



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 352/16

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

600 4th Avenue

L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room

Wednesday, June 15, 2016 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Marjorie Anderson

Deb Barker

Kathleen Durham

Robert Ketcherside

Jordon Kiel

Aaron Luoma, Chair

Jeffrey Murdock

Julianne Patterson

Matthew Sneddon

Mike Stanley

Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Genna Nashem

Rebecca Frestedt

Melinda Bloom

Absent

Nick Carter

Kristen Johnson

Chair Aaron Luoma called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

061516.1

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

May 4, 2016

MM/SC/RK/JK

10:00 Minutes approved as amended.

061516.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

061516.21 Harvard-Belmont Landmark District
1025 Boylston Ave E
Proposed landscaping

Ms. Nashem explained the removal and replanting of trees and other landscaping and hardscaping. The Harvard-Belmont Landmark District Review Committee met April 18, 2016. She reported that on December 29, 2014 an emergency Certificate of Approval for removal of five diseased Elm trees was issued coinciding with an emergency removal permit by SDOT Urban Forestry. The condition was that a proposal to replant the trees must be submitted. This proposal includes the replanting of those five trees, the repair to the sidewalk and additional tree removal and replanting and other landscaping. Urban forestry has also done a site visit. She said that they would prefer there be two trees replanted to replace the two additional trees removed, the applicant understood that although Urban Forestry preferred it but that there was not room for two with the required spacing. Therefore I added a clause to the motion as the Board has done in the past to allow some changes if they are required when they go to get their actual SDOT permit.

Brian Johnson, Bioscape, explained that trees damaged the sidewalk; he proposes to replace the sidewalk, curb, and add new plantings in the parking strip and above the sidewalk retaining wall. He said that two trees left on E. Prospect are leaning badly; have been poorly pruned and his tree consultant recommended removal. He noted that the roots are lifting the curb. He said that SDOT doesn't want trees within 30' of an intersection. He recommended replacing the two trees with one Zocoba, a narrower tree that will still provide shade.

Ms. Nashem asked the applicant to discuss the five trees removed in 2014 and replacements as well.

Mr. Johnson said those will be replaced with Dogwoods; they are narrower and are a better tree for the location. He said he would widen the parking strip to 6' and narrow the sidewalk to give the trees and plantings more space. He said they will add granite boulders and hardscape; plantings will include edibles – blueberries and strawberries, fragrant winter plant, and plant with interesting bark to create an interesting sidewalk. Responding to clarifying questions about sidewalk width Mr. Johnson said that SDOT told him to make sure the parking strip is at least 6'; sidewalk minimum is 4' and what is proposed will comply.

Ms. Nashem suggested an allowance for changes to tree species and number when he gets permits as the Board has done on previous applications as it has been common that Urban Forestry identifies needed changes when the permit is actually reviewed.

Mr. Johnson said that the elm trees were likely planted in 1910; he noted they tend not to live as long in a city environment.

Ms. Nashem clarified that the trees removed had Dutch Elm disease which is why there was an emergency removal permit.

Mr. Kiel asked if the Zocoba species will be shorter.

Mr. Johnson said the height won't impact power lines – if it does it can be pruned.

Mr. Luoma said he visited the site and noted the other trees were removed because of disease. He said that these two trees are in poor condition. He said there is limited space so they can't plant a like tree; what is proposed is reasonable.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board issue a Certificate of Approval for replanting of the five trees removed on an emergency approval, removal of two Linden trees and replant with one new tree, replacement of the sidewalk, landscaping and hardscaping in the parking strip and yard above the retaining wall. The areas will be irrigated and granite curb will remain at the corner. Adjustment to the location of the street trees, number of street trees and substitution of the species of tree is allowed as approved by Board staff in consultation with the Board's Landscape Architect and the City Urban Forestry Office.

The proposed exterior alterations meet the following sections of the District ordinance and The Harvard Belmont District Guidelines:

District ordinance

The proposed landscaping plans as presented June 15, 2016 do not adversely affect the special features or characteristics of the district as specified in SMC 25.22.

The other factors of SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable

The Harvard Belmont District Guidelines

3. Landscaping:

Guideline: Maintain existing landscaping, especially the mature trees.

Guideline: Maintain the alignment and spacing of street trees. Planting street trees where none now exist is encouraged. Existing street trees are important and pruning should be done only in a professional manner to maintain the trees health and to retain the natural form.

Guideline: Keep the space between sidewalk and street as a green planting space maintaining the same width wherever possible. Ground covers may be used in place of grass. Do not use crushed rock, concrete or similar materials as the major surface material.

Secretary's Standards for Rehabilitation

5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.

MM/SC/DB/MSN 10:00 Motion carried.

061516.22

Columbia City Landmark District
3813 & 3817 S. Ferdinand St.

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed installation of security cameras on new townhomes and proposed installation of an electronic pay station on the adjacent parking lot. Exhibits included photographs, plans and specifications. She said the Landmarks Preservation Board approved Final Design of the townhomes in April 2015. The Landmarks Preservation Board approved installation of the fence surrounding the parking lot in 2004. On June 7, 2016 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. The Committee recommended approval of the proposal.

Tom Reid, property co-owner, explained the proposal to install four security cameras in response to car burglaries. He said three cameras will be installed at the east end of the townhomes, adjacent to the parking lot, and one will be installed facing the alley. He said they will be 16' off the ground, installed the belly band of the building; the largest camera is 3" x 6". He said they will also install an electronic parking pay station on the northern side of the parking lot. He said they will cut into the retaining wall. They will retain and cover the existing pay slot cabinet, so it could be used if needed. He said they will put a fresh coat of paint on the existing bollards behind the pay station.

Pete Lamb, co-owner, said they are updating the system to allow credit card use in response to customer demand.

Mr. Reid said the cover will match the stainless steel box.

Ms. Frestedt said CCRC discussed attachment of the existing box. It was noted that if removed the big brackets on the pole would still be there.

Mr. Luoma said that overall they are minor changes to non-contributing structures.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for exterior and site alterations, located at 3813 & 3817 S. Ferdinand St, as proposed

This action is based on the following:

The proposed exterior and site alterations meet the following sections of the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards:

Secretary of the Interiors Standard #9

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

061516.23 Columbia City Landmark District
3834 S. Edmunds St.

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed landscaping. Exhibits reviewed included photographs and renderings. The Lincoln-Rotermund House was built in 1920 and is a contributing home within the District. It was remodeled in 1959. In 2010, the LPB approved a Certificate of Approval for Final Design of three adjoined townhomes on the northern portion of the lot. That approval included landscaping around the site.

Ms. Frestedt stated that on June 7, 2016 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. The Committee recommended approval of the proposal.

Applicant Comment:

Anna Stiver, property owner representative, explained the proposal to plant small English Boxwood across the front of their property to delineate their yard. She said it will grow 2' – 3' tall at the most. She said they are also replacing plants that have not done well in shade conditions.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker said it is reasonable.

Mr. Luoma noted other hedges in the District.

Ms. Barker said she is glad the plants will not be 'reaching for the sky', referring to taller hedges elsewhere in the District that were denied by the board due to their proposed height.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for landscaping, located at 3834 S. Edmunds St, as proposed

This action is based on the following:

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

Relevant Code citations

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

Relevant Columbia City Design Guidelines:

Guidelines/Specific

6. **Landscaping.** Landscaping is encouraged but not required. Approval of the use of landscaping, including window boxes and planters, shall be based on the applicant's desire and ability to maintain the landscaping.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards #9 and #10

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

061516.24

Admiral Theater
2343 California Avenue SW
Proposed exterior and interior alterations

Ms. Barker disclosed she worked on the Save the Admiral Task Force in 1989.

Ms. Doherty explained the designated areas of control. She said that alterations to the concession stand requires review but it is not historic.

Sol Baron explained proposal to do updates to the building and uncover the historic murals. He said they want to update the bathrooms, put in new stalls, do ADA accessibility upgrades; lobby improvements; convert to a four screen auditorium from two; add demising walls. He said they plan to replace the flashing on the roof and replace the emergency exit doors with steel; it will look identical to what is there now. He said they will paint the inside of the door the color of interior walls. He said interior and exterior colors will remain unchanged. He said that there are storm water issues; they will add a downspout at the southwest corner that will be painted to match the building. He said there are two stairwells with below grade doors where water collects along the alley and flood the theater. He said they will add two steel canopies to keep water out, and they will each have a light fixture below. He said they will do patching and painting at the main entry.

Mr. Baron said they want people to be able to walk into the lobby without purchasing a ticket, and create an accessible public space. He said the condiments will be on designated counters that will separate the space and control the flow of traffic into theaters; there will be a 5' tall wall behind these counters. He said they will remove signage at concession counters to allow visibility of the historic lobby mural. He said they will install custom carpet with a nautical theme to tie in with the mural and architectural elements. He said they will touch up painting to match in-kind. He said murals inside the theaters need restoration and they will work with community to raise the funds to restore them. For now they will be uncovered. He said they propose to place a silicone and foam strip against the wall at the mural location so the new demising walls won't damage them.

Ms. Doherty passed around old photos of the auditorium, and noted what has since changed based on what they know today.

Responding to questions Mr. Baron said that the larger theaters will hold 700 people when done. He said having a four-plex theater helps the community and allows them an opportunity for more films. He said the change in theater size is needed to sustain the business.

Mr. Murdock asked about ticket handling.

Mr. Baron said they don't use the exterior ticket box; ticket handling is just inside the door. The ticket booth will remain unchanged. He said they will now combine that function with concessions.

Public Comment:

Clay Eals, Southwest Seattle Historical Society, spoke in support of the project and said it is an exciting turning point. He said the Admiral Theater has been a bellwether for the rest of the community. He said the work won't harm the building and multiple smaller theaters will be more viable. He said exposing the murals is inspirational to getting funding for restoration. He said this is the next phase of this jewel.

Ms. Barker said ARC talked about the project and clarified what was proposed. She said the drainage will be taken care of and noted that the awning will add new material – there is no other metal. She said ARC didn't have too many issues with the proposed work.

Mr. Luoma said the original auditorium is already split into two theaters and doing it again is not a big deal. He said that the proposed demising walls are more partitions than walls and are easily removed.

Ms. Barker said the building has been a theater from the early days. She said the fish relief elements from the auditorium mural ended up being relocated to the Fifth Avenue Theater, and shadows of where those were once located can still be seen on the walls. She said uncovering the murals is good.

Mr. Kiel said a piece of the mural will be viewable in each theater.

Mr. Baron said this will make sure the theater remains a viable business; they want to keep it a theater and to keep the landmark alive.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior and interior alterations to the Admiral Theater, 2343 California Avenue SW, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed exterior and lobby alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 116972 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The proposed theater alterations affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 116972, but will be undertaken in a manner that will minimize impact on the historic murals' essential form and integrity, and can be easily removed in the future without causing further damage as per Standard #10 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
3. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

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

061516.25

Smith Tower
506 Second Avenue

Proposed lighting and restoration of designated interior features on 35th floor

Ms. Sodt explained only the decorative ceiling and tile are included in the designation.

Brett Baba said that Unico wants to reopen the Chinese room.

Melissa Glen said that over the years much is gone but the ceiling is still there.

Eric Kroll said they want to open the space to the public as a speakeasy and provide tours. He said they will take the color and tone and panelizing and put it back int. He said they will tell the story about what was happening when the building was built. He said they will have some theme tours and plan an expanded bar.

Ms. Glen said they will update the lighting which is currently large downlights. She said what is there now doesn't function well. She said they propose to replace the cove lighting and to expand it to the entire room. She said they will use LED fixture and make cove profile smaller. She said the thin rectangular shape will be hollowed out with space for the light. She said they will do a full size mock up. She said they will remove the downlights and add sconces for a wash on the wall. She said the current light pattern is haphazard. She said they will remove mechanical column chase and replace it with tile from attic that will be fixed by conservationist. She said that artist-technical consultant Currin Landrew thinks they can be fixed. She said the cover plate will be a simple wood disc with detail routed in with as minimal profile as possible. She said that there are a couple spots where corbels were removed; when they move the mechanical ducts they will replace with original corbels in attic.

Mr. Murdock asked if they have original pendants.

Ms. Glen said they found one which they will display as a piece of art.

Mr. Baba said the walls were clad in dotted panels which they will try to replicate and use as touchstone. He said they want flexibility in the space for programming tours, special events, etc.

Ms. Glen said they don't want to draw attention to lamps.

Mr. Stanley asked if they will install sprinklers.

Ms. Glen said there are sprinklers there n ow.

Public Comment:

Michael Herschensohn, Queen Anne Historical Society, said he did an exhibit on the history of the building. He noted the specialness of the elevators and the room.

Mr. Baba said the beautiful brass will remain.

Ms. Glen said they are not touching the elevator doors but noted they found one in the basement.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Murdock said it is great they are creating a public space and celebrating the building. He said the lighting plan makes sense. He said the rectangular profile is good.

Mr. Luoma said it is refreshing to see economics helping preservation for once.

Mr. Sneddon said he likes the illumination of one of the character defining feature of the roof. He wondered about the pendant connection to the history of the room. He asked what the origin of the Chinese Room name.

Ms. Sodt said the fire place from the Josephinum was designed by the same tile designer.

Ms. Glen said that very little originated in China. She said the tiles were replicas based on a temple in Philadelphia. She said the wood is from New Jersey; the furniture is Japanese. She noted the trend at the time for thematic names.

Ms. Sodt said that Ivar Haglund owned the building at one time.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed interior alterations to the Smith Tower, 506 Second Avenue, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed interior alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 113427 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/JM/DB 10:00 Motion carried.

061516.26

Terminal Sales Annex

1931 Second Avenue

Proposed application for Final Design of new construction

Ms. Sodt explained the application for proposed final design and the consideration of materials, finishes, and construction details.

Matthew Poncelow noted pages 2 and 3 and what the building will look like. He said the terracotta on the landmark will remain; the open cell block on sidewalls is in rough shape and will be replaced with a stucco application. He said that they downsized the project from early concepts to a 17-story boutique hotel and will save as much of the landmark as possible. He said that hotel check-in will be at the top where the view can be appreciated.

Dave Peters said that the premium suites will be in the landmark building and will be tied into the history of the site.

Mr. Poncelow said the tower has been pulled back.

Mr. Peters said they have done a window survey.

Mr. Poncelow said they are taking a rehabilitation approach with the windows and now recommend putting storm windows on the inside. He said they will save leaded glass and they will replace thin glass. He said three big window will be saved and preserved and protected in place. He said they will replace the non-original entry with a new updated storefront system that will match what is there now. He said that said that they will protect the exterior terracotta while re-glazing. He said the period molding on the inside will be taken back to historic feel. He noted page 11 of the plan to show the detail of the edge condition where the stucco meets the terracotta façade. He said where it meets the glass tower there will be a thin slot darker metal panel that gives the impression the historic building continues through. He said there are two types of stone in the new tower.

Responding to clarifying questions Mr. Poncelow explained that marble planned for first floor stairs and landing will receive Alaska marble. He explained that at the turn of the century a large boat load of Alaska marble was lost; it has not been salvaged and they will use it for floors and stairs. It is from the same bath as used on the building originally. He said they will bring marble up into the guest suites.

Ms. Patterson asked how they will protect the three massive glass panels.

Mr. Poncelow said that they will apply plywood during construction. He said they will put up temporary bracing frames to tie the concrete slabs to existing.

Mr. Sneddon asked if the interior storms will cover the entire window.

Mr. Poncelow said they will cover the entire window opening – they will be inset into the frame.

Mr. Sneddon asked why replace the others.

Mr. Poncelow said they are keeping all the leaded windows. He said the others are not in good condition.

Mr. Luoma asked about the spacing on the control joints on the stucco.

Mr. Poncelow said they will line up at each floor line horizontally. He said they will be small ½” joints. He said one vertical joint will be split in the middle. He noted detail 15 on page 11.

Mr. Kiel asked about the radius on page 10.

Mr. Poncelow said the terracotta is curved and the store front sets right behind that decorative piece. He said the frame will disappear. He said they will keep all the same mounting points.

Ms. Barker asked if the below grade window will be dark.

Mr. Poncelow said yes.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker said ARC reviewed the project a lot and she noted the applicants were receptive to comments and she noted the good results.

Mr. Kiel said he was happy where they landed and noted they were receptive to ARC comments.

Mr. Luoma said the window pattern was discussed and ARC said to leave it as it is. He said the stucco sides meet the general idea of uniform finish – there is some texture but not too much.

Ms. Barker noted the change from a 40 story project to what it is now. She said that ARC gave direction where they could and the project has had several lives before this.

Mr. Kiel said the façade is a unique case – they are keeping the whole frontage and made it part of the composition of the street. He said this approach doesn't always work.

Mr. Murdock asked if the stucco control joints line up with floor plates.

Mr. Poncelow said they do.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for Final Design for the new construction, partial demolition and rehabilitation as described in the application submittal and submitted plans. This action is based on the following:

In regards to SMC 25.12.750 A, the extent to which the proposed alteration or significance change would adversely affect the features or characteristics described in Ordinance No.122981: While the proposal includes partial demolition, a substantial portion of the first bay is proposed to remain, including the existing historic windows, therefore the primary elevation and view of the building will remain.

The other factors of SMC 25.12 .750 are not applicable at this time in the process.

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

The following items were reviewed out of agenda order.

061516.5 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

061516.51 Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center
4000 NE 41st Street
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for a three month extension. She said they will try and plan a site tour for this summer, for newer Board members.

Mr. Luoma said the extension request is reasonable.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

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

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

061516.52 Franklin Apartments
2302 Fourth Avenue
Request for extension

Ms. Sodt explained the request for a four month extension.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Franklin Apartments, 2302 Fourth Avenue, for four months.

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

061516.3 DESIGNATION

061516.31 Seattle City Light Power Control Center
157 Roy Street

Michael Herschensohn, Queen Anne Historical Society, prepared and presented the report (full report in DON file). He showed photos of the building that the subject building replaced, as well as neighborhood context photos from the 1950s and early 1960s. He provided supplemental information about the designers, reporting that Harmon, Pray and Detrich were architects and engineers who built industrial projects throughout the region including Puget Power in Bellevue, UW Sieg Hall, Boeing Engineer Building 2, schools, and lots of PUD work. He said this building was shown in a firm brochure so it was important to them. He said the building is reinforced concrete with “cast stone” facing (now called exposed aggregate), described as ‘fall out’ protection.

Mr. Luoma asked if fall out protection was part of the specs.

Mr. Herschensohn said there is no lead in the walls and nothing in the drawings. He said the building was designed in 1962 and built in 1963; he noted the connection in style and proximity to the World’s Fair.

Mr. Ketcherside asked if the Puget Power building was constructed before.

Mr. Herschensohn said he suspected it was.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Ketcherside supported designation of areas based on the Staff Report, under criteria C, D, and E. He said it is an important building architecturally and it was important to this firm. He said it is a significant installment of the City Light story.

Ms. Durham supported designation on criteria C, D, and E. She noted how it reads from the street. She said it is unique, and it’s interesting to see its relationship to the Space Needle and the World’s Fair, and how the modern language bled out from the fairgrounds into nearby utilitarian buildings. She said it is a nice reminder of their excitement about the future.

Mr. Sneddon supported designation based on the Staff Report. He said it is an interesting chapter in the history of electric utilities, mergers etc. He said it is a former Puget Power substation and noted the hidden integration of two systems. He said the building meets criteria C, D, and E. He said the character is Googie / Space Race architecture, a craze both localized and nationally. He said it is how the architecture represented that – here it is a highly localized example. He noted the reinforced concrete panels and aggregate language are a product of that time.

Mr. Murdock supported designation and said the architectural work is graceful and timeless. He said it is very much a part of the post-war era, the nuclear age, and the World’s Fair. He said the details are beautiful and are so intact. He noted the porcelain enamel spandrel panels, and the cantilevered stair. He supported the staff recommendation.

Mr. Kiel supported designation, and said the addition was well done and compatible. He said that criteria D and E are straightforward; the building is of its time period and shows

World's Fair thinking. He didn't support Criterion C – he said it is significant to City Light but questioned if it is significant enough to meet that criterion.

Ms. Patterson echoed fellow board members. She supported designation and agreed with the Staff Report on criteria C, D, and E, and suggested adding F. She said that it stands out and contributes to the neighborhood. She noted the association with Seattle Center.

Ms. Anderson supported designation based on the Staff Report and also suggested adding F. She noted the association with Seattle Center and World's Fair.

Ms. Barker supported designation on criteria C, D, E, and F. She noted the heritage of electric power, and the cultural heritage of fall out protection was intriguing. She noted the era when the power system was visible, while now it is hidden. She supported inclusion of the former exterior wall that is now at the interior.

Mr. Stanley supported designation on criteria C, D, and E. He noted the World's Fair, the Jetson's era, and the optimism of the age.

Mr. Luoma supported designation; he agreed with the Staff report and criteria C, D, E, and said he was a bit torn on F because the aluminum fencing detracts from the architecture. He said the aggregate on the addition is slightly different from the original. He noted the integration of the building downspouts into the structural columns; the elegant building details. He said that the fallout shelter "myth" is still an important story to the residents of Queen Anne.

Ms. Ketcherside also noted the space age connections, and the optimism for the future. He said the last day of the World's Fair coincided with the beginning of the Cuban Missile crisis.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Seattle City Light Power Control Center / Systems Operation Headquarters at 157 Roy Street 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, the exterior of the building, and the former exterior concrete panel walls at the building interior.

MM/SC/JP/JM 10:0:0 Motion carried.

Ms. Patterson left at 6:10 pm.

061516.4 NOMINATION

061516.41 1914-1920 Eastlake Avenue East Office Building

Bryon Ziegler, Aegis Living, said the building has served its useful life and has seen many changes over the years and noted the removal of the brise-soleil on the south facade. He noted the Docomomo WeWa letter (in DON file).

Larry Johnson, The Johnson Partnership, provided context of the site and the Eastlake neighborhood. He said the building sits on the trapezoidal parcel with parking lots at the north and south ends. He said the building was constructed in 1959, and in 1978 a small one-story addition was added on the north side. He said the building is concrete with steel web trusses; he noted the north south structural grid and the structural bay and the wide flange steel beams and columns. He said the south façade is the primary façade and he noted the ribbon windows that run the entire width. He said the entry is in the middle with a stair from the lower parking lot. He said there was a partial brise-soleil and trellis shelf and the second floor extended outward. He said the windows are vertical with divided muntins. He noted the blank west façade and the railroad tie terraced retaining wall.

He said that the north façade is one story and the entry is adjacent to and set back from the 1978 addition. He noted the blank CMU vault, ribbon windows and said there was very little insulation. He said that inside the suspended ceiling is non-original and the partition is gone. He said that the main building entry was on the north and now it is opened up and replaced with one large reception area. He said the northwest addition is now a kitchen and dining area and he noted the skylight is gone. He said the roof edge fascia is thicker now and the lower brise-soleil is gone. He said that in the 1978 addition roof insulation was added which necessitated the thicker fascia.

He said that the building did not meet any of the criteria for nomination. He said it was originally the home of Elmec (El – electrical for Tom Sparling and, Mec – mechanical for Richard Stern). He said that they shared the office with one on each end, eventually Stern left and Sparling took his half. He said that Sparling & Associates eventually moved downtown and this building doesn't convey its association with them. He said there are other buildings of theirs that are better examples of their work. He noted the casual association of this building with South Lake Union and said the subject building doesn't compare favorably with others by Kirk, Wallace and McKinley in 1961, or Steinhart, Theriault and Anderson in 1956. He said there are other better examples of the International Style such as Paul Thiry's Washington State Library in Olympia, Paul Kirk's Blakely Clinic, and Victory Steinbrueck and Paul Kirk's University of Washington Faculty Club. He said that the subject building turns its back to the street and its face to a parking lot.

Mr. Murdock asked about light fixtures on the blank wall.

Ms. Doherty noted the light fixtures are visible in a 1960 photo.

Mr. Murdock asked if the studs or hardware for the brise-soleil are still there.

Mr. Johnson said the fasteners are still there.

Mr. Luoma asked why the architect oriented the building north – south instead of east-west.

Mr. Johnson said it may have been to take advantage of the grade, or to get daylight.

Mr. Ziegler said perhaps it was to create two separate exterior building entries at upper and lower stories, and separate parking lots.

Mr. Kiel noted solar access and the brise-soleil.

Mr. Ketcherside asked about the connection between Durham and his clients, the two engineering firms.

Mr. Johnson said it is common to work with the same consultants over and over. He noted that one firm was mechanical engineering and the other was electrical engineering.

Mr. Luoma asked why Mr. Johnson felt there was no significant connection between Sparling and Stern and the building.

Mr. Johnson said it was his prejudice as an architect; he said that they were a large firm that won awards and he didn't see the connection to this building.

Mr. Murdock noted a book by Grant Hildebrand; he said this building could have easily been a wood structure based on its size, but that instead they designed a concrete and steel structure.

Mr. Johnson said that the Steinhart Building was faced with wood but sits on a concrete, stone faced plinth. He said the northwest school was largely influenced by Japanese architecture – he said he loved the Gene Zema building in Eastlake.

Public Comment:

Michael McQuaid spoke on behalf of the owner, David Leavengood, who he said was not able to attend due to illness. He said Mr. Leavengood has been in declining health for the past several years and that is why he had closed his architectural firm. He said that Mr. Leavengood said to specifically say that the reason he purchased this property when he did was to eventually redevelop it. He said Mr. Leavengood saw it as insignificant and had no problem demolishing it for a higher and better use. He said his health has turned and he is not able to develop it. He said Seattle is now hot for real estate redevelopment – he has his pick of buyers; there is no shortage of people wanting to buy this site. He said that he chose this buyer because of what they want to put there and he thought that would best represent the future of what the site could be. He said they didn't know it was being recommended for nomination. He said he thought Mr. Leavengood probably would have taken an ambulance here to speak if he could have. He said he would like to come and speak about his knowledge of the site at another time but he never in his wildest dreams thought this would ever be considered as historically significant or a landmark quality site. He said on two occasions he allowed his office to host neighborhood landmark groups during tours. He said Mr. Leavengood is clearly a preservationist and clearly interested in the landmark preservation work, but never did he consider this property anything other than a development site.

Ms. Doherty clarified that Mr. McQuaid is referring to the Staff Report, and it is the board who will decide whether it is nominated. She said her opinion in support of nomination was provided to Mr. Johnson many months ago, when he called her and said he was considering preparing an Appendix A. It should not be a surprise.

Mr. McQuaid said he saw the Staff Report when he came in and it was the first he saw it.

Ms. Doherty said the nomination is being presented today because she told Mr. Johnson that the building was eligible.

Mr. McQuaid said he didn't know about it.

Ms. Doherty said they were notified that the nomination was scheduled for today.

Mr. McQuaid said he knew about the nomination, but didn't know about the Staff Recommendation.

Ms. Doherty said that the Staff Recommendation had been informally conveyed to Mr. Johnson and that is why the nomination is being submitted.

Mr. McQuaid said he wasn't aware of that and neither was Mr. Leavengood, until at the meeting.

Mr. Johnson said his communications were directly with Aegis Living (identified in writing by Mr. Leavengood as the owner's representative for the proceedings).

Ms. Doherty said it is entirely up to the board and their deliberation tonight.

Mr. Luoma said if it is nominated there is a designation hearing.

Mr. McQuaid said that Mr. Leavengood may not live long enough to attend the designation meeting.

Mr. Stanley did not support nomination and said the building has no integrity and the details were an afterthought.

Ms. Barker did not support nomination. She said the photos don't do it justice and that the building didn't rise to the purity of what the design method embodied – there are expansive windows that look out to the parking lot, as well as blank walls.

Ms. Anderson did not support nomination and noted the east – west orientation was damaging to the design. She said that there is overall a light gesture to surface level but it is not holistic and doesn't embody the modern style.

Mr. Kiel did not support nomination and did not feel that it met any of the standards.

Mr. Murdock said he was on the fence but that the steel and concrete expression was skillfully done. He noted the relationship between upper and lower, and the early response to daylighting. He said the east – west orientation was for even light. He said he would support nomination and wanted to study it further.

Mr. Sneddon said a lot of important architectural firms were built in Eastlake, and there could even be a district with this as a contributing building. He said that it is part of an Architectural/Engineering firm portfolio; it was carefully designed in the International Style with consideration of the northwest style. He noted the exposed

steel frame, window ribbons and the use of concrete. He said that the building functioned as advertising for the engineering firm and was cutting edge for its time. He said that he supported criterion B for occupancy by a prominent electrical engineer firm. He said this was a crucial period for the firm. He supported nomination.

Ms. Durham did not support nomination although she appreciated Messrs. Murdock and Sneddon's comments. She did not think it met the standards.

Mr. Ketcherside said he was struck by the number of architectural office buildings that were already destroyed, and that a thematic district may have been possible. He said he was sympathetic to the plight of the engineer. He noted the collaboration between architects and engineers and noted the purposeful design of this building. He said we are not protecting enough modern buildings. He said that many post-war buildings with AIA awards are being destroyed. He did not support nomination and said the building is missing the appropriate level of architectural design.

Mr. Luoma said he was torn and asked where Sparling & Associates stands in the engineering community. He wondered how this building would convey its association with Tom Sparling. He noted the car-centric design and the orientation for parking. He noted the awful blank façade on Eastlake and the awful railroad tie retaining wall. He said there are two nice facades and the addition is good, but questioned if the building embodies a style. He said he would support nomination to learn more about Sparling.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the 1914-1920 Eastlake Avenue East Office Building 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, and the exterior of the building; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for July 20, 2016; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/MSN/JM 3:6:0 Motion failed. Messrs. Ketcherside, Kiel, Stanley, and Mmes. Durham, Anderson, and Barker opposed.

061516.6 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator