kiel asked if there had been any intrusion.

Ms. Kurz said mostly in the two, single-story buildings.

Ms. Barker said from her perspective, once a week clean up is not sufficient; it should be every other day.

Mr. Kurz said they hired a company that is there regularly.

Ms. Barker asked if they would commit to every two days.

Ms. Hsu said yes.

Mr. Kiel noted the Seattle Times Building and said to take ownership. He suggested adding motion sensors.

Ms. Hsu said they will start with soft demolition of interior.

Ms. Chang said there should be contingency in case permits are delayed.

Ms. Johnson arrived at 4:45 pm.

Ms. Barker said there have been security issues from the get-go.

Mr. Chalana suggested three-month extension.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Franklin Apartments, 2302 Fourth Avenue for three months. Applicant will monitor the building every two days with documentation.

MM/SC/DB/MC 7:0:0 Motion carried

011520.4 DESIGNATIONS

011520.41 Canterbury Court
4225 Brooklyn Avenue NE

Katie Kendall, McCullough Hill Leary said they support designation on criteria D and E.

Full report in DON file.

David Peterson, Historic Resource Consulting provided context of the site and neighborhood and noted the area was platted in 1890. He went over history of the Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition and the growth and expansion of the University of Washington campus.

The subject building was constructed as a Tudor Revival style “bungalow court” apartment building in 1928-1929, for the Estate of Samuel Fried, on a parcel originally consisting of three equally sized lots.

Henry Harold Hodgson was a Seattle architect who was active from the mid-1920s to the mid-1930s, but not well known today—very little previous research was found. Mr. Hodgson primarily designed single family houses, and a few institutional buildings, typically in a Tudor Revival or English Cottage style, or occasionally in a simplified Mediterranean Revival style. His projects appear to have been largely located in the Laurelhurst and University District neighborhoods. The subject building is his only known multifamily structure that could be identified for this report.

Canterbury Court has a C-shaped plan, with 16 attached apartments surrounding a landscaped courtyard open to the east, towards Brooklyn Avenue NE. Structure is wood frame with brick and stucco veneer cladding, over a concrete basement. Cladding at the exterior perimeter walls, upper gable ends, and the courtyard upper story is painted cedar shingles. Decorative half-timbering is used at a few locations for effect. The C-shaped mass features a two-story north-south central bar at the rear which contains apartment flats on both levels, flanked by two east-west wings which each consist of one or one-and-a-half story apartments. The second floor of the central bar is reached by a straight wooden stair extending into the center of the courtyard. The original stair shown in the 1937 tax assessor photo appears to have been constructed of masonry; the construction date of the current stair is unknown. A door at the south side base of the stair leads to the basement. At the top of the stair is a recessed balcony with original decorative railing of shaped boards and pickets, which provides access to the four units at that level.

Canterbury Court was designed in the Tudor Revival style, which often features varied architectural details to create a picturesque ensemble. Elements contributing to the style on the subject building include decorative brickwork (irregularly laid courses, lime-washed brick, brick laid in patterns, or brick corbelling), a wide variety of windows (leaded clear glass, leaded colored glass, steel or wood sash, bay windows, casements, double-hung, timber headers, brick sills), and individualized entries with covered porches or projecting half-timbered vestibules. Windows at the rear and side building elevations are more uniform, and typically consist of 6-over-1 leaded glass single-hung sash occurring in pairs or singly. Some windows have been updated with double-paned glazing, as at the west part of the south elevation (visible from the alley), but these appear to be sympathetic replacements. Original doors throughout typically feature six leaded glass upper panel glazing.

No information was found regarding the original design or installation of the courtyard landscaping. Available historic drawings do not show any planting plans or hardscape/path designs, although concrete walks lead from the main gate on Brooklyn Avenue to the individual unit entries. Some trees, such as the large birch, appears as one of two saplings flanking the stair in the 1937 tax assessor photo. Planting beds in the center of the courtyard and against the building currently appear to be maintained by residents, and have an informal, picturesque quality.

Ms. Kendall said the Birch is an exceptional tree and will remain.

Ms. Doherty included Criterion F in the Staff Recommendation because of the building's contrast to the neighborhood.

Ms. Kendall said the hedges are in the City right of way and are not part of the site.

Mr. Chalana asked about the immediate context of the building and how it might have transformed.

Mr. Peterson said there are buildings around; there is a lot of early development. He said the oldest house in the area is from 1905-07 with most built in the 1920's.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Deliberation:

Ms. Johnson supported designation and said the Tudor Revival details are there. She noted the brick patterns and character and wood railing. She said criteria D and E were relevant.

Mr. Chalana said it is a nice building and he supported designation on criteria D and E.

