



The City of Seattle

# Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 489/21

## MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

Remote Meeting

Wednesday November 3, 2021 - 3:30 p.m.

### Board Members Present

Taber Caton

Russell Coney

Kristen Johnson

Ian Macleod

Lawrence Norman

John Rodezno

Harriet Wasserman

### Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Melinda Bloom

### Absent

Dean Barnes

Roi Chang

Matt Inpanbutr

Lora-Ellen McKinney

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

**110321.1 PUBLIC COMMENT**

**110321.2 MEETING MINUTES**

July 21, 2021

MM/SC/HW/LN 5:0:2 Minutes approved. Ms. Caton and Mr. Macleod abstained.

August 18, 2021

MM/SC/HW/LN 7:0:0 Minutes approved.

September 1, 2021

MM/SC/HW/LN 7:0:0 Minutes approved.

**110321.3 SPECIAL TAX VALUATION**

110321.31 Bon Marche Building  
300 Pine Street

Ms. Sodt explained the Special Tax Incentive Program and said this review is for Phase 2 of three for Unit 1. She said the building is divided into two condominium units. She said the submitted costs are \$60,849,867.23; allowed costs are \$59,964,566.10; disallowed costs are \$885,301.13. She said work for designated portions of the property was performed in conformance with Certificates of Approval issued by the Landmarks Preservation Board.

Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill Leary said it has been great and this project is the best evidence of how the process can work so well. The project was set up to ensure capital reinvestments and has made a material difference with a willingness to pour millions into the building. He said they have made good progress for first floor retailers. He said a new shear wall was built inside the exterior stair wall on exterior of building. He said the project focused on shell and core work.

Paul Brenneke, ownership said they stripped back to concrete and updated all HVAC, electrical, core and shell for tenant floor 2, basement and subbasement.

Ms. Sodt said it is a big project that is being done in multiple phases, others have impacted designated features.

Mr. Brenneke said an earlier phase included canopy restoration, braided bronze around windows, restoration of storefronts, doors.

Mr. Coney asked if they were able to work with Metro to restore openings for transit.

Mr. McCullough asked if he means on Pine Street for light rail.

Mr. Coney said yes.

Mr. McCullough said he is meeting with Sound Transit next week. He said they decided to do a Lidar Survey on all tunnel entrances. He said they are renegotiating the easement and he will come back to bring the board up to date.

Ms. Johnson said it is reasonable and the amount is over the required threshold.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: Bon Marche/Macy's Building, 300 Pine Street, that this action is based upon criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; that this property 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/IM/TC 7:0:0 Motion carried.

Agenda reordered.

**110321.5 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

110321.51 Magnolia Elementary School  
2418 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue W  
Proposed removal of one tree

David Jackson explained the need to remove a dead English Elm from the southeast portion of the site. He said the tree is within range of the school, property line and playground and is a hazard. He said the tree will be replaced with two trees.

Ms. Johnson said the tree is diseased, it is not a construction issue.

Mr. Jackson said the disease predates construction.

Mr. Macleod asked if any of the wood would be salvaged.

Mr. Jackson said it is not their intent; it is an expensive endeavor.

Ms. Doherty clarified that replacement trees are not proposed, only the removal is being considered today.

Mr. Macleod said the construction looks nice; it is unfortunate to lose the tree.

Ms. Johnson asked if there are any other Elms nearby.

Mr. Jackson said not that he was aware of.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed tree removal at Magnolia Elementary School, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed removal of this tree affects the features of the landmark as specified in the Report on Designation (LPB 435/15). But the applicant has demonstrated the need to perform this work to address safety concerns. The tree is also at the rear of the lot, reading more as part of the adjacent park than the school site, and does not impact the integrity of the landmark.
2. There is no alternative to removing the tree.
3. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

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

**110321.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

110321.41 The Fairfax  
1508 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue E  
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for extension to February 2, 2022 and noted she has been actively negotiating with property representatives. She said she is working on a second draft and needs more time.

Mr. Coney said it was reasonable especially with holiday and winter challenges.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for The Fairfax, 1508 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue E. until February 2, 2022.

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

**110321.6 NOMINATIONS**

110321.61 University of Washington – Faculty Club  
4020 E Stevens Way NE

Susan Boyle, BOLA presented (full report in DON file).

The University of Washington Faculty Club is a striking post-war Modern design achievement by two prominent local architects – Paul Hayden Kirk and Victor Steinbrueck, along with a landscape design by Garrett Eckbo of Eckbo, Dean & Williams. Built in 1960, the two-story building was placed on a steeply sloping site at a prominent location along the east edge of the central campus. Constructed concrete, steel, brick, stucco and glass, its cubic massing, white volumetric forms, full height window walls, exposed framing and strong relationship of interior and exterior spaces expressed a Modern design and Northwest sensibility.

She said for nearly six decades the building served as a membership club for faculty, with dining and reception facilities, and as a rental venue. The lower floor conference room was utilized also for project reviews by the University's Architectural Commission and other campus groups. The UW Club suffered economic impacts due to the pandemic closure of all dining facilities, and it laid off its staff in March 2020. At the end of June 2020, the Club's Board of Directors were forced to close the club permanently and dissolve the non-profit corporate entity that operated it. The building was then passed onto University Facilities.

She provided context of the site and neighborhood and noted this site has historic significance relating to emergence of the campus during the Alaska Yukon Pacific Exposition (AYPE). The Faculty Club is located on the eastern portion of the fairground site at the location of a former Hoo House. The earlier building, designed for use during the AYPE by noted Seattle architect Ellsworth Storey, was for the Hoo Hoo, a lumbermen's fraternal association. The half-timbered, rustic style building was designed with Prairie-style elements in contrast to the neoclassical style buildings of the AYPE. It remained a beloved location of the club for nearly 40 years.

Ms. Boyle said that to accommodate growth of faculty a new faculty club was proposed. To accommodate these increasing numbers, it was decided to demolish the Hoo Hoo House and build a new free-standing structure. One of the most notable requirements developed by the Faculty Club was to "build a contemporary-style structure."

She said the building was designed by Paul Hayden Kirk and Victor Steinbrueck. The one-time collaboration between Steinbrueck and Kirk was unique in that it brought together two leading architects of the time for a building that married the International Style modernist ideals together with a Northwest aesthetic – something both architects valued and practiced in their designs.

She said Paul Kirk was a pre-war practitioner who came to the forefront with beautiful modern dwellings. Kirk was a modernist who honored the human response in his architecture both in scale and materiality. He deeply admired both Scandinavian and Japanese traditions, both for their uniqueness to architectural space. In the Scandinavian, he saw the warmth and humanity of buildings. In Japanese buildings, he admired screening, modular systems, large, movable simple windows and doors, and the integration of inside and outside living spaces. His firm, Kirk, Wallace and McKinley designed the University Unitarian Church, Blakely Clinic, Kirk, Wallace, McKinley office. She said they took on larger work as the firm grew – Seattle Civic Center, Japanese Presbyterian Church, Magnolia Public Library. She said Kirk taught at the University of Washington.

Ms. Boyle said design of the subject building was done in collaboration with Victor Steinbrueck who also taught at the University of Washington; he produced residential work that was very much of its time and of the Northwest Regional style, he was a collaborator on the Space Needle design, an author, activist, architect. She

said he led the fight to save Pike Place Market. She said he was an urbanist who understood the importance of preservation.

She said the building should have been called the “Men’s Faculty Club” as women faculty were relegated to the wives’ portion of the club; she noted the men’s restroom, men’s bar, men’s billiards room. She said the upper floor was complex in plan and noted a ramp leads up to the entry. She said the main entry encircles the courtyard space. She said a covered open deck was later enclosed. She noted the layering of open spaces and the grade change and how the building hovers over the site. She said the way the building is sited in landscape the way it is layered reflects Northwest Regionalism. She said above the dining room is an elevated monitor roof. She noted clerestory windows, regular bays, rectilinear floor plans. She said the site extends outward and includes the entire paved parking lot. She conducted a virtual walk-through the building and site via photos and noted elements.

She said that Kirk had polio as a child and used canes. She said he created ramp access to the building that turn to deliberately give different views to the building. She said the building is simple – cubism as architecture. She noted the expansion of the kitchen, the lightwells with view to light scale deciduous plants that change with the season. She noted outrigger elements used as a way of extending visually the light scale of the framing device. She said there is ADA compliant access from the parking lot across the street but noted the ramp does not meet the prescriptive requirements of ADA.

She said the club has been closed during Covid and hasn’t reopened. She said some wood was salvaged from the Hoo Hoo House.

Mr. Norman asked if seismic studies have been done.

Julie Blakeslee, University of Washington said she wasn’t aware of anything.

Ms. Boyle suspected not, as she hadn’t seen anything in the drawings.

Ms. Johnson asked if National Register nomination had been submitted.

Ms. Boyle said it was submitted in 2013 or 2014.

Mr. Norman said the landscape seems significant here and asked if it was included.

Ms. Boyle said the plan shows the landscape boundary and noted the northwest native plants in southeast and east sides. She said around the back there is a low hedge. She said the rectangle drawn around encompasses the parking lot and all landscaping seen in lightwells and courtyards.

Ms. Blakeslee said there is a mature landscape. She said over time some things have changed; there is lots of original planting material but changes as well.

Ms. Boyle said the George Tsutakawa sculpture in the light well and the concrete lady are not original elements.

Mr. Norman asked if interiors are included.

Ms. Boyle cited pages 7 and 8 and said the interiors are intact with exception of new kitchen expansion with addition, new equipment and new restrooms.

Mr. Rodezno asked if ADA upgrade is needed.

Ms. Boyle said the building needs to be more energy code compliant and they will likely try to address both at the same time.

Ms. Blakeslee said the front ramp is helpful but not ADA compliant. She said the bathroom has helped with access issues. She said getting to the lower floor is a problem. There is a movable chair that goes up and down the stair although not often used. She said the exterior path from Stevens Way south of site and then angling to doorway on lower level has been contemplated as an option. She said elevator addition to exterior has been thought about as well.

Ms. Caton asked about current use.

Ms. Boyle said it was formerly used as University Club, a separate business and a membership club. She said it was closed due to Covid and is now being used as a Covid testing location.

Mr. Coney asked if there are any code issues. He said he wanted to know more about the sculptures in the landscape.

Ms. Boyle said she would seek that information.

Ms. Wasserman supported nomination and called it a glorious place. She said the interior is still there and the sculptures can't be added later. She said included elements can always be pared back at designation meeting.

Mr. Macleod supported nomination and said it is a special building. He said it is a landmark on campus. He said Paul Kirk and Victor Steinbrueck were masters of their craft. He said he was lucky to go inside; it is lovely inside as out. He supported inclusion of interior and front landscape. He said he understands ADA issues.

Mr. Rodezno said the building is already on the National Register. He supported nomination of interior and exterior. He said the building is the work of a master builder.

Mr. Norman said it is a beautiful building. He said he loves the glass and thought of the Space Needle and that whole era. He supported inclusion of interior and landscape.

Mr. Coney supported nomination of site, interior, exterior and said it would be narrowed down at designation.

Ms. Caton supported nomination and said it is an excellent building. She supported inclusion of the interior and noted the connection between interior and exterior is character defining and important.

Ms. Johnson supported nomination. She said this is exactly what architecture students studied. She said it feels like a spaceship landed in place. She agreed with other board members that the interior and site should be included; elements can be pared back at designation if desired.

Ms. Doherty suggested including “site as illustrated in Figure 3 of nomination, including courtyards, interior and exterior”.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the University of Washington Faculty Club at 4020 E Stevens Way NE for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the site as illustrated in Figure 3 of nomination, interior and the exterior of the building, including courtyards; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for December 15, 2021; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

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

Ms. Boyle hoped a tour could be arranged.

110321.62                      University of Washington – Wallace Hall  
3737 Brooklyn Avenue NE

Julie Blakeslee, University of Washington said this property is sited in the west campus. She said they want to understand the status of the building.

Susan Boyle, BOLA presented (full nomination report in DON file). She said the building is a low and horizontal building, a simple rectangle. She called it an ‘introverted’ building. She said the west campus was developed after WWII. She said the area at one time housed marine and fisheries-oriented facilities.

Prior to the mid-late 19th century, Euro-American settlement of the area that became the University District was a forested land crossed by trails used by the Native Americans for hunting and berry growing. In 1855, the federal government surveyed and divided the unceded territory it into townships. This land was governed initially by the Oregon Territory's Organic Act, which reserved Sections 16 and 36 of each township for the maintenance of public schools. Section 16 later became the University campus. In 1936 the area was part of a government takeover with claiming of unceded lands. She said the shoreline still had vestiges of boat sales and ship repair.



Use of the west campus area was anticipated by UW in campus plan in 1962 master plan. She noted the division of the neighborhood by the addition of the freeway, movement of academic buildings related to marine environmental studies onto this plot. She said fisheries in the area at this time were insignificant.

Ms. Boyle said 1950-60 marked the emergence of computers. She said they used to be huge pieces of equipment with lots of needed infrastructure; this building responded to that need. She said this was a new building type to house a main frame and was designed around its mechanical needs. She said the building was heated by recycling heat from equipment and lights.

She noted a rectangle was drawn around suggested site for nomination and does not include parking lot or driveway. She said the site slopes to 4' lower on the north. She said the original floor plan included a large computer area with keyboard room above it. She noted curved elements around circulation spaces and study hall spaces. She said a space now used as offices was originally the library. She said upstairs offices are arranged around a double loaded corridor. Offices have small openings for visual windows that would have no glare on computer screen. She said the west part of the roof was a roof deck and has long been closed. She noted skylights and tilt-up concrete construction. She said windows were placed in limited areas. She said the north side has a large curtain wall in conference room with strip windows.

Ms. Boyle said there are three other buildings on this block. The surrounding buildings are 1970-80s experiments with 'how to do modern buildings.' She said the 1977 Corten sculpture is owned by the Arts Commission. She said the subject building has 11 ½' floor to floor heights and is 200' long. She noted the tautness of the entry ramp and the texture of the concrete, the canopy over entry on south façade and the west side recessed entry and original roof deck.

She said the first floor is more typical, the original open two-story study area 'POE (Program for the Environment) Commons' is enclosed now and is a semi-private study area. She noted the skylight and narrow windows. She said the first-floor computer room and second floor class room are largely unchanged.

Ms. Boyle said architect Ibsen Nelsen's career began with a short period of employment with NBBJ before opening his own firm in 1953. The following year he formed a partnership with architect Russell Sabin. The firm of Nelsen & Sabin, later Nelsen, Sabin & Varey, designed a variety building projects throughout the Pacific Northwest. Bond and Miller Hall, Arntzen Hall, the Social Science Building, and the Northwest Environmental Studies Center, which won an AIA Honor Award in 1981.

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. Upon retirement he moved to his Danish style farmhouse on Vashon Island.

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 noted comparable buildings of this style: Robin Hood Gardens in London, Carpenter Hall at Harvard, Yale Art and Architecture, Pike and Virginia Building, and Seattle's Freeway Park among others. She said the style dealt in a non-historic way to deal with current real conditions. The roughness as a poetic expression when handled by good architects and noted McMahan Hall, Oceanography, Gould Hall, and Condon Hall. She noted the rigor, beauty of construction, and use of concrete.

Ms. Boyle said Baugh Construction was a good contractor and the building is well-crafted. She noted Haverall Pavilion at Century 21, Bricklayer's Union Hall, North Seattle Community College among many others.

Ms. Boyle said there is anticipated change to this property as noted in 2018 Campus Master Plan.

Ms. Blakeslee noted the desire for more open space by the community.

Mr. Coney said the board does not consider future changes and only focuses on the building. He said as part of the report, he wondered if there are any other purpose built, dedicated computer buildings.

Ms. Boyle said she is sure there are some on other campuses such as Microsoft but she didn't know of any remaining from this era. She said she was not sure she would call it a building type, it only lasted less than a decade.

Mr. Coney said he would like to know how this fits in with others in college systems.

Mr. Norman asked for more information on students who went through this building – Paul Allen? Bill Gates? He said it is an interesting building historically.

Ms. Boyle said it was built in 1976. The move from main frame to desktop to cloud happened rapidly.

Mr. Norman said Bill Gates donated millions to the program and he would like more information.

Mr. Macleod asked if there is any interior imagery from its heyday.

Ms. Boyle said she went to her typical sources, and there isn't anything on social media.

Mr. Rodezno asked why the roof deck is no longer used.

Ms. Boyle alluded to student drinking and trash, and it didn't meet the 42" rail height for life safety.

Ms. Blakeslee said it also distracting to have people gathering outside a classroom.

Ms. Caton said she is not sure it rises to the level of a landmark, and maybe not an outstanding work. She said it has had changes, and would like to hear from other board comments.

Mr. Coney said that the board has seen other buildings related to master plans over time. He said the story is not complete. He said the building has been determined to be eligible for listing on the National Register by the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP). It was the first building dedicated to computers. It takes a unique eye and Brutalists need to tune their eye to it to appreciate it. He said the building is worthy of nomination. He supported nomination of the exterior and said moss does not impact integrity. He said with higher board attendance there will be more discussion to flesh out.

Mr. Norman said he was tentatively in favor of nomination but said he needs to know more about historic significance. He requested more information about computer center history.

Mr. Rodezno supported nomination and cited a DAHP letter regarding eligibility for the National Register. He said the building was built/designed directly in response to main frame computing. The building was innovative at the time. He said the Brutalist style got bad attention.

Mr. Macleod supported nomination and said he concurred with Mr. Coney. He said as Mr. Rodezno brought up a letter from DHAP which is a huge force in favor. He said it is not spectacular even though he is a fan of Ibsen Nelsen, but it rises above utilitarian with its sculpted moments at ramp and entry way. He said renovations may have lost original 'moments.' He said he is interested in historical significance component more so than architecture; how many other buildings like this are there. He noted the loss of the nuclear reactor building as a tragedy.

Ms. Wasserman supported nomination of the building exterior with the site identified on drawing with line around it. She said she spent much time in this building. She said it was purpose-built during a big era. She said the building served a lot of people. She said by 1980 many people had their own personal computers.

Ms. Johnson said she was torn. She said she was more interested in the history than the architecture although the massing and texture are nice. She said the building was nicer than it needed to be. She said it is interesting to think about building a building that has never been built before. She said it was a new type of building and the beginning of an era. She said she would not support nomination.

Mr. Macleod started a motion. Discussion ensued about wording of motion to appropriately identify the drawing with site boundary on it.

Ms. Doherty suggested wording that included exterior of building and site as designated in Figure 40 in nomination packet.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of University of Washington Wallace Hall at 3737 Brooklyn Avenue NE for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the exterior of building, and the site as illustrated in Figure 40 of the nomination application; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for December 15, 2021; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/IM/HW            6:1:0    Motion carried. Ms. Johnson opposed.

**110321.7**

**STAFF REPORT**

Adjourn

6:19 pm