Mr. Inpanbutr supported designation on criteria D and E.

Mr. Macleod supported designation on Criteria D, E, and F. He said the building is unique among Hodgson's work. He said he understood why staff included Criterion F; the building is unique in the block.

Ms. Chang supported designation based on Criterion D. She was not certain about criteria E and F but noted the changing landscape in the area.

Ms. Barker supported designation based on Criterion D, noting the brick, and F. She said when built the building was a different scale from what was around it; even now the scale and massing are different, and you can see it.

Mr. Kiel supported designation on Criterion D only and said it is an exceptional example of the style. He said it is easily identifiable.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Canterbury Court at 4225 Brooklyn Avenue NE, as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standard D; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the site and the exterior of the building.

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

011520.42

Golden Rule Dairy / Stoneway Electric Supply
3665 Stone Way North

Ms. Doherty provided letters of public comment to board.

Adam Alsobrook, Sound Historical Resources said in response to board member requests at the nomination meeting, he was providing an overview of the building as it stands now, dairy food processing operations, and other dairy buildings in Seattle (detailed report in DON file). He said the building is constructed of reinforced concrete on north, east and south sides with hollow clay tile on secondary elevation. He said most of the windows have been replaced or altered and entry doors replaced. He said that roof monitor windows have been replaced and chimney has been removed. He said the loading dock is the new primary entry. He said there have been many alterations to the east side and the current sign obscures the building's history as a dairy.

He said there are many forms of dairy building style but typically, the dairy building was a one-story building, with signage and tall smokestack. He said without those elements it would be hard to identify it as a dairy building. He provided a diagrammatic overview of the basic steps of dairy processing.

Marvin Anderson, Marvin Anderson Architects provided detailed information about the style and use of brick. He noted relation to the Amsterdam School and Frank Lloyd Wright's use of brick. He noted the strong vertical emphasis and noted work by Willem Dudok. He noted the expression of structural members and the explosion of the box by Mies Van der Rohe. He said brick was widely used. He said there are many potential influences of the building and lots of stylistic tropes found. He noted the importance of light and the use of roof light monitors to bring in more light. He said here, the monitors faced the south and not the north as was standard. He noted the use of glass block for light diffusion. He said here, it is not used in a modern way; they put in glass block with no expression of structure. He said there are no large spans of glass. He said Wright used horizontal bands and eaves and grouped windows to show expression of function inside. He said here, there is no expression of function. He said form does not follow function; the structure is concealed and not expressed. He said the stylistic trope is inconsistent.

Mr. Alsobrook provided photos of the building in its neighborhood context and said it is not noticeable.

Jessica Clawson, McCullough Hill Leary said the building does not have integrity to convey significance and doesn't meet any of the criteria for designation. She said the building doesn't have integrity to convey significance. She said the building is 74 years old and was a dairy only 16 years, and it is not a significant part of the culture or industry. She said the smokestack is gone. She said it is not the first, oldest, nicest, or best looking. She said it is not the first Golden Rule. She said the building is not the last dairy remaining – there are several remaining in better shape and two were recommended by survey to be landmarked. She noted Mr. Anderson's presentation and said the building did not meet Criterion D. She said it is not a modern building and the light monitors were installed facing the wrong way, to the detriment of the building occupants. She said the glass block was not well done; there are better examples. She said the building doesn't embody the style – everything was done incorrectly. She said there are other, better examples for criteria E and F.

Elizabeth Tellesen, the owner's representative, said the building has always been a single tenant warehouse building. She said as the neighborhood changes the current tenant wants to relocate, and the owner wants to repurpose the building to reflect the values of the neighborhood.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Deliberation:

Ms. Barker supported designation and said it feels emblematic of F as wayfinding. She said as background as community place of live/work; for electrical supplies, people shopped there; for milk, electricity, the community shopped there. She said it was a small business in the Stone Way community. She supported Criterion C for significance to the community and F as it is easily identifiable in its contrast in siting.

Ms. Chang said she can't identify relevant criteria.

Mr. Macleod said he was struggling with individual criteria but the strongest would be C and F. He said C was relevant because of the history as a dairy and being important to the community and this neighborhood. He said the building is part of the working-class heritage of the neighborhood. He said D was relevant for an interstitial period only; E was not relevant. He said the building meets Criterion F.

Mr. Inpanbutr said only Criterion F is relevant. He said it is visually prominent in siting and scale in the neighborhood and as a method of wayfinding. He said the photos show it used to be more prominent.

Mr. Chalana supported designation and said the building met criteria C and F. He said the building retains integrity and conveys significance as an industrial working building more than for its use. He said the designer played with the form. He said Modernism is a mixed bag; this could be playful and fun, not a goof-up.

Ms. Johnson appreciated the additional information provided about the dairy process and how it fit within the building. She said the relation to dairy is less important than being an industrial building; it was much nicer than it needed to be. She said she wondered if the light monitors were installed facing south because there is not so much light here. She said the building does not rise to meet Criterion C. She said the architecture is more than just applied elements; there is form to it. She didn't support designation. She said it is interesting and unusual in its context.

Mr. Kiel did not support designation and said the building didn't meet any of the criteria for designation. He appreciated Mr. Anderson's analysis and said the bands were not used to embody the style.

Ms. Chang did not support designation.

Mr. Macleod wished the board had heard more from community members.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Golden Rule Dairy / Stoneway Electric Building at 3665 Stone Way Avenue North, 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 and the exterior of the building.

MM/SC/DB/MC 3:4:0 Motion failed. Messrs. Kiel and Inpanbutr, and Mmes. Chang and Johnson opposed.

011520.43

Community Psychiatric Clinic / Bush Roed & Hitchings Office
2009 Minor Avenue East

Ellen Mirro, Studio TJP provided context of the site and neighborhood. Via photos she provided a virtual walk around the building noting elements. She noted the openness of the building when first built and said the brise soleil on the west façade is gone and all

windows have been changed. She showed the potential extension of the building. She reported infill took away the openness. She noted changes to courtyard facades, infill of lower level, removal of deck, small addition, and the original siding was replaced.

Katie Jaeger, Studio TJP said the building didn't meet criteria A, B, or C. She said the association with development of Eastlake is tangential only. She said this was not the original site of Community Psychiatric Clinic (CPC) who occupied the building until 1974. Tenant from 1974-78 was DSHS and from 1979 on, Bush, Roed & Hitchings.

Ms. Mirro said the building is in the Mid-Century Modern style; she provided examples of the work of Mies Van der Rohe and Paul Kirk. She said the building was a new typology; doctors had previously made house calls. She said Kirk was a design leader in medical offices and clinics – one story, flat roofs, plenty of glass, double loaded corridors, lab and x-rays. Buildings were in suburban neighborhoods. She said the building may or may not have integrity to convey significance. She said all consulting rooms were removed. She said Paul Kirk won many awards; he was one of the fathers of Pacific Northwest Modernism. His office was next door and it is noted as one of his best buildings. He was a leader in establishing clinic typology. Kirk won a lot of design awards – almost every year from 1953-70. She said Magnolia Library is his only Seattle landmark and seven of his clinics won awards; this one didn't so it is not outstanding. She said the building may or may not meet Criterion F.

Owner Statement:

Scott Hitchings, of Bush, Roed Hitchings said the building was purchased as an investment for retirement. He said they lost three sales offers because of the landmark nomination. He said there is no seismic integrity – the building needs sheer walls. He said the HVAC needs replacing and the building needs a roof cap. He said market value has diminished. He said the building is not one of Kirk's gems; it won no awards or accolades. He said the building is not unique as his other designs and doesn't have great integrity. He said it is not one of his best works. He said the building is not the original location of CPC. He asked the board not to designate.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Deliberation:

Ms. Barker supported designation and said CPC had greater stature and the building can convey that. She noted the accessibility of the building; it is low-slung and had many windows which express its functions. She said windows are important as a path to mental health. She said Criterion C is relevant; culturally and politically it was a big deal for its time for people to go in and seek help. She said it met Criterion D but not E or F.

Ms. Johnson did not support designation. She said Kirk is important. She said the building is interesting and she noted Kirk's hand in creating medical clinic typology. She said this building didn't have integrity and noted the window changes, loss of brise soleil and the landscaped courtyards were never realized.

Mr. Macleod supported designation on Criterion C; the building was designed for CPC, a public community focused clinic that was supported by architectural design. He said some elements have been lost.

Mr. Inpanbutr agreed with Ms. Johnson and said the building at one point embodied the style but there have been too many changes that have eroded great features.

Ms. Chang did not support designation and noted the loss of integrity. She questioned the ability of the building to live on. She said CPC was not in the building for the majority of the life of the building.

Mr. Chalana said Kirk was fabulous architect. He said the building was a good example of Mid-Century Modern style. He noted cultural and political significance for the City. He supported Criterion C.

Mr. Kiel did not support designation.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Community Psychiatric Clinic / Bush Roed & Hitchings Offices at 2009 Minor Avenue East, as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the site and the exterior of the building.

MM/SC/IM/DB 3:4:0 Motion failed. Messrs. Kiel and Inpanbutr, and Mmes. Chang and Johnson opposed.

011520.5 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator